

Journal of Biblical Apologetics

Number 3, Summer 2002, Volume 6

Front Cover Art as Described by Dr. Robert a. Morey

The Dome Mosque on the temple site in Jerusalem. It has been destroyed and rebuilt many times, and the present one is not very old. Since Muhammad (1) only went there in a dream, and (2) thus never physically visited Jerusalem, the mosque is a fraud. Muhammad never stood on the rock that forms the center of the Mosque.

Special thanks to Sam Shamoun for his assistance in gathering together various articles that refute Islam.

Islam Part 2: Muhammad

Journal of Biblical Apologetics
No. 3, Summer 2002, Vol. 6
© Christian Scholars Press 2002 All rights reserved.

ISBN No. 1-931230-14-5

Published by:
Christian Scholar's Press, Inc.
1350 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 97
Las Vegas, NV 89119-5263
christianscholarspress@hotmail.com
1-800-901-7416

Table of Contents

Are the Arabs the Descendants of Ishmael?

By Dr. Robert Morey

By Their Moles Ye Shall Know Them

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Muhammad: the Racist Prophet

By Dr. Robert Morey

Muhammad's False Prophecies

By Sam Shamoun

Muhammad's Suicide Attempts

By Silas

Muhammad and Idolatry

By Sam Shamoun

Muhammad's Alleged Night Journey to the Jerusalem Temple

By Sam Shamoun

The Paracletos of John: Muhammad or the Holy Spirit

By Sam Shamoun

The Claim That Muhammad Is Prophesied in Deuteronomy 33:2

By Andy Bannister

The Death of Muhammad

By Silas

Common Logical Fallacies Made by Muslims

By Dr. Robert Morey

Are the Arabs The Descendants of Ishmael?

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Introduction

The Middle East will never have peace until the above question is honestly answered according to the historical facts. Myths and legends are fine as stories for children, but in the real world we must have facts and documentation.

Part One

The Arab Claim

The Arabs' claim to the land of Israel rests entirely on three false assumptions:

1. All Arabs are the descendants of Abraham through Ishmael.
2. Ishmael and his descendants were included in the covenant God made with Abraham.
3. Since the Abrahamic covenant included the land of Israel, the Arabs have a legitimate claim to it.

Ten Historical Facts

1. According to the Torah, when Abraham left Ur of the Chaldees, he went West to what is now called Israel ([Gen. 12 ff.](#)). He became a dweller in tents in that land. It was in Israel that God made a covenant with him for the land in which he was living at that time. It was in Israel that he fathered Isaac, Ishmael, and many other sons and daughters. Isaac was the only son of Abraham chosen by God to be the heir of the covenant. Abraham took Isaac to Mt. Moriah to be offered up as a sacrifice to God.

2. The Torah is contradicted by the Qur'an at nearly every point. According to Surah 2:119–121, Abraham and Ishmael did not dwell in tents in Israel but in the city of Mecca in Arabia. Together they rebuilt the Kabah and placed the black stone in the wall. It was Abraham who started the tradition of an annual pilgrimage to Mecca, throwing stones at the devil, etc. Abraham took Ishmael (not Isaac) to nearby Mt. Mina to offer as a sacrifice to God.

3. Ishmael's twelve sons were named Nebaioth, Kedar, Adbeel, Mibsam, Mishma, Dumah, Massa, Hadad, Tema, Jetur, Naphish, and Kedemah ([Gen. 12:11–16](#)). They intermarried with the local population in North Arabia and produced several nomadic tribes known as the "Ishmaelites."

4. It was prophesied in the Torah that Ishmael and his family would "live to the East of all his brothers" ([Gen. 16:12](#)). "And they settled from Havilah to Shur which is east of Egypt as one goes toward Assyria" ([Gen 25:18](#)). This broad area is the desert section East of Egypt in Northern Arabia toward the kingdom of the Assyrians.

5. The Ishmaelites are mentioned as a distinct tribe in the Assyrian records. They later intermarried with and were absorbed by the Midianites and other local tribes. In [Gen. 37:25–28; 39:1](#), the Ishmaelites are called the Midianites and in [Judges 8:22–24](#) cf. [7:1f](#), the Midianites are called the Ishmaelites. The identification cannot be made any stronger.

6. Arabia was already populated by the descendants of Cush and Shem long before Abraham or Ishmael were born ([Gen. 10:7](#)). Their cities and temples have been well documented by archaeologists.

7. If all the Arab people descended from Ishmael as Muhammad claimed, where did all the original Arabs go? What happened to them? Who did Ishmael marry if the Arabs did not already exist? If Arabia was unpopulated, who built Mecca? Since he lived there, obviously it existed before he was born. The facts speak for themselves. The Arab people existed before, during, and after Ishmael moved and started roaming the wilderness of North Arabia.

8. The descendants of Ishmael were scattered in Northern Arabia from the wilderness of Shur to the ancient city of Havilah. They were absorbed by the local tribes such as the Midianites ([Gen. 37:25–28](#); [39:1](#); [Judges 8:24](#)). There is no historical or archaeological evidence that Ishmael went south to Mecca and became the “Father” of the Arab race. Some modern Arab scholars admit that before Muhammad, Qahtan was said to be the “Father” of the Arab people, not Ishmael.

9. The Abrahamic Covenant was given only to Isaac and to his descendants. Ishmael and the other sons of Abraham were explicitly excluded by God from having any part of the covenant made with Abraham ([Gen. 18:18–21](#)).

10. Therefore the descendants of Ishmael and the other sons of Abraham do not have any claim to the land of Israel because they are not included in the covenant God made with Abraham. Only the Jews have any claim to the land of Israel.

Part II

Islam’s Claim

Muslims like to claim that Islam give them the right to claim the land of Israel as their own. This claim rests upon two false assumptions:

1. All Arabs are the descendants of Ishmael.
2. Muhammad went to Jerusalem.

Three Historical Facts

1. The first assumption has already been proven false. The Arab people are not all the descendants of Ishmael and hence they are not the heirs of the Patriarchs, the prophets, the Scriptures or the land of Israel.

2. The claim that Muhammad went to Jerusalem is false. According to the Qur’an and the Hadith, Muhammad had a dream in the middle of the night in which he traveled through the sky, visited seven heavens, met great people like Jesus, and visited Jerusalem. Since this was only a dream, he was never actually in Jerusalem. The Mosque on the temple site in Jerusalem is a hoax built on the lie that Muhammad stood on the site.

3. Nowhere in the Qur’an does it state that Ishmael is the progenitor of the Arab race. Since it is not taught in the Qur’an, it cannot be a true Islamic belief.

Conclusion

The Arab people are not the children of Ishmael. Even if they were, they would still have no claim to Israel because Ishmael was excluded by God Himself from having any part in the covenant made with Abraham. Isaac was the only heir of the Abrahamic covenant. Thus the Arabs as a people have no claim to the land of Israel.

The Muslims have no claim to the land of Israel either. Muhammad never went to Jerusalem except in a dream. The only ones with a spiritual and biblical claim to the land of Israel are the descendants of Isaac, the Jews.

Documentation

“Arabian literature has its own version of prehistoric times, but it is entirely legendary” (*Encyclopedia Britannica*, Vol. 2:176).

“The pure Arabs are those who claim to be descended from Joktan or Qahtan, whom the present Arabs regard as their principle founder... The ‘Arabu ’l-Musta’ribah, the mixed Arabs, claim to be descended from Ishmael... They boast as much as the Jews of being reckoned the children of Abraham. This circumstance will account for the preference with which they uniformly regard this branch of their pedigree, and for the many romantic legends they have grafted upon it... The Arabs, in their version of Ishmael’s history, have mixed a great deal of romance with the narrative of Scripture” (*A Dictionary of Islam*, pp. 18–19).

“Muhammad was not informed about the family of Abraham” (*Encyclopedia of Islam* 1:184. See also pages 544–546.)

“There is a prevalent notion that the Arabs, both of the south and north, are descended from Ishmael; and the passage in [Gen. 16:12](#), “He (Ishmael) shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren,” is often cited as if it were a prediction of that national independence which, upon the whole, the Arabs have maintained more than any other people. But this supposition is founded on a misconception of the original Hebrew, which runs literally, “He shall be before the faces of all his brethren,” i.e., (according to the idiom above explained, in which “before the face” denotes the east), the habitation of his posterity shall be “to the east” of the settlements of Abraham’s’ other descendants... These prophecies found their accomplishment in the fact of the sons of Ishmael being located, generally speaking, to the east of the other descendants of Abraham, whether of Sara or of Keturah. But the idea of the southern Arabs being of the posterity of Ishmael is entirely without foundation, and seems to have originated in the tradition invented by Arab vanity that they, as well as the Jews, are of the seed of Abraham—a vanity which, besides disfiguring and falsifying the whole history of the patriarch and his son Ishmael, has transferred the scene of it from Palestine to Mecca” (Mc Clintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature* Vol. 1:339).

In the Qur’an, “[Gen. 21:17–21](#) ... are identified with Mecca” (*The Concise Encyclopedia of Islam*, p. 193). It also states that the Southern Arabs come from Qahtan, not Ishmael (p. 48).

See also:

The Encyclopedia of Religion, Vol. 7, p. 296 where the connection between the Midianites and the Ishmaelites is noted.

The Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam, pp. 178–179.

A Popular Dictionary of Islam, p. 127.

By Their Moles Ye Shall Know Them

By Dr. Robert Morey

One obvious question that comes to the mind about Islam is why did the 7th century Arabs accept the prophethood of Muhammad? There were no biblical or pagan prophecies which foretold his coming. He was nearly illiterate and only of average intelligence. Why did they follow him?

The natural blood lust of the 7th century Arab was no doubt stirred by Muhammad’s call to kill, rape, and plunder in the name of Allah. Their quest for more slaves was no doubt satisfied

by Muhammad's proclaiming "open season" on all non-Muslims. Even the forced conversions at Mecca and elsewhere cannot explain everything.

The truth is found in pre-Islamic Arabia. The pagan Arabs, like many other barbaric peoples, believed in shamans or what we call today "witch doctors" or "medicine men." These "prophets" were revered as having magical powers over the forces of nature and over the spirits which inhabited trees, rocks, ponds, and streams.

Muhammad presented himself to the pagan Arabs as a shaman. This is clear from both the Qur'an and the Hadith. As documented in *Islamic Invasion*, Muhammad claimed to control the jinn, i.e., the spirits who lived in the trees, rocks, ponds and streams. In the Hadith, Muhammad is pictured as being in control of the forces of nature, and he could supposedly make it rain or cause a drought by his prayers.

The pagan Arabs looked for certain physical defects on the body as a sign of prophethood. They believed that a "seal" of prophethood would be found on the body of someone called to be a shaman. This "seal" was a large hairy mole on the back of the shaman just below the neck. Just like a lump of wax seals a letter, the gods would place a lump of flesh on the back of someone called to be a shaman. What the pagan Arabs wanted to know was whether or not Muhammad had a large hairy mole on his back. Did he have the "seal" of prophethood?

In the Qur'an we read these words in Surah 33:40:

Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the apostle of Allah, and *the Seal of the prophets*: and Allah has full knowledge of all things.

What is the identity of this "seal" and what is its significance? There are two different ways of asking these questions. If you asked a modern Muslim what this "seal" was all about, the answer would depend on whether you were talking to a Sunni or a Shi'ite Muslim.

Sunni Muslims in opposition to Shi'ite Muslims believe that Muhammad was the last of the prophets and that there will be no prophets after him. (See Yusuf Ali's comment in his translation of the Qur'an, n. 3731, pg. 1119, as an example of how the Sunnis interpret the significance of the "seal.") The modern Muslim controversy over the significance of the seal is not really germane to our discussion.

We are not asking what Muslims are told today by their mullahs as to the identity and significance of the "seal" mentioned in the Qur'an. We have asked a simple historical question: What did the early Muslims believe concerning the "seal of the prophets?" In fact, we are asking: What did the most trusted and revered early Muslim historians and theologians say about this "seal" of the prophets mentioned in the Qur'an?

The early Hadith scholars are unanimous in their interpretation of the identity and significance of the "seal of the prophets" found in Surah 33:40. The greatest of all Hadith scholars, al-Bukhari, tells us:

Narrated As-Sa'ib bin Yazid: I stood behind him (i.e. Muhammad) and saw the seal of Prophethood between his shoulders, and it was like the 'Zir-al-Hijla (meaning the button of a small tent, but some say "egg of a partridge.") (vol. 1, no. 189, vol. 4, no. 741).

The second greatest work on the Hadith is without a doubt the Sahih Muslim Hadith. It records the following:

THE FACT PERTAINING TO THE SEAL OF HIS PROPHETHOOD, ITS CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE AND ITS LOCATION ON HIS BODY. Jabir b. Sammura reported: I saw the seal on his back as it were a pigeon's egg. This Hadith has been narrated on the authority of Simal with the same chain of transmitters. Abdullah b. Sarjis reported: I went in after him and saw the Seal of Prophethood between his shoulders on the left side of his shoulder having spots on it like moles (vol. IV, CMLXXIX, p. 1251).

The early Muslim scholars clearly held to the same view of the seal. It was a large hairy mole on Muhammad's back which signified that he was a prophet.

A mole of an unusual size on the Prophet's back, which is said to have been the divine seal which, according to the predictions of the Scriptures, marked Muhammad as the "Seal of the Prophets" (Khatimu 'n-Nabiyin).

It was the size of the knob of the bridal canopy. Others say it was even the size of a closed fist (Mishkatu 'I-Masabih, bk. iii, ch. 7).

It was a piece of flesh, very brilliant in appearance, and according to some traditions it had secretly inscribed within it, "Allah is one and has no associate" (Shaikh 'Abdu 'I-Hagq).

Muhammad said to Abu Ramsa, "Come hither and touch my back." Which he did, drawing his fingers over the prophetic seal, and behold! There was a collection of hairs upon the spot. When Abu Ramsa offered to remove it, Muhammad said, "The Physician thereof is He who placed it where it is" (Muir, new edition, p. 542).

The *Dictionary of Islam* interprets the "Seal of Prophecy" as:

This, says one, was a protuberance on the Prophet's back of the size and appearance of a pigeon's egg. It is said to have been the divine seal which, according to the predictions of the Scriptures, marked Muhammad as the last of the Prophets... From the traditions it would seem to have been nothing more than a mole of unusual size (p. 389).

Ali Tabari, one of the most respected early apologists for Islam, interpreted the "seal of the Prophets" as a mole on Muhammad's back. He desperately tried to find some biblical prophecy that would predict such a physical sign. He seized upon [Isaiah 9:6](#) as a prophecy of Muhammad. He took the phrase, "and the government shall be upon his shoulders" and interpreted it as a prophecy concerning moles!

And he said in this chapter, "Unto us a child is born and unto us a child is given, whose government is on his shoulder" ([Isaiah 9:6](#)). He means by that "his prophecy is on his shoulder." ... In the Hebrew it is said: "The sign of prophecy is on his shoulder." This is what the Muslims call "the sign of prophecy." This is therefore, a clear allusion to the portraiture (i.e. physical characteristics) of the prophet—may Allah bless and save him—and a reference to his face and his moles (N.A. Newman, *Early Christian-Muslim Dialogue*, [13.111: Hatfield, PA, 1994] p. 628).

We could go on with many more references from early Muslim theologians and historians, but these citations are sufficient to prove that the "seal of prophecy" referred to in Surah 33:40 was a large hairy mole on Muhammad's back. While such physical defects are often looked upon by pagans as a mystical sign, nowhere in the Bible is such a thing ever considered.

As to [Isaiah 9:6](#), it refers to the Messiah whose title is “Mighty God.” Obviously, the word “government” does not mean a mole. I have not found a single modern Muslim scholar who views [Isaiah 9:6](#) as a prophecy of Muhammad.

Now the truth can be told. The pagan Arabs were looking for a shaman who had a mole on his back. Muhammad had such a mole. Thus he was a pagan shaman. That is why he won over so many pagan Arabs.

Conclusion

Why am I not a Muslim? Simple. An ugly, hairy mole on someone’s back does not make him a prophet! Thus the Qur’an is wrong, the Hadiths are wrong. The Muslim theologians, historians and scholars are all wrong. Muhammad was a pagan shaman and thus was under the curse of God ([Deuteronomy 18:9–12](#)).

Muhammad The Racist Prophet

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Was the founder of Islam a white racist? Did he have prejudicial views of black people? What was his view of the black man? Did he own black slaves?

These questions are very important for black Americans because they have been conned by Farrakhan and other black Muslims into thinking that Muhammad was a black man and Islam is the black man’s religion. But if it can be shown that Muhammad was a white man, that he was a racist, that he had prejudicial attitudes against black people, and that he was a slave owner of black slaves, then Islam will lose all respect in the black community. What is the truth?

First, Muhammad was a white man. There can be no doubt of this because the Hadith states this plain and simple. Since Bukhari is accepted by all Muslims as the greatest of all Hadith scholars, we will use his collection of Hadiths. His work is entitled “Sahih” which means that it is absolutely authentic.

In Hadith no. 63, vol. 1, when a man arrived at the mosque, he asked, “Who amongst you is Muhammad?” The companions of the prophet replied, “This white man reclining on his arm.” Muhammad is described as “a white person” in Hadith no. 122, vol. 2. And in vol. 2, Hadith no. 141, when Muhammad raised his arms in prayer, we are told that “the whiteness of his armpits became visible.” The Hadith vol. 1, no. 367 tells us that Anas, one of Muhammad’s most trusted companions, “saw that whiteness of the penis of Allah’s prophet.”

Any black man who converted to Islam because he was told by the Muslims that Muhammad was a black man should now realize that he was suckered into becoming a Muslim by lies and deception. The only thing he can do to regain his dignity and to escape being a fool is to renounce Islam.

Second, Muhammad was a slave owner of black slaves. In Hadith no. 436, vol. 6, when Umar came to visit Muhammad, he saw “a black slave of Allah’s apostle sitting on the first step.”

Lest some Muslim will claim that Muhammad had only one black slave, we will now quote from Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, a great Muslim historian. In his famous book *Zad al-Ma'ad* (Part I, p. 160) we read:

Muhammad had many male and female slaves. He used to buy and sell them, but he purchased more slaves than he sold, especially after God empowered him by His message, as well as after his immigration from Mecca. He once sold one black slave for two. His name was Jacob al-Mudbir.

He also tells us on pages 114–116 the names of Muhammad's black slaves: Bilal, Abu Hurairah, Usamah Ebn Zaayed, and Rabbah were some of the black slaves of Muhammad. Among the black slaves was a black man by the name of Mahran. His story bears telling in the next section.

The most famous slave market was in Mecca during Muhammad's day. Black people stolen from African villages were auctioned off like cattle. This same slave market in Mecca was still being used for buying and selling black slaves until the late 1960s!

In the Sudan, as you are reading this material, the Muslim slave market has been revived as blacks in chains from the Dinka tribe are now being auctioned off to Muslim masters. (See *Islamic Invasion*, p. 199, for the documentation which proves this.) In Arabic the common word for "black" is "Abd" which also means "slave."

In 1992, a book written by Jean Sasson shook the Muslim world. It was entitled *Princess* because it was the true story of a Saudi princess in her own words. In her autobiography she revealed the fact that her Muslim family had many black slaves. On page 29, we read:

We owned a family of Sudanese slaves. Our slave population increased each year when Father returned from Haj, the annual pilgrimage to Macca made by Muslims, with new slave children.

The Haj is the greatest religious event in all Islam. And what do the Muslims do on their Haj? Buy more black slaves!

Third, Muhammad mistreated his black slaves. It is clear that Muhammad treated his black slaves as animals of burden. The black slave Mahran tells us his story in his own words. The great Muslim historian, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, records that:

Mahran was renamed (by Muhammad) Safina (i.e. ship). He himself relates his own story. He says, "The apostle of God and his companions went on a trip. When their belongings became too heavy for them to carry, Muhammad told me, 'Spread your garment.' They filled it with their belongings, then they put it on me. The apostle of God told me, 'Carry it for you are a ship.' Even if I was carrying a load of six or seven donkeys while we were on a journey, anyone who felt weak would throw his clothes or his shield or his sword on me so I would carry that, a heavy load. The prophet told me, 'You are a ship'" (Ibn Qayyim, pp. 115–116, al Hulya, vol. 1, p. 369, quoted from *Amad* 5:222).

It does not take a Ph.D. to see that Muhammad mistreated Mahran and made him carry heavy loads. He even changed his name to "ship" to degrade him. The name "Safina" meant that the black slave Mahran was nothing more than a ship to carry Muhammad's burdens.

“But,” one Muslim stated, “these are things from long ago. Islam does not make racist statements against blacks anymore.” But Malik Ibn Ons, one of Islam’s most respected modern scholars, states in his commentary on Muhammad’s teachings on slavery:

The master does not have the right to force the female slave to wed an ugly black slave if she is beautiful and agile unless in the case of utmost necessity (Ibn Hazm, vol. 6, Part 9, p. 469).

Referring to black men as “ugly black slaves” cannot be understood as anything less than racism.

In the Qur’an, Surah 33:50–52 tells us that a slave master could force sex upon his female slaves. The expression, “those whom thy right hand possesses out of the prisoners of war” has always been interpreted by Muslim scholars to mean that a Muslim slave master could force his slaves to have sex with him.

Only the Day of Judgment will reveal how many black women were raped by Muslim masters. Since the Muslims were in the slave business long before they got the Europeans involved and the Muslims are still enslaving and raping slaves today in black Africa, a fearful judgment awaits the Muslims.

Fourth, Muhammad was prejudiced against black people. He said that if you dreamed of a black woman, this was an evil omen (Hadith no. 9, vol. 162, 163). He referred to black people as “raisin heads” (Hadith no. 662, vol. 1).

Conclusion

It has now been demonstrated from Muslim books that Muhammad was a white, racist, slave owner of black slaves who treated them as animals to carry his burdens or as sex slaves. He enslaved blacks and treated them as animals. No intelligent black man or woman should have any respect for Muhammad or his racist religion.

Muhammad’s False Prophecies

By Sam Shamoun

The Holy Bible gives us a test to determine a true prophet from a false one:

“But a prophet who presumes to speak in my name anything I have not commanded him to say, or a prophet who speaks in the name of other gods, must be put to death. You may say to yourselves, ‘How can we know when a message has not been spoken by the LORD?’ If what a prophet proclaims in the name of the LORD does not take place or come true, that is a message the LORD has not spoken. That prophet has spoken presumptuously. Do not be afraid of him” ([Deuteronomy 18:20–22](#)).

In light of what God says in the preceding passage, we will examine several predictions made by Muhammad in the Quran and Islamic traditions to see whether he passes God’s test.

On the Roman Conquest of Persia

S. 30:2–4: “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.”

As the prophecy stated, the Byzantines did become victorious over the Persians who had at first defeated them. Yet there are fundamental problems with this alleged prophecy:

- According to Yusuf Ali the Arabic word for “a few years,” BIDH’UN, signifies a period of three to nine years; yet according to some scholars the victory did not come until nearly twelve years later. The Persians defeated the Byzantines and captured Jerusalem at about A.D. 614 or 615. The Byzantine counter-offensive did not begin until A.D. 622 and the victory was not complete until A.D. 625, making it a period between ten and eleven years, not “a few years” alluded to in the Quran.

- The original Quranic text had no vowel marks. Thus, the Arabic word SAYAGHLIBUNA, “they shall defeat,” could easily have been rendered, with the change of two vowels, SAYUGHLABUNA, “they (i.e. Romans) shall be defeated.” Since vowel points were not added until some time after this event, it could have been quite possible for a scribe to deliberately tamper with the text, forcing it to become a prophetic statement.

This fact is solidified by Muslim commentator al-Baizawi. C.G. Pfander mentions Baizawi’s comments on the variant readings surrounding this passage:

“But Al Baizawi shatters the whole argument of the Muslims *by informing us of certain varied readings in these verses of Suratu’r Rum*. He tells us that some read (Arabic text appears here) instead of the usual (Arabic text appears here) and (Arabic text appears here) instead of (Arabic text appears here). The rendering will then be: ‘The Byzantines have conquered in the nearest part of the land, and *they shall be defeated in a small number of years.*’ *If this be the correct reading, the whole story about Abu Bakr’s bet with Ubai must be a fable, since Ubai was dead long before the Muslims began to defeat the Byzantines, and even long before the victories which Heraclius won over the Persians.* This shows how unreliable such Traditions are. The explanation which Al Baizawi gives is that the Byzantines became conquerors of ‘the well-watered land of Syria’ (Arabic text appears here) and that the passage predicted that the Muslims would soon overcome them. If this is the meaning, the Tradition which records the ‘descent’ of the verses about six years before the Hijrah must be wrong, and the passage must belong to A.H. 6 at earliest. It is clear that, *as the vowel points were not used when the Qur-an was first written down in Cufic letters, no one can be certain which of the two readings is right.* We have seen that there is so much uncertainty about (1) the date at which the verses were ‘sent down,’ (2) *the correct reading,* and (3) *the meaning, that it is quite impossible to show that the passage contains a prophecy which was fulfilled.* Hence, it cannot be considered to be a proof of Muhammad’s prophetic office” (C. G. Pfander, *Mizan-ul-Haqq—The Balance of Truth*, revised and enlarged by W. St. Clair Tisdall [Light of Life, P.O. Box 18, A-9503, Villach Austria], 279–280) [emphasis ours].

This being the case, a Muslim cannot confidently tell us what the true reading of the text is and hence cannot assure us that this verse originally predicted the Byzantine victory over the Persians. Yet either rendering leaves us with a false prophecy within the Quran.

● It amazes us that a prophecy from God would not specify the exact time of the victory, seeing that God is all-knowing and all-wise, declaring the end from the beginning. When God specifies a time frame as an important part of a prophecy we would expect that it be precise, not a mere guess. For God to guess that the Byzantines would win at some time within “a few years” as opposed to specifying the exact year, is inconsistent with the belief in an Omniscient, Omnipotent Being. Hence, it is unlikely that the true God would actually make such a prophecy.

Interestingly, the phrase “a few years” serves to further discredit this alleged prophecy. Abu Bakr believed the term “a few years” meant that the Byzantines were going to win in three years:

“This passage refers to the defeat of the Byzantines in Syria by the Persians under Khusran Parvis (A.D. 615–6 years before the Hegira). However, the defeat of the Persians should take place soon ‘in a small number of years.’ In the light of this prediction, Abu-Bakr undertook a bet with Ubai-ibn-Khalaf that this prediction would be fulfilled within three years, but he was corrected by Mohammed who stated that the ‘small number’ is between three and nine years (Al-Baizawi). Muslims tell us that the Byzantines overcame their enemies within seven years. The fact, however, is that the Byzantines defeated Persia in A.D. 628 (Al-Baizawi commentary). That was twelve years after the prediction of Mohammed. Consequently this passage does not qualify as a prophecy, particularly as the time between prophecy and fulfilment was far too short, and in addition the event was easily predictable” (Gerhard Nehls, *Christians Ask Muslims* [Life Challenge, SIM International: Africa, 1992], pp. 70–71).

On Entering Mecca

Sura 48:27 makes the following promise:

“Truly did Allah fulfill the vision for His Messenger. Ye shall enter the Sacred Mosque, IF ALLAH WILLS, with minds secure, heads shaved, hair cut short, and without fear. For He knew what ye knew not, and He granted, besides this, a speedy victory.”

This verse was revealed in conjunction with the Muslims’ failed attempt of entering Mecca to perform TAWAF (the ritual during Hajj of running between two mountains that was supposed to commemorate Hagar’s fetching of water for Ishmael).

On their way to the Ka’bah, they were met by a Meccan deputation headed by Suhail b. Amr who forbade the Muslims from completing their journey. This meeting then led to the signing of the treaty of Hudaibiya.

Several problems arise from this whole incident. First, at the signing of the Hudaibiya treaty Muhammad agreed with the pagan Meccans to return to them those who had converted to Islam. At the same time Muhammad also bowed to their demands of replacing his signature of ‘Muhammad, Messenger of God’ with ‘Muhammad, son of Abdullah’ so that he might be allowed to make pilgrimage to Mecca the following year. The following is taken from *Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 3, Book 50, Number 891*:

“When Suhail bin Amr came, the Prophet said, ‘Now the matter has become easy.’ Suhail said to the Prophet ‘Please conclude a peace treaty with us.’ So, the Prophet called the clerk and said to him, ‘Write: By the Name of Allah, the most Beneficent, the most Merciful.’ Suhail said, ‘As for “Beneficent,” by Allah, I do not know what it means. So write: By Your Name O Allah, as you used to write previously.’ The Muslims said, ‘By Allah, we will not write except: By the Name of Allah, the most Beneficent, the most Merciful.’ *The Prophet said, ‘Write: By Your Name O Allah.’* Then he dictated, ‘This is the peace treaty which Muhammad, Allah’s Apostle has concluded.’ Suhail said, ‘By Allah, if we knew that you are Allah’s Apostle we would not prevent you from visiting the Kaba, and would not fight with you.’ So, write: ‘Muhammad bin Abdullah.’ The Prophet said, ‘By Allah! I am Apostle of Allah even if you people do not believe me. Write: Muhammad bin Abdullah.’ (Az-Zuhri said, ‘The Prophet accepted all those things, as he had already said that he would accept everything they would demand if it respects the ordinance of Allah (i.e. by letting him and his companions perform ‘Umra.)’). *The Prophet said to Suhail, ‘On the condition that you allow us to visit the House (i.e. Ka’ba) so that we may perform Tawaf around it.’* Suhail said, ‘By Allah, we will not (allow you this year) so as not to give chance to the Arabs to say that we have yielded to you, but we will allow you next year.’ **SO, THE PROPHET GOT THAT WRITTEN.**

“Then Suhail said, ‘We also stipulate that you should return to us whoever comes to you from us, even if he embraced your religion.’ The Muslims said, ‘Glorified be Allah! How will such a person be returned to the pagans after he has become a Muslim?’ ” (italic emphasis mine).

One of those forced to return to Mecca with the pagans was Abu Jandal. In Ibn Ishaq’s *Sirat Rasululllah (The Life of Muhammad*, trans. Alfred Guillaume, Oxford University Press), p. 505 we are told:

“When Suhayl (the Meccan representative and the treaty’s compiler) saw Abu Jandal he got up and hit him in the face and took hold of his collar, saying, ‘Muhammad, the agreement between us was concluded before this man came to you.’ He replied, ‘you are right.’ *He began to pull him roughly by his collar and to drag him away to return him to Quraysh*, while Abu Jandal shrieked at the top of his voice, ‘Am I to be returned to the polytheists that they may entice me from my religion O Muslims?’ and that increased the people’s dejection” (emphasis mine).

And:

“While they were in this state Abu- Jandal bin Suhail bin ‘Amr came from the valley of Mecca staggering with his fetters and fell down amongst the Muslims. Suhail said, ‘O Muhammad! This is the very first term with which we make peace with you, i.e. you shall return Abu Jandal to me.’ The Prophet said, ‘The peace treaty has not been written yet.’ Suhail said, ‘I will never allow you to keep him.’ The Prophet said, ‘Yes, do.’ He said, ‘I won’t do.’ Mikraz said, ‘We allow you (to keep him).’ Abu Jandal said, ‘O Muslims! Will I be returned to the pagans though I have come as a Muslim? Don’t you see how much I have suffered?’

“Abu Jandal had been [previously] tortured severely for the cause of Allah” (*Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 3, Book 50, Number 891*).

We need to ask, Did Moses ever return a convert (especially one who was an Egyptian) back to the pagan Pharaoh in order to please the latter in obtaining what he wanted? Did Jesus ever

compromise the truth of God by agreeing with the Pharisees in turning back all gentile seekers in order to be accepted by the Jewish ruling council? Would either Moses or Jesus go so far as to deny their apostleship in order to please the demands of pagans? Would these men refuse to glorify the true God in the manner commanded by the Creator and acquiesce to the request of addressing God in a manner pleasing to the unbelievers, much like Muhammad did?

As one would expect, the Muslims were enraged, especially Umar b. al-Khattab who rebuked Muhammad:

“Umar bin al-Khattab said, ‘I went to the Prophet and said, “Aren’t you truly the messenger of Allah?” The Prophet said, “Yes, indeed.” I said, “Isn’t our cause just and the cause of the enemy unjust?” He said, “Yes.” I said, “Then why should we be humble in our religion?” He said, “I am Allah’s messenger and I do not disobey Him, and He will make me victorious” ’ ” (*Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 3, Book 50, Number 891*).

The anger of the Muslims is justifiable when we realize that Muhammad promised that his followers would have access to Mecca that very same year. When that did not occur, Muhammad attempted to justify his statement by stating, “Yes, did I tell you that we would go to Ka’ba this year?” (Ibid.).

In other words, since he did not specify when they would enter Mecca this cannot be considered a false prophecy! This is simply erroneous since the Muslim contingent was on their way to Mecca when a deputation from the pagan Arabs stopped them. In fact, one of Muhammad’s demands in signing the treaty was that the pagans permit the Muslims to complete their journey to Mecca in order to perform *Tawaf*. Suhail denied Muhammad’s request and instead made an agreement that the Muslims could enter Mecca the following year. Ibn Kathir further supports this in his commentary on S. 48:27:

“In a dream, the Messenger of Allah saw himself entering Makkah and performing *Tawaf* around the House. He told his Companions about this dream when he was still in Al-Madinah. When they went to Makkah in the year of Al-Hudaybiyyah, *none of them doubted that the Prophet’s vision WOULD COME TRUE THAT YEAR*. When the treaty of peace was conducted *and they had to return to Al-Madinah that year, being allowed to return to Makkah the next year, SOME OF THE COMPANIONS DISLIKED WHAT HAPPENED*. ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab asked about *THIS*, saying, ‘Haven’t you told us that we will go to the House and perform *Tawaf* around it?’ ” (*Tafsir Ibn Kathir, Abridged, Volume 9, Surat Al-Jathiyah to the end of Surat Al-Munafiqun*. Abridged by a group of scholars under the supervision of Shaykh Safiur-Rahman Al-Mubarakpuri [Darussalam Publishers & Distributors, Riyadh, Houston, New York, London, Lahore; first edition, September 2000], p. 171; italic and capital emphasis mine).

This proves that Muhammad actually believed he was going to enter into Mecca, a plan that never materialized. In order to save face he had to deny admitting that he actually implied that the Muslims would enter Mecca that same year.

Second, to make matters worse Muhammad broke the treaty with the Meccans by refusing to return a Muslim convert from the Quraysh. This refusal was in clear violation of things expressly stipulated in the very document that Muhammad had agreed to sign:

“Umm Kulthum Uqba b. Mu’ayt migrated to the apostle during this period. Her two brothers ‘Umara and Walid sons of ‘Uqba came and asked the apostle to return her to

them *in accordance with the agreement between him and Quraysh at Hodaybiyya*, but he would not. *God forbade it*" (*Sirat Rasulullah*, p. 509; emphasis mine).

Hence, Muhammad justified the breaking of his oath by claiming that it was God's will to do so. Unfortunately for Muslims, this would prove that Muhammad's God is not the God of the Holy Bible since breaking one's oath is strictly forbidden (cf. [Numbers 30:1–2](#)).

In light of all these considerations, we are again compelled to ask the following questions. Did Moses ever bow down to Pharaoh's requests in order to bring Israel out of bondage from Egypt? Did Jesus ever deny his Messiahship to gain access to the Temple? Did any true prophet of God ever compromise with the unbelievers in order to fulfill the will of God? Did these men proceed to break their oaths and promises in order to gain an unfair advantage over the unbelievers?

One final problem with all this is that Muslims claim that every single word in the Quran was revealed directly by God to Muhammad through Gabriel. Based on this assumption Muslims further reason that one will not find Muhammad's words intermingled with the words of God. This being the case, how do Muslims explain the fact that S. 48:27 has Allah saying INSHA' ALLAH, i.e. "If Allah wills"? Does God not know what his will is? If so, is he uncertain whether his purpose shall come to pass necessitating him to then qualify his statement with the phrase, INSHA' ALLAH?

One can understand how fallible humans who are unaware of God's purpose can qualify their statements with the expression, "If God wills" (cf. [James 4:13–15](#)). But for God to make such a qualification is beyond reasoning.

Furthermore, if God is in fact speaking, then whom is he referring to when he says, "If Allah wills"? Is he addressing himself or someone else? If he is addressing someone else, then how many Gods are there? Or perhaps Allah is also a multi-personal Being seeing that there are more than one Person that make up the unity of Allah?

This leads us to conclude that Muhammad's prediction not only failed to materialize, but that his motives in concocting revelation were power, money and fame. This verse also proves that God cannot be the author of the Quran.

On the Appearance of the Antichrist and the End of the World

Muhammad allegedly claimed that the Antichrist (called the DAJJAL) was to appear shortly after the Muslim conquest of Constantinople. The following traditions are taken from the SUNAN ABU DAWUD:

Book 37, Number 4281:

Narrated Mu'adh ibn Jabal:

The Prophet (peace_be_upon_him) said: The flourishing state of Jerusalem will be when Yathrib is in ruins, the ruined state of Yathrib will be when the great war comes, the outbreak of the great war *will be at the conquest of Constantinople and the conquest of Constantinople when the Dajjal (Antichrist) comes forth*. He (the Prophet) struck his thigh or his shoulder with his hand and said: This is as true as you are here or as you are sitting (meaning Mu'adh ibn Jabal).

Book 37, Number 4282:

Narrated Mu'adh ibn Jabal:

The Prophet (peace_be_upon_him) said: The greatest war, the conquest of Constantinople and the coming forth of the Dajjal (Antichrist) will take place *within a period of seven months*.

Book 37, Number 4283:

Narrated Abdullah ibn Busr:

The Prophet (peace_be_upon_him) said: The time between the great war and the conquest of the city (Constantinople) will be six years, and the Dajjal (Antichrist) will come forth in the seventh.

Accordingly, Muslims conquered Jerusalem in 636 AD. Constantinople was taken over by Muslims in May 1453 AD. Yet the prophecy regarding Yathrib (Medina) being in ruins and Antichrist's advent to take place seven months after the conquest of Constantinople did not materialize. Based on the preceding traditions Antichrist was to appear in November 1453.

Some may wish to argue that these events refer to future conquests. For instance some may wish to say that Constantinople is used as a synonym for the Roman Christian Empire. This would therefore be predicting that Muslims are to take over Rome before Antichrist appears.

The problem with this is that if Muhammad was speaking of Rome he could have simply used the word Romans (Arabic: AR-RUM). In fact, ROMANS/AR-RUM is the name given to chapter 30 of the Quran. To call Rome either Constantinople or even Byzantium would be rather anachronistic. See above.

Hence, in light of the preceding factors we are forced to conclude that Muhammad's predictions failed to materialize, thus disqualifying him regarding his claim to prophethood.

Muhammad also believed in a young earth and that the world was about to end shortly after his advent. The following citations are taken from *The History of al-Tabari, Volume I—General Introduction and from the Creation to the Flood* (trans. Franz Rosenthal, State University of New York Press, Albany 1989), with all italic emphasis being mine:

“According to Ibn Humayd- Yahya b. Wadih- Yahya b. Ya'qub- Hammad- Sa'id b. Jubayr- Ibn Abbas: This world is one of the weeks of the other world—*seven thousand years. Six thousand two hundred years have already passed. (The world) will surely experience hundreds of years, during which there will be no believer in the oneness of God there. Others said that the total extent of time is six thousand years*” (Tabari, pp. 172–173; emphasis mine).

“According to Abu Hisham- Mu'awiyah b. Hisham- Sufyan- al-A'mash- Abu Salih- Ka'b: *This world is six thousand years*” (Ibid.).

“According to Muhammad b. Sahl b. 'Askar- Isma'il b. 'Abd al-Karim- 'Abd al-Samad b. Ma'qil I- Wahb: *Five thousand six hundred years of this world have elapsed. I do not know which kings and prophets lived in every period (ZAMAN) of those years. I asked Wahb b. Munabbih: How long is (the total duration of) this world? He replied: Six thousand years*” (Tabari, pp. 173–174; emphasis mine).

According to at-Tabari, Muhammad believed that the end of the world was to occur 500 years after his coming:

“According to Hannad b. al-Sari and Abu Hisham al-Rifa'i- Abu Bakr b. 'Ayyash- Abu Hasin- Abu Salih- *Abu Hurayrah: The Messenger of God said: When I was sent (to transmit the divine message), I and the Hour were like these two, pointing at his index and middle fingers*” (Tabari, p. 176; emphasis mine, see also pp. 175–181).

At-Tabari comments on the meaning of the Hour being as close as Muhammad's index and middle fingers:

“Thus, (the evidence permitting) a conclusion is as follows: The beginning of the day is the rise of the dawn, and its end is the setting of the sun. *Further, the reported tradition on the authority of the Prophet is sound.* As we have mentioned earlier, he said after having prayed the afternoon prayer: What remains of this world as compared to what has passed of it is just like what remains of this day as compared to what has passed of it. He also said: When I was sent, I and the Hour were like these two—holding index finger and middle finger together; I preceded it to the same extent as this one—meaning the middle finger—preceded that one—meaning the index finger. Further, the extent (of time) between the mean time of the afternoon prayer—that is, when the shadow of everything is twice its size, according to the best assumption (‘ALA AL-TAHARRI)—(to sunset) is the extent of time of one-half of one-seventh of the day, give or take a little. Likewise, the excess of the length of the middle finger over the index finger is something about that or close to it. *There is also a sound tradition on the authority of the Messenger of God,* as I was told by Ahmad b. ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Wahb—his paternal uncle ‘Abd-allah b. Wahb-Mu’awiyah b. Salih- ‘Abd al-Rahman b. Jubayr b. Nufayr—his father Jubayr b. Nufayr—the companion of the Prophet, Abu Tha’labah al-Khushani: *The Messenger of God said: Indeed, God will not make this nation incapable of (lasting) half a day—referring to the day of a thousand years.*

“All these facts taken together make it clear that of the two statements I have mentioned concerning the total extent of time, the one from Ibn Abbas, and the other from Ka’b, the one more likely to be correct in accordance with the information coming from the Messenger of God is that of Ibn ‘Abbas transmitted here by us on his authority: *The world is one of the weeks of the other world—seven thousand years.*

“Consequently, because this is so *and the report on the authority of the Messenger of God is sound—namely, that he reported that what remained of the time of this world during his lifetime was half a day, or five hundred years, since five hundred years are half a day of the days, of which one is a thousand years—the conclusion is that the time of this world that had elapsed to the moment of the Prophet’s statement corresponds to what we have transmitted on the authority of Abu Tha’labah al-Khushani from the Prophet, and is 6,500 years or approximately 6,500 years.* God knows best!” (Tabari, pp. 182–183, italic emphasis mine).

Hence, according to these traditions Muhammad believed that not only was the world less than 7,000 years old but it was to end on the seventh day, or seven thousand years from the time it was created. Accordingly, the world should have ended sometime between 1070–1132 AD, approximately 500 years after the birth and death of Muhammad. This is based on the fact that according to at-Tabari and others, the advent of Muhammad took place approximately 6,500 years from the time of creation. This is clearly a false prophecy.

Yet this date contradicts the one approximated by Abu Dawood in his Sunan. There, we saw that Antichrist was to appear seven months after the conquest of Constantinople, an event that took place in 1453 AD. This being the case, how could Muhammad have claimed elsewhere that the world was to end 500 years after his own birth and death? To make matters worse, the Islamic traditions claim that Antichrist was actually present during Muhammad’s lifetime. In fact, according to the traditions, Antichrist was a man named Ibn Saiyad:

Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 2, Book 23, Number 437:

Narrated Ibn 'Umar:

'Umar set out along with the Prophet (p.b.u.h) with a group of people to *Ibn Saiyad* till they saw him playing with the boys near the hillocks of Bani Mughala. Ibn Saiyad at that time was nearing his puberty and did not notice (us) until the Prophet stroked him with his hand and said to him, "Do you testify that I am Allah's Apostle?" Ibn Saiyad looked at him and said, "I testify that you are the Messenger of illiterates." Then Ibn Saiyad asked the Prophet (p.b.u.h), "Do you testify that I am Allah's Apostle?" The Prophet (p.b.u.h) refuted it and said, "I believe in Allah and His Apostles." Then he said (to Ibn Saiyad), "What do you think?" Ibn Saiyad answered, "True people and liars visit me." The Prophet said, "You have been confused as to this matter." Then the Prophet said to him, "I have kept something (in my mind) for you, (can you tell me that?)" Ibn Saiyad said, "It is Al-Dukh (the smoke)." (2) The Prophet said, "Let you be in ignominy. You cannot cross your limits." On that 'Umar, said, "O Allah's Apostle! Allow me to chop his head off." The Prophet (p.b.u.h) said, "*If he is he (i.e. Dajjal), then you cannot over-power him, and if he is not, then there is no use of murdering him.*" (Ibn 'Umar added): Later on Allah's Apostle (p.b.u.h) once again went along with Ubai bin Ka'b to the date-palm trees (garden) where Ibn Saiyad was staying. The Prophet (p.b.u.h) wanted to hear something from Ibn Saiyad before Ibn Saiyad could see him, and the Prophet (p.b.u.h) saw him lying covered with a sheet and from where his murmurs were heard. Ibn Saiyad's mother saw Allah's Apostle while he was hiding himself behind the trunks of the date-palm trees. She addressed Ibn Saiyad, "O Saf! (and this was the name of Ibn Saiyad) Here is Muhammad." And with that Ibn Saiyad got up. The Prophet said, "Had this woman left him (had she not disturbed him), then Ibn Saiyad would have revealed the reality of his case."

The traditions go on to positively identify Ibn Saiyad as Antichrist:

Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 9, Book 92, Number 453:

Narrated Muhammad bin Al-Munkadir:

I saw Jabir bin 'Abdullah swearing by Allah *that Ibn Sayyad was the Dajjal*. I said to Jabir, "How can you swear by Allah?" Jabir said, "I have heard 'Umar swearing by Allah regarding this matter in the presence of the Prophet *and the Prophet did not disapprove of it.*"

Sunan Abu Dawood, Book 37, Number 4317: Narrated Jabir ibn Abdullah:

Muhammad ibn al-Munkadir told that he saw Jabir ibn Abdullah swearing by Allah *that Ibn as-Sa'id was the Dajjal (Antichrist)*. I expressed my surprise by saying: You swear by Allah! He said: I heard Umar swearing to that in the presence of the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him), *but the Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) did not make any objection to it.*

Yet these traditions contradict the following traditions where Antichrist is described as being one-eyed and as being locked up in chains:

Sahih Bukhari, Volume 4, Book 55, Number 553:

Narrated Ibn Umar:

Once Allah's Apostle stood amongst the people, glorified and praised Allah as He deserved and then mentioned the Dajjal saying, "I warn you against him (i.e. the Dajjal) and there was no prophet but warned his nation against him. No doubt, Noah warned his nation against him but I tell you about him something of which no prophet told his nation before me. *You should know that he is one-eyed, and Allah is not one-eyed.*"

Sunan Abu Dawood, Book 37, Number 4306:

Narrated Ubadah ibn as-Samit: The Prophet (peace_be_upon_him) said: I have told you so much about the Dajjal (Antichrist) that I am afraid you may not understand. *The Antichrist is short, hen-toed, woolly-haired, one-eyed, an eye-sightless, and neither protruding nor deep-seated. If you are confused about him, know that your Lord is not one-eyed.*

Sunan Abu Dawood, Book 37, Number 4311:

Narrated Fatimah, daughter of Qays:

The Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) once delayed the congregational night prayer.

He came out and said: The talk of Tamim ad-Dari detained me. He transmitted it to me from a man who was of the islands of the sea. All of a sudden he found a woman who was trailing her hair. He asked: Who are you?

She said: I am the Jassasah. Go to that castle. *So I came to it and found a man who was trailing his hair, chained in iron collars, and leaping between Heaven and Earth.*

I asked: Who are you? He replied: *I am the Daiial (Antichrist).* Has the Prophet of the unlettered people come forth now? I replied: Yes. He said: Have they obeyed him or disobeyed him? I said: No, they have obeyed him. He said: That is better for them.

Someone might interject here and claim that the traditions make mention of 30 Antichrists to come into the world:

Sunan Abu Dawood, Book 37, Number 4319:

Narrated Abu Hurayrah:

The Prophet (peace_be_upon_him) said: The Last Hour will not come before there come forth *thirty Dajjals (fraudulents)*, everyone presuming himself that he is an apostle of Allah (see also *Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 9, Book 88, Number 237*).

This implies that Ibn Saiyad was just one of the thirty antichrists, and not THE Antichrist that was to come right before the end of the world.

There are several problems with this assertion. First, none of the traditions claim that Ibn Saiyad is one of the thirty antichrists that were to appear. Rather, the traditions imply that he is THE Dajjal or Antichrist. Second, if we take either of the dates proposed by at-Tabari or Abu Dawood, all thirty Dajjals needed to have appeared before either 1070–1132 or 1453 AD. Finally, according to the New Testament, Muhammad is actually one of these Antichrists:

"Dear children, this is the last hour; and as you have heard that the antichrist is coming, *even now many antichrists have come.* This is how we know it is the last hour ... Who is the liar? It is the man who denies that Jesus is the Christ. *Such a man is the antichrist—he denies the Father and the Son. No one who denies the Son has the Father; whoever acknowledges the Son has the Father also*" (1 John 2:18, 22–23).

Since Muhammad denied that Jesus is God's Son he is therefore one of the many antichrists that was to come according to the apostle John.

Therefore, no matter from what angle one looks at it we are still left with irreconcilable contradictions and false predictions.

Conclusion

We have examined both the Quran and the Islamic traditions and found that both sources contain false predictions. In light of the prophetic criteria given by God in [Deuteronomy 18](#), we discover that Muhammad fails this test. This means that Muhammad is neither a true prophet nor is he the prophet like Moses.

In the service of our Great God and Savior, Jesus Christ, our risen Lord forever. Amen. Come Lord Jesus. We love you always.

Further articles by Sam Shamoun can be found on the Answering Islam home page www.answering-islam.org

Muhammad's Suicide Attempts

By Silas

An extraordinary event occurs on the dusty road to Damascus. One strong, grim, determined traveler encounters his enemy—the God he fights against. Saul—a zealous, knowledgeable Jew, a Pharisee, is faced by Jesus Christ. He hated those that followed Christ; he was a sword welded against the flesh of the church. Upon his authority, those that followed Christ were imprisoned. He joined in their killing. Saul was a persecutor par excellence, and with all his heart, soul, strength, and mind, he was going to destroy the Christians. Now he was experiencing an event that would change his life; he came face to face with his opponent...

“Meanwhile Saul, still breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord, went to the high priest and asked for letters to the synagogues at Damascus, so that if he found any who belonged to the Way, men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem. Now as he was going along and approaching Damascus, suddenly a light from heaven flashed around him. He fell to the ground and heard a voice saying to him, “Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?” He asked, “Who are you, Lord?” The reply came, “I am Jesus, whom you are persecuting. But get up and enter the city, and you will be told what you are to do.” The men who were traveling with him stood speechless because they heard the voice but saw no one. Saul got up from the ground, and though his eyes were open, he could see nothing; so they led him by the hand and brought him into Damascus. For three days he was without sight, and neither ate nor drank. Now there was a disciple in Damascus named Ananias. The Lord said to him in a vision, “Ananias.” He answered, “Here I am, Lord.” The Lord said to him, “Get up and go to the street called Straight, and at the house of Judas look for a man of Tarsus named Saul. At this moment he is praying and he has seen in a vision a man named Ananias come in and lay his hands on him so that he might regain his sight.” But Ananias answered, “Lord, I have heard from many

about this man, how much evil he has done to your saints in Jerusalem; and here he has authority from the chief priests to bind all who invoke your name.” But the Lord said to him, “Go, for he is an instrument whom I have chosen to bring my name before Gentiles and kings and before the people of Israel; I myself will show him how much he must suffer for the sake of my name.” So Ananias went and entered the house. He laid his hands on Saul and said, “Brother Saul, the Lord Jesus, who appeared to you on your way here, has sent me so that you may regain your sight and be filled with the Holy Spirit.” And immediately something like scales fell from his eyes, and his sight was restored. Then he got up and was baptized, and after taking some food, he regained his strength.

“For several days he was with the disciples in Damascus, and immediately he began to proclaim Jesus in the synagogues, saying, “He is the Son of God.” All who heard him were amazed and said, “Is not this the man who made havoc in Jerusalem among those who invoked this name? And has he not come here for the purpose of bringing them bound before the chief priests?” Saul became increasingly more powerful and confounded the Jews who lived in Damascus by proving that Jesus was the Messiah” (Acts 9:1–22, New Revised Standard Bible¹).

Another man had a similar experience. This experience also dramatically changed his life.

Narrated 'Aisha:

The commencement of the Divine Inspiration to Allah's Apostle was in the form of good righteous (true) dreams in his sleep. He never had a dream but that it came true like bright day light. He used to go in seclusion to (the cave of) Hira where he used to worship (Allah Alone) continuously for many (days) nights. He used to take with him for the journey food for that (stay) and then come back to (his wife) Khadija to take his food like-wise again for another period to stay, till suddenly the Truth descended upon him while he was in the cave of Hira. The angel came to him in it and asked him to read. The Prophet replied, “I do not know how to read.” (The Prophet added), “The angel caught me (forcefully) and pressed me so hard that I could not bear it anymore. He then released me and again asked me to read, and I replied, “I do not know how to read,” whereupon he caught me again and pressed me a second time till I could not bear it anymore. He then released me and asked me again to read, but again I replied, “I do not know how to read (or, what shall I read?).” Thereupon he caught me for the third time and pressed me and then released me and said, “Read: In the Name of your Lord, Who has created (all that exists). Has created man from a clot. Read and Your Lord is Most Generous ... up to ... that which he knew not” (96.15).

Then Allah's Apostle returned with the Inspiration, his neck muscles twitching with terror till he entered upon Khadija and said, “Cover me! Cover me!” They covered him till his fear was over and then he said, “O Khadija, what is wrong with me?” Then he told her everything that had happened and said, “I fear that something may happen to me.” Khadija said, “Never! But have the glad tidings, for by Allah, Allah will never disgrace you as you keep good relations with your Kith and kin, speak the truth, help the poor and the destitute, serve your guest generously and assist the deserving, calamity-afflicted ones.” Khadija then accompanied him to (her cousin) Waraqa bin Naufal bin Asad bin 'Abdul 'Uzza bin Qusai. Waraqa was the son of her paternal uncle, i.e., her father's brother, who during the Pre-Islamic Period became a Christian and used to write the Arabic writing and used to write of the Gospels in Arabic as much as Allah wished him

to write. He was an old man and had lost his eyesight. Khadija said to him, “O my cousin! Listen to the story of your nephew.” Waraqa asked, “O my nephew! What have you seen?” The Prophet described whatever he had seen.

Waraqa said, “This is the same Namus (i.e., Gabriel, the Angel who keeps the secrets) whom Allah had sent to Moses. I wish I were young and could live up to the time when your people would turn you out.” Allah’s Apostle asked, “Will they turn me out?” Waraqa replied in the affirmative and said: “Never did a man come with something similar to what you have brought but was treated with hostility. If I should remain alive till the day when you will be turned out then I would support you strongly.” But after a few days Waraqa died and the Divine Inspiration was also paused for a while and the Prophet became so sad as we have heard that he intended several times to throw himself from the tops of high mountains and every time he went up to the top of a mountain in order to throw himself down, Gabriel would appear before him and say, “O Muhammad! You are indeed Allah’s Apostle in truth,” whereupon his heart would become quiet and he would calm down and would return home. And whenever the period of the coming of the inspiration used to become long, he would do as before, but when he used to reach the top of a mountain, Gabriel would appear before him and say to him what he had said before. (Ibn ‘Abbas said regarding the meaning of: ‘He it is that Cleaves the daybreak (from the darkness)’ (6.96) that Al-Asbah means the light of the sun during the day and the light of the moon at night). Quoted from the Sahih (authentic) Hadith (traditions) of Bukhari,² Volume 9, number 111.

Here are additional details from Ibn Ishaq’s “Sirat Rasulallah” from Guillaume’s translation, *The Life of Muhammad*,³ page 106. Words in [] type brackets are mine. Words in () brackets are the author’s.

“So I [Muhammad] read it, and he [Gabriel] departed from me. And I awoke from my sleep, and it was as though these words were written on my heart. (Tabari: Now none of God’s creatures was more hateful to me than an (ecstatic) poet or a man possessed: I could not even look at them. I thought, Woe is me poet or possessed—Never shall Quraysh say this of me! I will go to the top of the mountain and throw myself down that I may kill myself and gain rest. So I went forth to do so and then) when I was midway on the mountain, I heard a voice from heaven saying “O Muhammad! thou are the apostle of God and I am Gabriel.” End of quote.

The “Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir,” (*Book of the Major Classes*), by Ibn Sa’d, translated by S. Moinal Haq,⁴ page 225 has Muhammad saying:

“O Khadija, I see light and hear sounds and I fear I am mad.”

The visitations from the spirit continued. Then they stopped for a time believed to have been from six months to three years. When this happened, Tabari,⁵ volume 6 page 76, records:

“The inspiration ceased to come to the messenger of God for a while, and he was deeply grieved. He began to go to the tops of mountain crags, in order to fling himself from them; but every time he reached the summit of a mountain, Gabriel appeared to him and said to him, ‘You are the Prophet of God.’ Thereupon his anxiety would subside and he would come back to himself.”

Also, from Tabari Vol. 9, page 167, note 1151 says:

“The pre-Islamic Arabs believed in the demon of poetry, and they thought that a great poet was directly inspired by demons....

“This explains why Muhammad thought he was demon possessed, or influenced by demons; the Quran in many places reads like typical Arabic poetry.”

In *Muhammad at Mecca*,⁶ by W. M. Watt, pages 40, 41, there are also references that detail Muhammad's suicidal thoughts. Watt quotes from az-Zuhri's material.

“He (Muhammad) said, I had been meditating throwing myself from a mountain crag, but while I was so meditating, he appeared to me and said, ‘O Muhammad, I am Gabriel, and thou are the Messenger of God.’....

“Az-Zuhri said: ‘There was a gap for a time in the revelation to the Messenger of God and he was very sorrowful. He started going early to the tops of the mountains to throw himself down from them. But whenever he reached the summit of a mountain, Gabriel would appear to him and say, “Thou are the Prophet of God.” ’ ”

Introduction

Few people are aware of Muhammad's suicide attempts. Following his initial visitation by a spirit that claimed to be Gabriel, Muhammad was frantic with fear and attempted suicide. He walked up to the top of a mountain and intended to throw himself off a cliff. This same being that caused his fear then intervened. Later, over the course of up to the next three years, the visitations by this spirit became rare, and Muhammad would then again attempt suicide in a like manner. Again, it was only due to the intervention of this being that Muhammad did not kill himself.

Few Islamic leaders will teach this to their fellow Muslims because it casts a stain upon Muhammad; it brings doubt to his credibility and the credibility of his assumed “prophetic” experience. Some Muslims deny the sources of the story. Other, more intelligent Muslims, knowledgeable about the sources, respond by saying that the shock of the experience caused him to attempt suicide.

However, the shock of the initial experience would have worn off over the next few days, if not weeks, hardly cause for Muhammad's continued suicide attempts over the next years.

Discussion

Examine these events. Both men had an unexpected encounter. Paul was confronted by a Being that identified Himself as the Lord Jesus Christ; Muhammad was visited by a spiritual force that claimed to be Gabriel.

Paul was face to face with the God of the people he was persecuting. He saw a light, heard a voice, and suddenly knew whom he was really persecuting. We read that Paul then understood that he experienced a confrontation from God. We see that he was not terrorized, he did not panic with fear, and he attempted no rash, desperate actions. And following the event, God directed his people to minister to Paul; Paul was comforted, encouraged, and strengthened.

If anyone had a reason and justification to commit a rash action it was Paul. He was forced to realize that he was persecuting and killing God's people. What type of punishment would be

meted out to him? How could he be forgiven for the crimes against God he had committed? Would there be any peace or comfort to be found any place for the rest of his life?

Instead of acting crazed, Paul somehow began to know the God he was confronted by. Paul knew that this God was not going to exact revenge for the evil he had committed. Paul experienced God's forgiveness and having been forgiven much now loved much. Because of his intimate, spiritual experience, because he had tasted and seen that the Lord is good, he now submitted to God, and was determined to serve Him as ardently as he had persecuted Him.

Muhammad reacted quite differently. It is undeniable that something distressing occurred. He returns back to his wife bewildered, terrorized, "What's wrong with me?", he asks his wife. Just as children hide under the covers when they are afraid of monsters in the dark, so Muhammad had his wife wrap him in a blanket; he did not want to see the cause of terror again.

Not satisfied with her comfort, he goes to the mountain instinctively knowing that something evil had happened to him. The only way he knows how to deal with it is the final solution: commit suicide. But on top of the mountain this spirit intervenes, consoles him, strokes his ego, "O Muhammad, you are God's apostle." Muhammad returns.

But it's not over. The terror, depression, and doubt Muhammad experienced were too real, too persistent to shake. Soothing words are eroded by the inward torments, doubts, and fears, "Woe is me, poet or possessed ... I will go to the top of the mountain and throw myself down that I may kill myself and gain rest."

Unlike Paul's experience, Muhammad is not comforted by anyone but this "spirit." Muhammad is left in the lurch. As time goes on, this spirit visits Muhammad less often, the torments and depression return, and gain strength. He again goes to kill himself. And, just in time, the spirit intervenes, telling him, stroking his ego again and again, he is an apostle of god. The bouts of depression continue over the next years, the suicide attempts follow, and the spirit persists to sooth him. Muhammad begins to believe he is a messenger of god. A messenger of a god whose influence caused him to attempt suicide.

People in the Bible Who Encountered God

Let's further compare Muhammad's experience with Biblical stories of men who had experiences with God.

Noah—Gen. 6

God speaks to Noah and tells him that he is going to destroy the earth. Noah does not panic, become depressed, or driven by fear. He knows that this is God speaking to him, and there is no need for rash action. Noah knows this is God, and Noah does not become irrational. Noah knows that this God is not going to harm him.

Abraham—Gen. 12–18

God speaks to Abraham. Abraham does not panic, Abraham is not bewildered, Abraham does not doubt or become depressed, Abraham believes and obeys. God visited Abraham, yet neither he nor Sarah attempts any rash actions.

Moses—Ex. 3–34

God appeared to Moses in the burning bush. Moses was afraid to look at God but Moses did not act paranoid. He knew that this God was not a God of terror. Moses did not run back to his family frightened out of his mind. Moses did not become depressed over the event, thinking he was possessed or bewitched. Instead, because Moses personally experienced this God and knew he could trust this God; Moses knew and obeyed.

Isaiah—Isaiah 6

Isaiah had a powerful vision and experience of God. Yet he did not lose his mind, he was not driven by dread of God. He feared God because of the sin in his heart, and the sinfulness of the people he dwelt among, but he did not panic. During this experience he realized God had forgiven him and accepted him. Because he experienced the real God, Isaiah did not attempt suicide or any other rash action. His mind was sound, he did not need to have a “spirit” continue to sooth him.

Mary—Luke 1

The real Gabriel also visited Mary. She too was perplexed and afraid. But during her experience with Gabriel, she gained confidence and strength. She knew God loved her. She did not become irrational or depressed, and she did not run around frightened out of her mind. She did not attempt suicide. Instead, because she experienced the living God, she knew she was loved and accepted. She knew this God was real, and she had nothing to fear.

Jesus—Mark 1

When Jesus Christ began his ministry, he was baptized in water. The Holy Spirit descended upon him. God spoke from heaven, and the people there heard God speak, “This is my beloved Son, in Whom I am well pleased.” There were no panic attacks, depression, or doubt.

And, after Jesus was challenged by Satan in the desert he was ministered to by the angels. But Muhammad was ministered to by none. You get the feeling that instead of ministering, those spirits haunted him. Satan told Jesus, “If you are the Son of God, throw Yourself down”; the spirit told Muhammad not to throw himself down—he was the apostle of Allah.

As I read the stories about people in the Bible who encountered God I do not find anything that resembles Muhammad’s experience. These people actually met God, while Muhammad’s entire prophethood rests only upon what a spirit interface told him. These people were filled with a reverent fear, but never became depressed as a result of their experience. These people fellowshiped with God. Some walked with him, to others he revealed himself. None of them contemplated suicide. But many times over a course of up to three years, Muhammad tried to commit suicide, and each time this “spirit” stopped him. What plans did this spirit have in store for him?

Another Person Influence by Satan

On the other hand examine Judas. Satan put it into his heart to betray Christ; Satan entered Judas. And when Judas came to his faculties he committed suicide. When Muhammad had a

period of clear thought, without the influence of a spirit, he attempted suicide (Ref. [John 13](#) and [Acts 1](#)).

Also when Jesus cast out demons from a man, the demons entered a herd of pigs. What did the pigs do? They went mad and killed themselves—running into the sea where they drowned. These demon-possessed pigs committed suicide!

Other References to Muhammad And Demonic Experiences

Even in the Quran,⁷ there are references that people believed that Muhammad was possessed or influenced by demons.

Sura 81:22, 25 says:

“No, your compatriot [Muhammad] is not mad. He saw him [Gabriel] on the clear horizon. He does not grudge the secrets of the unseen, nor is this the utterance of an accursed devil.”

Sura 69:41, 42 says:

“It [the Quran] is no poet’s speech: scant is your faith! It is no soothsayer’s divination: how little you reflect! It is revelation from the Lord of the Universe.”

Here Muhammad is saying to his critics that he really saw an angel, and his words are not from a devil, or from his own imagination. No doubt the people living at that time thought he was inspired by a devil, so Muhammad spoke these words, as the Quran, in self-defense.

An Experience Muhammad Had as a Child

When Muhammad was a child a Bedouin woman nursed him. During this time he had an experience with “two men in white raiment.” Here is W.M. Watt’s translation of Ibn Ishaq’s biography of Muhammad, page 36:

“...two men in white clothes came to me with a golden basin full of snow. They took me and split open my body, then they took my heart and split it open and took out from it a black clot which they flung away. Then they washed my heart and my body with that snow until they made them pure.”

This event deeply disturbed the Bedouins and they returned Muhammad to his mother. Here is the story told by Muhammad’s wet-nurse, related in Guillaume’s translation of Ibn Ishaq, page 72:

“His [Muhammad’s friend’s] father said to me, ‘I am afraid that this child has had a stroke, so take him back to his family before the result appears’ ... She [Muhammad’s mother] asked me what happened and gave me no peace until I told her. When she asked if I feared a demon had possessed him, I replied that I did.”

Even in his childhood, some people thought he was demon possessed. Note that even Muhammad’s wet-nurse believed he had been demon possessed. One expects a degree of attachment between the two, since she cared for and nursed him. And note it was Muhammad’s

mother that brought up the possibility of his being demon possessed. So it is peculiar that both the mother would suggest it and the wet nurse would return Muhammad in those circumstances: something alarming actually occurred.

What are the possibilities of who and what these experiences can be attributed? The things that come to mind are that:

- 1) Muhammad did indeed have a visit from Gabriel.
- 2) Muhammad was visited by a demon, or Satan himself.
- 3) Muhammad experienced some type of delusion.
- 4) Muhammad suffered from some type of epilepsy or other mental problem.
- 5) A combination of nos. 2, 3, and/or 4.

Let's recap.

From his youth, some people close to him thought he was demon possessed. Later in life, Muhammad's encounter with a spirit, the so called "Gabriel," deeply disturbs him, and he thinks he is demon possessed. He becomes very depressed, filled with fear, and attempts suicide. But he is stopped only when this spirit appears and says he is an apostle. Later, when these visitations become infrequent, he again goes and tries to commit suicide. Each time the spirit intervenes. As time went on people continued to think Muhammad was demon inspired.

Information on Suicide and Mental Illness

At this point, we should review mental illness related to suicide. Muhammad attempted suicide many times. This was not simply a one shot affair because of a traumatic experience he had. This was his state of mind for quite some time.

The website: <http://www.save.org/question.html> contains some general questions regarding the mental health of a person who attempts suicide. I have added the prefaces of QUESTION and ANSWER, etc. My prefaces are in all caps. Here are some excerpts:

QUESTION: Why do people kill themselves?

ANSWER: Most of the time people who kill themselves are very sick with depression or one of the other types of depressive illnesses, which occur when the chemicals in a person's brain get out of balance or become disrupted in some way. Healthy people do not kill themselves. A person who has depression does not think like a typical person who is feeling good. Their illness prevents them from being able to look forward to anything. They can only think about NOW and have lost the ability to imagine into the future. Many times they don't realize they are suffering from a treatable illness and they feel they can't be helped. Seeking help may not even enter their mind. They do not think of the people around them, family or friends, because of their illness. They are consumed with emotional, and many times, physical pain that becomes unbearable. They don't see any way out. They feel hopeless and helpless. They don't want to die, but it's the only way they feel their pain will end. It is a non-rational choice.

This website goes into more detail: <http://www.save.org/depfacts.html>

QUESTION: WHAT ARE DEPRESSIVE ILLNESSES?

ANSWER: They are total-body illnesses that affect a person's thoughts, feelings, behavior, and physical health and appearance. They affect all areas of a person's life—home, work, school, and social life. These illnesses are different from ordinary blues—which are normal feelings that eventually pass. Depressive illnesses last for months or years with varying patterns. People with depressive illnesses cannot talk themselves into feeling good.

They cannot snap themselves out of it. Suffering or not suffering from these illnesses does not have anything to do with a person's willpower.

QUESTION: WHAT IS ANXIETY?

ANSWER: Anxiety is feeling excessive fear, nervousness or worrying that something bad might happen, even though there is no logical or specific reason to be afraid. Many times depressive illnesses and anxiety go hand in hand.

Various types of anxiety disorders include: Panic Disorder—panic attacks occur with symptoms of dizziness, rapid heart beat, feelings of faintness or detachment from body, shortness of breath, nausea, diarrhea, numbness or tingling in arms/legs, trembling, flushes or chills, fear of dying, the immediate need to flee the situation which has triggered the attack.

Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder—this disorder can occur as a result of an emotional or physical trauma such as a car or plane crash, physical/sexual assault, war, or natural disaster. Symptoms such as flashbacks or nightmares may suddenly begin happening years after the event took place, resulting in social isolation, panic attacks, angry outbursts or substance abuse, which may be an attempt to forget.

Some Comments and Concerns

While I am not a psychiatrist, it is obvious that anyone who consistently attempts suicide over a period of years is suffering from some type of mental illness. Is this the work of God? Muhammad attempted suicide many times. His mental illness stemmed from the terrifying experience he had with that spirit. Would God cause his chosen prophet to become mentally imbalanced? We see in the Bible that God always edified and strengthened the people who first encountered him. But in Muhammad's case the opposite is true. Instead of being strengthened, Muhammad was weakened. Instead of being full of confidence, Muhammad was full of fear; instead of knowing the path, Muhammad was left in doubt.

Wouldn't God's peace and love comfort Muhammad's heart so that Muhammad did not need to continue to attempt suicide? What a horrible track record for "Allah." God does not work that way. God's presence certainly did not cause Paul, Abraham, Noah, or Mary to become depressed, lose hope, and commit rash acts. Even Paul, while being physically beaten and imprisoned later in his life, did not lose hope, or give in to depression, but rather, he praised the God he knew ([Acts 16:22–31](#)).

On the other hand, following his experience with the spirit, Muhammad became suicidal. And as time goes on he continues to be suicidal. All the while he wonders, deep down, if he is demon possessed. A rational person would judge that whatever happened to Muhammad had damaged his mental state. If he were alive today he would be considered to be mentally ill, given drugs, institutionalized, and considered dangerous to himself.

What Does It All Mean?

Muhammad had a painful experience. It demented him. He suffered from the experience. What is the real power behind an experience that causes a man to become suicidal for up to three years?

Jesus predicted false prophets would arise and mislead many. If Jesus were telling the truth, then we should expect such false prophets to rise up, and be successful in misleading people.

“And many false prophets will arise and lead many astray” ([Matt 24:11](#)).

Satan would seek out and try to use false prophets. Muhammad, as a false prophet, was certainly successful. For people to choose to follow Muhammad means they are rejecting what Jesus taught; they are rejecting Christ himself. They are rejecting God. Judging from Muhammad's experience, and from what Muhammad later did and taught, doesn't it make sense that it was a Satanic power that affected and motivated Muhammad?

Key References from the New Testament On Satanic Activity

An important note: people were receiving messages from "angels" long before Muhammad showed up. There are two key verses in the New Testament.

[2 Cor. 11:14](#): And no wonder, for Satan himself masquerades as an angel of light.

[Gal. 1:8](#): But even if we or an angel from heaven should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let him be eternally condemned!

"Satan masquerades as an angel of light." This is exactly what happened to Muhammad. Go back to the description of his "revelation" experience. He experienced "light" inside the seclusion of the cave. Joseph Smith, another false prophet, also was visited by an angel who gave him a false message.

Conclusion

"God has not given us a spirit of fear, but of power, love, and a sound mind" ([2 Tim 1:7](#)).

My conclusion is that Muhammad experienced a demonic visitation and it damaged his mental health. Satan or one of his demons appeared to Muhammad. This horrible experience terrorized him, depressed him, and caused him to attempt suicide. It made him mentally ill. However Satan protected his investment. When Muhammad was left alone, the truth about what really happened depressed and frightened him. It would always surface in his mind. It was only Satan's deceptive influence that kept Muhammad from killing himself. Finally, after a period of time, Muhammad's mind was seared. Satan had won a prize. Jesus said that Satan was a murderer from the beginning. As Muhammad went through the rest of his life, the more power he gained, the more dominion and conquest he sought, the more blood was shed. All the while, he kept telling himself and others what Satan had told him many years before, "I am the apostle of God."

Bibliography

1. "The Bible," New Revised Standard Version, published by Nelson, Nashville, TN.
2. "Sahih al-Bukhari," translated by M. Khan, published by Kitab Bhavan, New Delhi.
3. "Sirat Rasulallah," by Ibn Ishaq, translated as *The Life of Muhammad*, by A. Guillaume, published by Oxford University Press, London.
4. "Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir," (*Book of the Major Classes*), translated by S. Moinul Haq, published by the Pakistan Historical Society.
5. *The History of al-Tabari*, translated by W.M. Watt, published by SUNY.

6. *Muhammad at Mecca*, by W.M. Watt, published by Oxford University Press.
7. "The Koran," translated by N.J. Dawood, published by Penguin, London.

Notes on the Source Material

Muhammad's suicide attempts are documented in several prominent Islamic source materials: Bukhari's "Sahih" collection of Hadith, Ibn Ishaq's "Sirat Rasulallah," Ibn Sa'd's, "Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir," and Tabari's "Ta'rikh al-rulul wa'l-muluk."

These source materials form the basis of much of Islam today. Bukhari's Sahih Hadith is considered to be the second most important set of writings in Islam, following the Quran. Ibn Ishaq's work is considered to be the most authentic extant biography of Muhammad, and Tabari's History is the best historical collection on early Islam.

For more articles by Silas, see the Answering Islam home page at www.answering-islam.org

Muhammad And Idolatry

By Sam Shamoun

One thing that sticks out in Islam is that most of the rites and practices adopted into the religion are actually pagan customs that Muhammad claimed were sanctioned by God. In fact, we find that Muhammad before, during, and after his mission continued to perform rites that from a biblical perspective are nothing more than idolatry. For instance, we are told that prior to his calling, Muhammad made sacrifices to the pagan idols:

Narrated 'Abdullah:

Allah's Apostle said that he met Zaid bin 'Amr Nufail at a place near Baldah and this had happened before Allah's Apostle received the Divine Inspiration. Allah's Apostle presented a dish of meat (that had been offered to him by the pagans) to Zaid bin 'Amr, but Zaid refused to eat of it and then said (to the pagans), "I do not eat of what you slaughter on your stone altars (Ansabs) nor do I eat except that on which Allah's Name has been mentioned on slaughtering" (*Sahih al-Bukhari* 7:407).

Despite the fact that neither of the parenthetical statements "that had been offered to him by the pagans" nor "to the pagans" is part of the Arabic text, the point is still clear that Muhammad ate food sacrificed to idols that Zaid refused to partake. This is brought out more clearly from the following citations taken from F.E. Peters. According to a tradition reported by Zaid ibn Haritha who was also present at the event:

The Prophet slaughtered a ewe for one of the idols (NUSUB MIN AL-ANSAB); then he roasted it and carried it with him. Then Zayd ibn Amr ibn Nufayl met us in the upper part of the valley; it was one of the hot days of Mecca. When we met we greeted each other with the greeting of the Age of barbarism, IN'AM SABAHAHAN. The Prophet said: "Why do I see you, O son of Amr, hated by your people?" He said, "This (happened) without my being the cause of their hatred; but I found them associating divinities with God and I was reluctant to do the same. I wanted (to worship God according to) the religion of Abraham..." The Prophet said, "Would you like some food?" He said, "Yes."

Then the Prophet put before him the (meat of the ewe). He (that is, Zayd ibn Amr) said: “What did you sacrifice to, O Muhammad?”

He said, “To one of the idols.” Zayd then said: “I am not the one to eat anything slaughtered for a divinity other than God” (Al-Kharqushi, *Sharaf al-Mustafa*, cited in F.E. Peters, *Muhammad and the Religion of Islam*, pp. 126–127).

Ibn al-Kalbi also confirms the fact of Muhammad offering up a ewe to al-Uzza, “in accordance with the religion of the people” (Ibid., p. 127).

Alfred Guillaume records a tradition recorded by the first Muslim biographer, Ibn Ishaq, who wrote:

“I was told that the apostle of Allah said, as he was talking about Zayd son of ‘Amr son of Nufayl, ‘*He was the first to up braid me for idolatry and forbade me to worship idols.* I had come from al-Ta’if along with Zayd son of Haritha when we passed Zayd son of ‘Amr who was in the highland of Mecca. Quraysh had made a *public example of him* for abandoning his religion, so that he went out from their midst. *I sat down with him. I had a bag containing meat which WE HAD SACRIFICED TO OUR IDOLS—Zayd b. Haritha was carrying it—and I offered it to Zayd b. Amir—I was but a lad at the time—and I said, “Eat some of this food, my uncle.”* He replied, “Surely it is part of those sacrifices of theirs which they offer to their idols?” When I said that it was, he said, “Nephew mine, if you were to ask the daughters of ‘Abd al-Muttalib they would tell you that I never eat of these sacrifices, and I have no desire to do so.” *Then he upbraided me for idolatry and spoke disparagingly of those who worship idols and sacrifice to them, and said, “They are worthless: they can neither harm nor profit anyone,”* or words to that effect.’ The apostle added, ‘After that I never knowingly stroked one of their idols nor did I sacrifice to them until God honoured me with his apostleship’ ” (A. Guillaume, *Islam* [Penguin USA; ISBN: 0140203117], pp. 26–27; italic and capital emphasis mine).

In fact, Muhammad’s indulgence in idolatrous practices continued right into his alleged prophetic calling. For instance, after Muhammad encountered “Gabriel” Ibn Ishaq states:

“And when the apostle of God had finished his period of seclusion and returned (to Mecca), *in the first place he performed the circumabulation of the Ka’ba, as was his wont. While he was doing it, Waraqa met him and said, ‘O son of my brother, tell me what thou hast seen and heard’* ” (Alfred Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad* [Oxford University Press, Karachi], p. 107).

We must keep in mind that at this time in Muhammad’s life, there was no revelation confirming that the Kaba was originally built by Abraham and Ishmael. That came later in his life. As far as Muhammad was concerned, the Kaba was nothing more than a pagan shrine erected in honor of pagan deities.

The Quran itself commanded Muslims to continue practicing the pagan rites as part of the religion:

“Behold! Safa and Marwa are among the Symbols of Allah. So if those who visit the House in the Season or at other times, should compass them round, it is no sin in them. And if any one obeyeth his own impulse to good,—be sure that Allah is He Who recogniseth and knoweth” (S. 2:158).

Yusuf Ali states:

“The virtue of patient perseverance in faith leads to the mention of two symbolic monuments of that virtue. These are two little hills of Safa and Marwa, now absorbed in the city of Mecca and close to the well of Zam-zam. Here, according to tradition, the lady Hajar, the mother of the infant Isma’il, prayed for water in the parched desert, and in her eager quest round these hills, she found her prayer answered and saw the Zam-zam spring. *Unfortunately, the Pagan Arabs had placed a male and female idol here, and their gross superstitious rites caused offense to the early Muslims.* They felt some hesitation in going round these places during the Pilgrimage. *As a matter of fact they should have known that the Ka’ba (the House of God) had been itself defiled with idols, and was sanctified again by the purity of Muhammad’s life and teaching.* The lesson is that the most sacred things may be turned to the basest uses; that we are not therefore necessarily to ban a thing misused; that if our intentions and life are pure, God will recognize them even if the world cast stones at us because of some evil associations which they join with what we do, or with the people we associate with, or with the places which claim our reverence” (Ali, *Holy Quran*, f. 160, p. 62).

Despite the fact that there is not a single shred of evidence to support that Hagar was in Mecca or that Zam-zam was the well that sprung forth miraculously by the angel, Ali admits that the hills of Safa and Marwa originally housed two pagan idols. The Hadith concurs that the Muslims were hesitant to run between these two hills due to the connection with Arab paganism:

I said to ‘Aisha, the wife of the Prophet, and I was at that time a young boy, “How do you interpret the Statement of Allah: ‘Verily, Safa and Marwa (i.e. two mountains at Mecca) are among the Symbols of Allah.’ So it is not harmful of those who perform the Hajj to the House (of Allah) or perform the Umra, to ambulate (Tawaf) between them. In my opinion it is not sinful for one not to ambulate (Tawaf) between them.” ‘Aisha said, “Your interpretation is wrong for as you say, the Verse should have been: “*So it is not harmful of those who perform the Hajj or Umra to the House, not to ambulate (Tawaf) between them.*” This Verse was revealed in connection with the Ansar who (during the Pre-Islamic Period) used to visit Manat (i.e. an idol) after assuming their Ihram, and it was situated near Qudaid (i.e. a place at Mecca), and they used to regard it sinful to ambulate between Safa and Manva after embracing Islam. When Islam came, they asked Allah’s Apostle about it, whereupon Allah revealed:—“Verily, Safa and Marwa (i.e. two mountains at Mecca) *are among the Symbols of Allah.* So it is not harmful of those who perform the Hajj of the House (of Allah) or perform the Umra, to ambulate (Tawaf) between them” (2.158) (*Sahih al-Bukhari* 6:22).

Narrated ‘Asim bin Sulaiman:

I asked Anas bin Malik about Safa and Marwa. Anas replied, “*We used to consider (i.e. going around) them a custom of the Pre-Islamic period of Ignorance, so when Islam came, we gave up going around them.* Then Allah revealed, “Verily, Safa and Marwa (i.e. two mountains at Mecca) *are among the Symbols of Allah.* So it is not harmful of those who perform the Hajj of the House (of Allah) or perform the Umra to ambulate (Tawaf) between them” (2.158) (*Sahih al-Bukhari* 6:23).

Other practices that were adopted into Islam include:

And complete the Hajj or ‘umra in the service of Allah. But if ye are prevented (from completing it), *send an offering for sacrifice*, such as ye may find, and do not shave your heads until the offering reaches the place of sacrifice. And if any of you is ill, or has an

ailment in his scalp, (Necessitating shaving), (He should) in compensation either fast, or feed the poor, or offer sacrifice; and when ye are in peaceful conditions (again), if any one wishes to continue the 'umra on to the hajj, He must make an offering, such as he can afford, but if he cannot afford it, He should fast three days during the hajj and seven days on his return, Making ten days in all. This is for those whose household is not in (the precincts of) the Sacred Mosque. And fear Allah, and know that Allah is strict in punishment (S. 2:196).

Yusuf Ali comments:

“When this was revealed, the city of Mecca was in the hands of the enemies of Islam, and the regulations about the fighting and the pilgrimage came together and interconnected. But the revelation provides, as always, for the particular occasion, and also for normal conditions. Mecca soon passed out of the hands of the enemies of Islam...” (Ali, *Holy Quran*, f. 214, p. 78).

So when ye have accomplished your holy rites, celebrate the praises of Allah, as ye used to celebrate the praises of your fathers,—yea, with far more Heart and soul. There are men who say: “Our Lord! Give us (Thy bounties) in this world!” but they will have no portion in the Hereafter (S. 2:200).

Again Yusuf Ali,

After Pilgrimage, in Pagan times, the pilgrims used to gather in assemblies in which the praises of ancestors were sung. As the whole of the pilgrimage was spiritualized in Islam, so this aftermath of the Pilgrimage was also spiritualized. It was recommended for pilgrims to stay on three days after the pilgrimage, but they must use them in prayer and praise to God” (Yusuf Ali, *Holy Quran*, f. 223, p. 80).

Hence, Allah commanded Muslims to observe the pagan customs right alongside the Arab pagans and their 360 idols. Some of these practices included kissing the black stone:

Narrated Salim that his father said: I saw Allah's Apostle arriving at Mecca; *he kissed the Black Stone Corner first* while doing Tawaf and did ramal in the first three rounds of the seven rounds (of Tawaf) (*Sahih al-Bukhari* 2:673).

Narrated 'Abis bin Rabia: 'Umar came near the Black Stone and kissed it and said *“No doubt, I know that you are a stone and can neither benefit anyone nor harm anyone. Had I not seen Allah's Apostle kissing you I would not have kissed you”* (*Sahih al-Bukhari* 2:667, 675, 676, 679, 680).

The reason behind Umar's reluctance in kissing the black object is that the pagan Arabs also performed this ritual. Muhammad kept this pagan practice, a practice that Umar reluctantly observed. Yet, since he saw his prophet kissing it, he was obligated to follow suit.

Sheikh Sha'rawi says:

“The kissing of the meteorite is a firm practice in Islamic law because Muhammad did it. You must not ask about the wisdom behind that because this rite is (an expression) of worship in spite of the obscurity of its wisdom” (Sha'rawi, *Legal Opinions*, pt. 3, p. 167 as cited in *Behind the Veil*, p. 287).

Muslim practices such as gathering on Friday and the four sacred months of Islam were also pre-Islamic customs:

Then, *when the sacred months have passed*, slay the idolaters wherever ye find them, and take them (captive), and besiege them, and prepare for them each ambush. But if they repent and establish worship and pay the poor-due, then leave their way free. Lo! Allah is Forgiving, Merciful (S. 9:5 Pickthall).

Lo! the number of the months with Allah is twelve months by Allah's ordinance in the day that He created the heavens and the earth. *Four of them are sacred*: that is the right religion. *So wrong not yourselves in them*. And wage war on all of the idolaters as they are waging war on all of you. And know that Allah is with those who keep their duty (unto Him). *Postponement (of a sacred month) is only an excess of disbelief whereby those who disbelieve are misled*, they allow it one year and forbid it (another) year, that they may make up the number of the months *which Allah hath hallowed, so that they allow that which Allah hath forbidden*. The evil of their deeds is made fair seeming unto them. Allah guideth not the disbelieving folk (S. 9:36–37).

One author writes in relation to these passages:

“In *Bulugh al-‘Arab fi Ahwal al-‘Arab*, we read, “The four sacred months, Rajab, Dhu al-Qa’da, Dhu al-Hijja and Muharram, *had been considered sacred during the pre-Islamic period [Jahiliya]*. Raids, taking revenge, war, fighting and disputes were forbidden during them. If a man were to meet his enemy who killed his father or brother during these months, he would not quarrel with him ... During the sacred months, [the people] were under restriction not to fight or make raids, and had to remove [their] spearheads as a sign that they would avoid fighting at all costs.’ Obviously, Islam borrowed the hallowing of these months from Pre-Islamic Arabs and introduced nothing new into the world” (‘Abdallah ‘Abd al-Fadi, *Is the Qur’an Infallible?* [Light of Life, P.O. Box 13 A-9503 Villach Austria], p. 127).

Interestingly, Muhammad abrogates the command forbidding fighting in the sacred months in order to allow Muslims the right to wage war against the unbelievers:

The prohibited month for the prohibited month,—and so for all things prohibited,—there is the law of equality. If then any one transgresses the prohibition against you, *Transgress ye likewise against him*. But fear God, and know that God is with those who restrain themselves (S. 2:194).

The question thee (O Muhammad) with regard to warfare in the sacred month. Say: *Warfare therein is a great (transgression)*, but to turn (men) from the way of Allah, and to disbelieve in Him and in the Inviolable Place of Worship, and to expel His people thence, is a greater transgression with Allah; for persecution is worse than killing. And they will not cease from fighting against you till they have made you renegades from your religion, if they can. And whoso cometh a renegade and dieth in his disbelief: such are they whose works have fallen both in the world and the Hereafter. Such are rightful owners of the Fire: they will abide therein (S. 2:217 Pickthall).

Yusuf Ali tries to justify Allah's decree to retaliate against the unbelievers in the sacred months:

HARAM-prohibited., sacred. The month of the Pilgrimage (ZUL-HAJJ) was a sacred month in which warfare was prohibited by Arab custom. The month preceding (ZULQAD) and the month following (*Muharram*) were included in the prohibition, and *Muharram* was specially called AL-HARAM. Possibly *Muharram* is meant in the first line (author-S. 2:194), and the other months and other prohibited things in “all things prohibited.” In Rajab, also war was prohibited. If the pagan enemies of Islam broke that

custom and made war in the prohibited months, *the Muslims were free also to break that custom but only to the same extent as the others broke it*. Similarly the territory of Mecca was sacred, in which war was prohibited. If the enemies of Islam broke that custom, *the Muslims were free to do so to that extent*. Any convention is useless if one party does not respect it. There must be a law of equality. Or perhaps the word *reciprocity* may express it better (Ali, *Holy Quran*, f. 209, p. 77).

The intolerance and persecution of the Pagan clique at Mecca caused untold hardships to the Holy messenger of Islam and his early disciples. They bore all with meekness and long-suffering patience until the holy one permitted them to take up arms in self defense. Then they were twitted in the breach of the custom about Prohibited Months, though they were driven to fight during the period against their own feeling of self defense. But their enemies not only forced them to engage in actual warfare, but interfered with their conscience, persecuted them and their families, openly insulted them and denied God, kept out the Muslim Arabs from the Sacred Mosque, and exiled them. Such violence and intolerance are deservedly called worse than slaughter (Ibid., f. 238, p. 85).

Yusuf Ali's reasoning is that it is okay for believers to sin and break an ordinance of God in order to avenge themselves. Hence, Allah allows his followers to sin against his commands in order that his enemies may be destroyed. The simple fact is that two wrongs never make a right.

O ye who believe! *When the call is proclaimed to prayer on Friday (the Day of Assembly)*, hasten earnestly to the Remembrance of God, and leave off business (and traffic): That is best for you if ye but knew! And when the Prayer is finished, then may ye disperse through the land, and seek of the Bounty of God: and celebrate the Praises of God often (and without stint): that ye may prosper. But when they see some bargain or some amusement, they disperse headlong to it, and leave thee standing. Say: "The (blessing) from the Presence of God is better than any amusement or bargain! and God is the Best to provide (for all needs)" (S. 62:9–11).

Al-Baidawi comments:

"It was called the Day of Congregation because people [were] to gather on it for prayer. Arabs had called it AL-'ARUBA. Some claim that it was Ka'b Ibn Lu'ay who called it that name, for people used to gather around him on that day. The first Friday on which the Messenger of God gathered the people for prayer was in Medina after he had spent a week in Quba'. It was in the valley of the clan Salim Ibn 'Auf" (Al-Fadi, *Is the Qur'an Infallible?*, p. 126).

Accordingly:

The author *Bulugh al-'Arab fi Ahwal al Arab* said the same thing as above but added that Ka'b Ibn Lu'ay used to preach to the people on that day (vol. 1, p. 250). Thus, the sanctity of Friday was a pre-Islamic tradition, laid out by Ka'b Ibn Lu'ay, not by the revelation of God" (*Ibid.*).

The fact is that even the Muslim prayers were not something unique, but something stemming from paganism! Muslim writer Muhammad Shukri al-Alusi in his *Bulugh al-'Arab fi Ahwal al Arab* states that:

“The Sabeans have five prayers similar to the five prayers of the Muslims. Others say they have seven prayers, five of which are comparable to the prayers of the Muslims with regard to time [that is, morning; noon, afternoon, evening and night; the sixth is at midnight and the seventh is at forenoon]. It is their practice to pray over the dead without kneeling down or even bending the knee. They also fast for one lunar month of thirty days; they start their fast at the last watch of the night and continue till the setting of the sun. Some of their sects fast during the month of Ramadan, face Ka’ba when they pray, venerate Mecca, and believe in making the pilgrimage to it. They consider dead bodies, blood and the flesh of pigs as unlawful. They also forbid marriage for the same reasons as do Muslims” (Ibid., pp. 121-122).

Muhammad ibn ‘Abdalkannan al-Sharastani in his *Al-Milal wa al-Nihil*, admits that most of the practices of Islam were actually rites performed by the pagans:

“The Arabs during the pre-Islamic period used to practice certain things that were included in the Islamic Sharia. They, for example, did not marry both a mother and her daughter. They considered marrying two sisters simultaneously to be a most heinous crime. They also censured anyone who married his stepmother, and called him DHAIZAN. They made the major [hajj] and the minor [umra] pilgrimage to the Ka’ba, performed the circumambulation around the Ka’ba [tawaf], ran seven times between Mounts Safa and Marwa [sa’y], threw rocks and washed themselves after intercourse. They also gargled, sniffed water up into their noses, clipped their fingernails, plucked their hair from their armpits, shaved their pubic hair and performed the rite of circumcision. Likewise, they cut off the right hand of a thief” (Ibid., vol. 2 chapter on the opinions of the pre-Islamic Arabs as cited in al-Fadi, *Is the Qur’an Infallible?*, p. 122).

To further complicate matters, the pagans, much like the Muslims, ran around the Kaba seven times. The number of circumambulation seemingly corresponded to the number of planets which the pagans venerated as deities. That number totaled seven! Yusuf Ali, commenting on the paganism of Arabia, states:

“But the moving ‘stars,’ or planets, each with a motion and therefore will or influence of its own. As they knew and understood them, they were seven in number, viz.: (1) and (2) the moon and the sun, the two objects which most closely and indubitably influence the tides, the temperatures, and the life in our planet; (3) and (4) the two inner planets, Mercury and Venus, which are morning and evening stars, and never travel far from the sun; and (5), (6) and (7) Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn, the outer planets whose elongations from the sun on the ecliptic can be as wide as possible. The number seven itself is a mystic number, as explained in n. 5526 to 65. 12... It will be noticed that the sun and the moon and the five planets got identified each with a living deity, god or goddess, with characteristics and qualities of its own...” (Ali, *Holy Quran*, Appendix XIII, p. 1621).

And where does Ali draw the inference that the number seven is a mystical number? Is it from the Holy Bible and the fact that God is said to have rested on the seventh day, thus hallowing it? (cf. [Genesis 2:2–3](#)) Let us read note 5526 and find out:

“Seven Firmaments.” The literal meaning refers to the seven orbits or firmaments that we see clearly marked in the motions of the heavenly bodies in the space around us... In poetical imagery there are the seven Planetary spheres, which form the lower heaven

or heavens, with higher spheres culminating in the Empyrean or God's throne of Majesty... The mystical meaning refers to the various grades in the spiritual or heavenly kingdom, the number seven being itself a mystical symbol, comprising many and yet form an indivisible integer, the highest indivisible integer of one digit" (Ibid., p. 1567).

It is quite obvious that there are nine, not seven, planets or orbits in our galaxy and therefore this is an error in the Quran. The belief in seven orbits, two of which were the sun and moon, stemmed from the pagan belief prevalent in Muhammad's day as Ali himself admits in the citations above.

Finally, after Muhammad had attacked Mecca and won over the Quraysh tribes, he entered the Kaba and destroyed every icon or sculptured idol. According to some reports, Muhammad found Christian icons of Jesus, Mary and Abraham that he did not destroy but left intact.

[After the conquest of Mecca] "Apart from the icon of the Virgin Mary and the child Jesus, and a painting of an old man, said to be Abraham, the walls inside [Kaaba] had been covered with pictures of pagan deities. Placing his hand protectively over the icon, the Prophet told 'Uthman to see that all other paintings, except that of Abraham, were effaced" (Martin Lings, *Muhammad: His Life Based on the Earliest Sources*, p. 300; ref.—al-Waqidi, *Kitab al-Maghazi* 834, and Azraqi, *Akhbar Makkah* vol. 1, p. 107. Martin Lings is a practicing Muslim.).

"...pictures of the prophets and pictures of trees and of angels. Among them there was a picture of Ibrahim as of an elderly man, drawing lots with arrow lots, and the picture of Jesus, the son of Mary, and of his mother and a picture with angels" (al-Azraqi according to the Arabic text edited by Ferdinand Wuestenfeld, *Chroniken der Stadt Mekka*, Band 1, Leipzig 1858, reprint Beyrouth 1964, p. 110).

"On the day of the conquest of Mecca the Prophet entered the House (the Kaaba, author's comment) and sent al-Fadl ibn al Abbas ibn Abdalmuttalib to get water from the well of Zemzem. He ordered to bring pieces of cloth and to imbue them with water and then he commanded to wash off these pictures, as it was done. *He stretched his arms, however, over the picture of Jesus, the son of Mary, and of his mother and said: 'Wash off all except what is under my hands!'* But eventually he took his hands away from Jesus, the son of Mary, and his mother" (alAzraqi p. 111, cf. p. 76). (Source: soc.religion.islam newsgroup posting).

Not all the sources unanimously agree with this story. A. Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad* (translation of Ibn Ishaq's *Sirat Rasulallah*), p. 552, writes:

"The Apostle ordered that the pictures should be erased except those of Jesus and Mary."³

In his footnote, he states:

"3. Apparently Ibn Hisham has *cut out what Ibn Ishaq wrote* and adopted the later tradition that all the pictures were obliterated. A more detailed account of these pictures will be found in Azraqi 104–6."

The typical Muslim response to these allegations is to assume that these rites were instituted by Abraham and Ishmael when the latter migrated to Mecca with his mother Hagar. Not only do

both the Holy Bible and archaeology contradict this claim, the sound Hadith itself makes it impossible for Abraham and Ishmael to be the ones who built the Kabah:

Narrated Abu Dhaar:

I said, “O Allah’s Apostle! Which mosque was built first?” He replied, “AlMasjid-ul-Haram.” I asked, “Which (was built) next?” He replied, “Al-Masjid-ul-Aqs-a (i.e. Jerusalem).” I asked, “What was the period in between them?” He replied, “*Forty (years).*” He then added, “Wherever the time for the prayer comes upon you, perform the prayer, for all the earth is a place of worshipping for you” (*Sahih al-Bukhari 4:636*).

This Hadith affirms that the Kaba was actually built long after Abraham and Ishmael had died. Abraham lived about 2000 B.C. and the Temple was built by Solomon in about 958–951 B.C. This implies that the Kabah was built approximately 998–991 BC. If Muhammad is correct, then the Quran is wrong. But if the Quran is correct in stating that Abraham and Ishmael built the Kaba, then the Hadith is wrong. Yet, if this particular Hadith is wrong then this throws into question the authenticity of the entire Hadith collections, especially Bukhari’s collection, which is considered to be the most reliable and authentic collection. Yet, to reject the Hadith is to destroy the historical significance of Islam since the pillars, Muhammad’s prophetic calling, his life and wives, the caliphate, the wars are things that are only found in Islamic traditions. The Quran does not mention the names of Muhammad’s mother, father, his wives, companions etc. These things are to be found in the Hadith.

Secondly, Abraham would never have placed a black idol for his descendants to kiss, especially in light of the fact that one of his descendants received divine commands forbidding the honoring of any visible object:

Remember the day you stood before the LORD your God at Horeb, when he said to me, “Assemble the people before me to hear my words so that they may learn to revere me as long as they live in the land and may teach them to their children.” You came near and stood at the foot of the mountain while it blazed with fire to the very heavens, with black clouds and deep darkness. Then the LORD spoke to you out of the fire. You heard the sound of words *but saw no form*, there was only a voice. He declared to you his covenant, the Ten Commandments, which he commanded you to follow and then wrote them on two stone tablets. And the LORD directed me at that time to teach you the decrees and laws you are to follow in the land that you are crossing the Jordan to possess. *You saw no form of any kind the day the LORD spoke to you at Horeb out of the fire. Therefore watch yourselves very carefully, so that you do not become corrupt and make for yourselves an idol, an image of any shape, whether formed like a man or a woman, or like any animal on earth or any bird that flies in the air, or like any creature that moves along the ground or any fish in the waters below. And when you look up to the sky and see the sun, the moon and the stars—all the heavenly array—do not be enticed into bowing down to them and worshipping things the LORD your God has apportioned to all the nations under heaven* ([Deuteronomy 4:10–19](#)).

Hence, the true God of Abraham would never send a black stone for his followers to kiss.

Thirdly, the idol of Mary and Christ is something that finds no biblical precedence, since the New Testament and the earlier Christians never fashioned images of Christ or Mary. This practice was adopted centuries later by pagans converting to Christianity who integrated pagan customs into the Church. This is precisely what Muhammad did with Islam.

In conclusion, we must say that Muhammad began and ended with a pagan religion with the only difference being that he repackaged it in a monotheistic context.

For more articles by Sam Shamoun, see the Answering Islam home page at www.answeringislam.org

Muhammad's Alleged Night Journey To the Jerusalem Temple

By Sam Shamoun

According to the Quran, Allah allegedly took Muhammad on a journey from the Kabah in Mecca to the Temple at Jerusalem:

Glory to (Allah) Who did take His Servant for a Journey by night from the Sacred Mosque to the *Farthest Mosque (Masjid al-Aqsa)*, 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) (S. 17:1).

The hadiths expand on the theme of Muhammad's travel to the Temple at Jerusalem, and even describe some of its features:

Sahih al-Bukhari Volume 6, Book 60, Number 233:
Narrated Jabir bin 'Abdullah:

The Prophet said, "When the Quraish disbelieved me (concerning my night journey), I stood up in Al-Hijr (the unroofed portion of the Ka'ba) and Allah displayed Bait-ul-Maqdis before me, and I started to inform them (Quraish) about its signs while looking at it."

Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 5, Book 58, Number 228:

Narrated Ibn 'Abbas:

Regarding the Statement of Allah, "And We granted the vision (Ascension to the heavens) which We made you see (as an actual eye witness) was only made as a trial for the people" (17.60).

Ibn Abbas added: The sights which Allah's Apostle was shown on the Night Journey when he was taken to BAIT-UL MAQDIS (I.E. JERUSALEM) were actual sights, (not dreams). And the Cursed Tree (mentioned) in the Quran is the tree of Zaqqum (itself).

Sahih Muslim Book 001, Number 0309:

It is narrated on the authority of Anas b. Malik that the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said: I was brought alBuraq Who is an animal white and long, larger than a donkey but smaller than a mule, who would place his hoof a distance equal to the range of vision. I mounted it and came to the Temple (Bait Maqdis in Jerusalem), then tethered it to the ring used by the prophets. I entered the mosque and prayed two rak'ahs in it, and then came out and Gabriel brought me a vessel of wine and a vessel of milk. I

chose the milk, and Gabriel said: You have chosen the natural thing. Then he took me to heaven...

The following commentary on S. 17:1 is taken from *Tafsir Ibn Kathir—Abridged Volume 5, Surah Hud to Surat Al-Isra,* Verse 38, abridged by a group of scholars under the supervision of Shaykh Safiur-Rahman Al-Mubarakpuri (Darussalam Publishers & Distributors; Riyadh, Houston, New York, Lahore, July 2000):

From Al-Masjid Al-Agsa means the Sacred House which is in Jerusalem, the origin of the Prophets from the time of Ibrahim Al-Khalil. The Prophets all gathered there, and he (Muhammad) led them in prayer in their own homeland. This indicates that he is the greatest leader of all, may the peace and blessings of Allah be upon him and upon them (Ibid., p. 551; italic emphasis mine).

Ibn Kathir includes the following hadith:

“I remember being in Al-Hijr, and the Quraysh were asking me about my Night Journey. *They asked me things about Bayt Al-Maqdis that I was not sure of, and I felt more anxious and stressed then than I have ever felt. Then Allah raised up Bayt AlMaqdis for me to see, and there was nothing they asked me about but I told them about it.* And I remember being in a gathering of the Prophets. Musa was standing there praying, and he was a man with curly hair, as if he were one of the men of Shianu’ah. I saw ’Isa ibn Maryam standing there praying, and the one who most resembles him is ’Urwah bin Mas ud Ath-Thaqafi. And I saw Ibrahim standing there praying, and for the one who most resembles him is your companion (meaning himself). Then the time for prayer came, and I led them in prayer. When I finished, a voice said, ‘O Muhammad, this is Malik, the keeper of Hell,’ so I turned to him, and he greeted me first” (*Ibid.*, p. 571; italic emphasis mine).

Finally:

“The truth is that the Prophet was taken on the Night Journey when he was awake, not in a dream, *and he went from Makkah to Bayt Al-Maqdis riding can Al-Buraq. When he reached THE DOOR OF THE SANCTUARY, he tied up his animal by THE DOOR AND ENTERED, where he prayed two Rakahs to ‘greet the Masjid’ ...*

“*Then he came, back down to Bayt Al-Maqdis, and the Prophets came down with him and he led them in prayer there when the time for prayer came. Some claim that he led them in prayer in heaven, but the reports seem to say that it was in Bayt Al-Maqdis. In some reports it says that it happened when he first ENTERED...*

“*Then he came OUT OF BAYT ALMAQDIS and rode on Al-Buraq back to Makkah in the darkness of the night. As for his being presented with the vessels containing milk and honey, or milk and wine, or millk and water, or all of these, some reports say that this happened in Bayt Al-Maqdis, and others say that it happened in the heavens. It is possible that it happened in BOTH places, because it is like offering food or drink to a guest when he arrives, and Allah knows best” (Ibid. pp. 572–573; italic and capital emphasis mine).*

The following citations are taken from ‘Abd Allah Hajjaj’s *The Isra’ and Mi’raj—The Prophet’s Night Journey and Ascent Into Heaven*, Dar AlTagwa Ltd., London, second edition 1993. All italic emphasis mine:

Jabir Ibn ‘Abd Allah heard the Prophet (S) say: “When Quraysh disbelieved me (about the Isra’), I stood up in AL-HIJR (the unroofed part of the Ka’bah) and Allah displayed Bayt al-Maqdis to me. So I began to describe its features to there whilst I was looking at it” (*Ibid.*, p. 5).

Al-Hafiz said, Ka’b ibn Ahbar narrated that the gate of heaven called Mas’ad alMala’ikah (“The angels’ point of ascent”) faces Bayt al-Maqdis. The ‘Ulama’ understood from this that the reason why the Prophet (S) was taken to Bayt al-Maqdis before ascent was so that he could be taken straight up...

Other, weaker, suggestions have also been put forward. For example:

so that the Prophet (S) would see both of the Qiblahs on that night; or because Bayt al-Maqdis had been the place to which most of the previous Prophets had migrated, so the Prophet Muhammad (S) had to go there to have the same virtues as they had... (*Ibid.*, p. 15).

It is said that the ‘Isra happened twice, and on both occasions the Prophet (S) was awake. On the first occasion, he returned from Bayt al-Maqdis, and in the morning he told the Quraysh what had happened. On the first morning he told the Quraysh what had happened. On the second occasion he was taken to Bayt al-Maqdis, then on the same night he was taken up to heaven... But when he told them that he had traveled to Bayt al-Maqdis and returned in one night, they disbelieved him and asked to describe it, because some of them knew it, and they also knew that he had not seen it before... (*Ibid.*, p. 18).

“...I reached Bayt al-Maqdis, where I tied my beast (al-Buraq) to the hitching post which all the Prophets before me used... Gabriel and I entered Bayt al-Maqdis where we both prayed two Rak’at... “Then I entered the Mosque where I saw all the Prophets praying—some standing, some bowing and some prostrating... When the Prophet (S) reached al-Masjid al-Aqsa, he began to pray...” Another Hadith narrated by Ahmad tells us that when ‘Umar entered Bayt al-Maqdis, he said: “I shall pray where the Prophet (S) prayed”—then he went forward to the Qiblah and prayed (*Ibid.*, p. 28).

‘Ayat said: “It is possible that he prayed with all the Prophets IN Bayt al-Maqdis... Those who prayed with him IN Bayt al-Maqdis may have been there as souls only, or in body and soul. It is more likely that he prayed with them IN Bayt al-Maqdis before ascent; but Allah knows best” (*Ibid.*, pp. 28–29).

The book’s glossary notes:

Bayt al-Maqdis: The name used for Jerusalem and in particular for the Mosque from which the prophet Muhammad (S) ascended to Heaven (*Ibid.*, p. 54).

M.A. Qazi’s *A Concise Dictionary of Islamic Terms*, Kazi Publications, Chicago IL, 1979, p. 39 states:

Al-Masjid-al-Aqsa: “The most distant Mosque.” *The temple at Jerusalem erected by Prophet Solomon (A.A.)*, also known as “Baitul-Maqdis” or Umar’s Mosque.

Finally, Muhammad is purported to have said that a Muslim should visit the following three Mosques:

Sahih al-Bukhari Volume 2, Book 21, Number 281:

Narrated Quza’a:

I heard Abu Said saying four words. He said, "I heard the Prophet (saying the following narrative)." He had participated in twelve holy battles with the Prophet.

Narrated Abu Huraira: The Prophet said, "Do not set out on a journey *except for THREE Mosques* i.e. Al-Masjid-AlHaram, the Mosque of Allah's Apostle; and the Mosque of Al-Aqsa (Mosque of Jerusalem)."

That the phrase *Bayt Al-Maqdis* undoubtedly refers to the Temple structure located in Jerusalem as the preceding traditions affirm is further clarified in the following hadith:

Sahih al-Bukhari, Volume 4, Book 55, Number 585:

Narrated Abu Dhar:

I said, "O Allah's Apostle! Which mosque was first built on the surface of the earth?" He said, "Al-Masjid-ul-Haram (in Mecca)." I said, "Which was built next?" *He replied, "The mosque of Al-Aqsa (in Jerusalem)."* I said, "What was the period of construction between the two?" *He said, "Forty years."* He added, "Wherever (you may be, and) the prayer time becomes due, perform the prayer there, for the best thing is to do so (i.e. to offer the prayers in time)."

This would place the erection of the Kabah at approximately 998 B.C., since the construction of the first Temple was not completed by Solomon until 951 B.C. (cf. **1 Kings 6:1-7:51**).

The problem with all of this is that the first Jerusalem Temple was destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar's Babylonian armies in 587 B.C. Further more, General Titus and his Roman soldiers leveled the Second Temple in A.D. 70, more than five centuries before this alleged night journey to Jerusalem took place. In fact, the Temple that eventually became Masjid al-Aqsa did not come into existence until A.D. 691 when Amir Abd-ulMalik built it.

These preceding factors make it highly improbable to date Sura 17:1 to the time of Muhammad. This passage could have only been written sometime after the erection of Masjid al-Aqsa. This is further substantiated by the fact that Masjid al-Aqsa contains no early references to the supposed night journey. This is a strange omission since Muslims claim that Masjid al-Aqsa was erected in commemoration of this alleged event. The inscriptions that do mention the night journey are later additions made by Abdul Hamid II in 1876, nearly eleven centuries later.

In light of all this, we ask the following questions:

- What Temple did Muhammad visit, enter and pray at before ascending to heaven?
- Seeing that the Quran mentions a journey to a Mosque that did not exist during the lifetime of Muhammad, how can you consider the Quran to be 100 percent the word of God?
- In light of the fact that both the Quran and the Islamic traditions contain this historical error, how can you trust either source to provide you with reliable information on the life of Muhammad and the first Muslims?
- Does not the fact that the Quran mentions a Mosque which was only erected in A.D. 691 prove that there were Muslims who unashamedly and deceitfully added stories to the Quranic text and passed them off as revelation from God?
- If you cannot find an answer to this historical problem within the Quran, why do you still remain a Muslim?

May God use this article to bring open-minded Muslims to the truth of his word, the Holy Bible.

In the service of our Great God and Savior Jesus Christ forever Amen.

For further articles by Sam Shamoun visit the Answering Islam home page at www.answeringislam.org

The Paracletos of John: Muhammad or the Holy Spirit?

By Sam Shamoun

Recent attempts have been made by the Islamic community to disprove the authenticity of the Holy Bible in order to discredit any notion of divinity being attached to Jesus Christ. This, they endeavor to achieve in the hope that Christians would become convinced that Muhammad was a true prophet of God, rendering Islam the natural choice of humanity, since to deem the biblical record as reliable would sound the death knell of Islam.

At the same time, Muslims use the Bible, which they believe to be unreliable, in order to prove that Muhammad's advent had been prophesied long before his birth. They hope to accomplish this by quoting certain biblical passages which Muslims feel are prophetic utterances of Ahmad their prophet.

One such passage is the reference made by Jesus to the Paracletos, as recorded in John's gospel. To understand the Islamic position, we will first quote all the references to the Paracletos. Next we will present the arguments which the Muslims feel affirm that the Paracletos is Muhammad, the Islamic messenger and prophet.

Having stated the Islamic position on the Paracletos, we will present a rebuttal which will hopefully demonstrate to the reader that the biblical references could not possibly be statements made about Muhammad's advent. In fact it will become clear that the Bible is informing us about the Holy Spirit's descent from God on the day of Pentecost:

“If you love me, you will obey what I command. And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Counselor to be with you forever—the Spirit of truth. The world cannot accept him, because it neither sees him nor knows him. But you know him, for he lives with you and will be in you” (John 14:15–17 [all references are from NIV unless noted]).

“But the Counselor, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you all things and will remind you of everything I have said to you” (John 14:26).

“When the Counselor comes, Whom I will send to you from the Father, the Spirit of truth who goes out from the Father, he will testify about me” (John 15:26).

“But I tell you the truth: It is for your good that I am going away. Unless I go away, the Counselor will not come to you; but if I go, I will send him to you. When he comes, he will convict the world of guilt in regard to sin and righteousness and judgement: in regard to sin, because men do not believe in me; in regard to righteousness, because I am going to the Father, where you can see me no longer; and in regard to judgement, because the prince of this world now stands condemned.

“I have much more to say to you, more than you can now bear. But when he, the Spirit of truth, comes, he will guide you in all truth. He will not speak on his own; he will speak only what he hears, and he will tell you what is yet to come. He will bring glory to me by taking from what is mine and making it known to you. All that belongs to the Father is mine. That is why I said the Spirit will take from what is mine and make it known to you” (John 16:7–15).

The word Paracletos, translated as Counselor in John's gospel, has several possible meanings depending on the context under which it is used. It can mean (1) intercessor, (2) advocate, (3) consoler or comforter and (4) exhorter.

The other place where this word is used is in [1 John 2:7](#):

“My little children, I am writing this to you so that you may not sin. But if anyone does sin, we have an advocate (Paraclete) with the Father, Jesus Christ the Righteous” (RSV).

Here the context demands that the word be translated as “advocate” or “intercessor,” since this is what is needed to defend mankind before the Father.

Although these verses, with the exception of the latter, clearly identify the Paraclete as the Holy Spirit ([14:26](#)), Muslims take objection to this fact by presenting the following arguments:

- The Paraclete “speaks” and “hears.”

The Greek words which state that the Paraclete speaks and hears are *AKOUO* (hear) and *LALEO* (speaks), verbs used in reference to beings who have hearing and speech organs. This would nullify the idea that the Paraclete is an immaterial being, hence making him human.

- Answer

Although it is quite true that these verbs were normally used in reference to human beings, it is not true however, that the verbs in question are never used in regard to spiritual entities. To substantiate this statement we will refer to the *Dictionary of New Testament Theology*, vol.2, p. 172:

“Akouo (from Homer in 10 century B.C. on) means to hear and refers primarily to the perception of sounds by the sense of hearing. Hearing, however, covers not only sense perception but also the apprehension and acceptance by the mind of the content of what is heard. This led to differences of linguistic usage which are discussed below in connection with Heb. *Shama* and which also occur in secular Greek” (ed. Colin Brown).

In other words, it would be a fallacy to state that the Greek verbs are used only to describe material organs of sound and speech. Further textual evidence of this can be found in both the Greek Old and New Testaments:

Old Testament:

God also said to Moses, “I am the LORD, I appeared to Abraham, to Isaac and to Jacob as God Almighty...” ([Exodus 6:2, 3](#)).

“But their idols are silver and gold, made by the hands of men. They have mouths, but cannot speak... they have ears but cannot hear” ([Psalm 115:4–6](#)).

“They say, ‘The LORD does not see. The God of Jacob pays no heed.’ Does He who implanted the ear not hear? Does He who formed the eye not see?” ([Psalm 94:7, 9](#)).

These verses state that God, a Spirit Being, hears and speaks (*AKOUO* and *LALEO*) and that idols do not.

New Testament:

AKOUO

“We know that God does not listen to sinners. He listens to the godly man who does his will” ([John 9:31](#)).

“... Then Jesus looked up and said, ‘Father, thank you that you have heard me. I knew that you always hear me’” ([John 11:41, 42](#)).

LALEO

“We know God spoke to Moses...” ([John 9:29](#)).

“In the past, God spoke to our forefathers through the prophets in many different ways” ([Hebrews 1:1](#)).

“The Holy Spirit spoke the truth to your forefathers when he said through Isaiah the prophet...” ([Acts 28:25](#)).

Hence, we find these same Greek verbs applied to both God and the Holy Spirit, immaterial beings, demonstrating the interchangeable usage of these verbs.

A Greek version of the Quran (G.I. Pentakh, To Koranion, 1928), also confirms the usage of *LALFO* and *AKOUO* in conjunction with beings which do not have material organs of speech and hearing:

“And your Lord says: ‘Call on me; I will answer you’ ” (S. 40:60).

“Behold, the Lord said to the angels...” (S. 2:30). [Notice that God, a spirit, is speaking to other spirit beings i.e., angels.]

“He (God) said, ‘Fear not: For I am with you. I hear and I see everything’ ” (S. 20:46).

“There did Zakariya pray to his Lord, saying: O my Lord! Grant to me from you a pure child. For you are The Hearer (*EISAKOUO*) of prayer!” (S. 3:38).

The notion that these verbs are only used in relation to material beings is proven to be fallacious.

- The Holy Spirit was already with the Apostles.

Muslims use [John 16:7](#) to make this claim: “Unless I go away, the Counselor will not come to you, but if I go, I will send him to you” ([John 16:7](#)).

They further argue that this could not be a reference to the Holy Spirit since the Holy Spirit had already been there even before Christ’s coming (cf. [1 Samuel 10:10](#), [11:16](#); [Isaiah 63:11](#); [Luke 1:15](#), [35](#), [41](#), [67](#), [2:25](#), [26](#)).

- Answer

It is true that the Holy Spirit was active in history before the coming of Jesus. However, once Christ was revealed, His activity took on a new and different role. The Bible states that once the Holy Spirit rested upon Christ, He would not be given to any other person(s) until Christ’s glorification:

“And the Holy Ghost descended in a bodily shape like a dove upon him (Jesus)...” ([Luke 3:22](#)).

“By this he meant the Spirit, whom those who believed in him were LATER to receive. Up to that time the Spirit HAD NOT BEEN GIVEN, since Jesus had not yet been glorified” ([John 7:39](#)).

Furthermore, the Lord himself affirmed that the Paraclete/Holy Spirit was already present with the disciples:

“the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it neither sees Him nor knows Him; but you know Him, for He dwells with you and will be in you” ([John 14:17](#)).

The passage makes it very clear that the Holy Spirit had made himself known to the apostles through the manifestation of Christ’s miracles and was therefore present in the person of Christ (cf. [Matthew 12:28](#)).

This factor made it possible for the disciples to have an intimate, personal relationship with the Spirit of truth, due to their association with the Lord; a relationship the world could not have because of their rejection of Christ's Messianic claims.

Finally, although they had known the Holy Spirit, they would now be indwelt by him, making their bodies a tabernacle for him to reside in (1 Cor. 3:16, 6:19).

Another passage quoted by Muslims to disprove the idea of the Paraclete being the Holy Spirit is John 20:21–22:

“Again Jesus said, ‘Peace be with you! As the Father has sent me, I am sending you. And with that he breathed on them and said, ‘Receive the Holy Spirit. If you forgive anyone his sins, they are forgiven; if you do not forgive them, they are not forgiven.’”

They argue that that the apostles had already received the Spirit and yet the Paraclete had not arrived.

We answer this objection by simply stating that Christ did not give them the Holy Spirit, but rather was preparing them for his arrival, an event which took place days after Christ's resurrection. Christ consecrated his apostles by breathing on them in preparation for the Paraclete's descent, since it could not have been possible for the Holy Spirit to be given at this meeting as not all of Jesus' disciples were present (i.e., Thomas [John 20:24]). Clearly the descent of the Holy Spirit was a future event.

- The Paraclete, “Another” Christ

Muslims state that in John 14:16 Christ was to send “another Paraclete,” i.e., another like Christ. The Greek word used here is *allon* which is the masculine accusative form of *ALLOS* meaning, “another of the SAME kind.” The Greek for “another of a different kind” is *heteros* from which we derive the word heterosexual.

Now considering that Christ was human, it follows that the Paraclete would also be a human prophet who was yet to come. This could not be the Holy Spirit, a spiritual being, unlike Christ. They further stress that the only prophet to come after Jesus was Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam.

- Answer

The Muslims presume that Christ had but one nature, that of humanity, yet Christ also had a divine nature. It is this divine nature of the Paraclete, which is being referred to. Muslims naturally and consistently deny this nature as it pertains to both Christ and Paraclete in spite of the abundant biblical passages which prove otherwise:

“And I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Counselor to be with you forever—the Spirit of truth. The world cannot accept him, because it neither sees him nor knows him. But you know him, for he lives with you and will be in you” (John 14:16–17).

These verses indicate that the Paraclete being a Spirit, cannot be seen and is eternal and omnipresent. This effectively renders the Paraclete divine, since these are attributes of God:

“God is Spirit...” (John 4:14).

“The eternal God your refuge...” (Deut. 33:27).

“Where can I go from your Spirit? Where can I flee from your presence? If I go up to the heavens you are there; If I make my bed in the depths you are there” (Psalm 139:7, 8).

“...the invisible God” (Col. 1:15).

Christ, similar to the Paraclete, is eternal and ever-present:

“Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen” (1 Tim. 1:17).

“In the beginning was the Word and the Word was with God and the Word was God ... the Word became flesh...” (John 1:1, 14).

“For where two or three come together in my name, there I am with them” (Mt. 18:20).

These statements, in regard to the divine Counselor being “another” like Christ, make it unfathomable to suggest that Muhammad was that “Para clete.” Muhammad was seen, did not abide forever but died, and could not indwell any person(s) or be at more than one place at the same time.

- “Paraclete” or “Periklytos”/“Holy Spirit” or “Spirit”?

Muslims have a theory, albeit unsubstantiated by any textual proof, that the original Greek manuscripts contained the Greek word “Periklytos” meaning admirable or glorified one. The Arabic translation of this word is derived from the same root as that of the name Muhammad. The Muslims then go on to state that this original word became corrupted to “Paracletos,” for the purpose of suppressing any biblical evidence for Muhammad’s prophetic mandate from God.

- Answer

There exists no textual or linguistic evidence to support the notion that the word Periklytos was corrupted to Paracletos. Every ancient manuscript found from 200 A.D. onward contains only the latter. Unlike ancient Hebrew or Arabic, the Greek language has the vowels of a word written out. For a Muslim to ascribe Periklytos in place of Paracletos would demand a totally different vowel scheme, exchanging the Greek a,e,o for e,i,y. Clearly, such an assumption is absurd. Furthermore, the word Periklytos is never once used in either the Greek Old Testament (the Septuagint) or the Greek Koine writing of the New Testament.

It is also argued that verse 26 of John 14 did not originally contain the word “Holy” Spirit. The word “Holy,” it is claimed, was inserted later, turning this verse into a reference to the Holy Spirit.

This argument is based on a fifth century Syriac manuscript, where admittedly the word “Holy” is not found. Once again, we must state that the logic behind this line of reasoning is fallacious due to the fact that all Greek manuscripts which predate the Syriac version, do include the adjective “Holy.” The omission of the word in the Syriac manuscript is obviously due to copyist error.

Copying errors gave rise to thousands of variants between the copies of the Bible. However, owing to the careful scholarly examination of the overwhelming number of manuscripts in our possession, we can be assured that today’s Bible is in the original form as handed down by the Apostles of Christ. For centuries textual scholars have diligently researched and compared the numerous manuscripts. They have identified and corrected all common copying errors and have resolved the textual and linguistic ambiguities among the ancient manuscripts. In fact the miraculous discovery of the Dead Sea scrolls, and the amazing accuracy of today’s Bible in comparison with them, has delivered the coup-de-grace to all notions involving the corruption of the Holy Scriptures.

(It should be noted that the Quran itself contained thousands of conflicting variants between the copies circulating among the various Muslim communities. This fact has been fully documented by Arthur Jeffery in his book, *Materials for the History of the Text of the Quran* and by Muhammad Hamidullah in his French translation of the Quran, *Le Coran*, p.33.)

- The Paraclete is a “He,” not “It ”

Muslims make the observation of the consistent New Testament use of the masculine pronoun “He” in reference to the Paraclete, when actually the Greek word for spirit, *PNEUMA*, is itself neuter, i.e., “it.” They claim that such usage indicates that a man is being spoken of, hence eliminating those texts as making any reference to the Holy Spirit.

- Answer

If the Muslim claim is true then God must also be a man since the Bible often speaks of God in the masculine gender:

- Bible

“Jesus said to them, ‘If God were your Father, you would love me for I came from God and now I am here. I have not come on my own; but He has sent me’ ” (John 8:42).

If you really know me, you would know my Father as well. From now on, you do know HIM and have seen HIM” (John 14:7).

(Note—Throughout the Bible one will often find references to God, a Spiritual Being, as Father and as “He” and “Him,” all masculine pronouns.)

Further, would not their logic apply to the Quran as well?

“Say: HE is God, the One and Only. God, the eternal, Absolute. HE begeth not, nor is HE begotten. And there is none liken unto “HIM” (S. 112).

Angels are also referred to in the masculine gender in both the Bible and the Quran. Would this make them human if the Muslim contention were true?

- Bible

“Then an angel of the Lord appeared to him (Zechariah), standing at the right side of the altar of incense. When Zechariah saw HIM, he was startled and gripped with fear” (Luke 1:12, 13).

- Quran

“... Then We sent to her Our Spirit, and HE appeared before her as a man in all respects” (S. 19:17).

Arguments such as these are indeed poor and unscholarly and serve to discredit those who espouse them. Moreover, they tend to cast a dense shadow of doubt over the Muslim credibility as alleged scholars of the Bible and the Quran.

Having examined the major Islamic arguments presented against the Holy Spirit being the Paraclete, we find that none stands in the after math of a close and scholarly scrutiny. One by one the arguments fail in their attempt to portray Muhammad as the Paraclete promised by Jesus. In fact, in lieu of such a failure we will now seek our own response as to why Muhammad could not be the Paraclete of John:

The Paraclete is the Holy Spirit

In the Quran the angel Gabriel is twice called the Holy Spirit (S. 2:91; 66:4). Yusef Ali in his commentary on 53:13 note 5092, says that there “were only two occasions when Gabriel appeared in visible form” and implies that Muhammad saw him both times. This renders impossible the notion that Muhammad is the Paraclete since it will mean that he is Gabriel the

Spirit of Revelation. Thus Muslims only create immense problems of their own in claiming that Muhammad is the Paraclete. As the preceding facts clearly indicate, the biblical teaching about the Holy Spirit is so correct vis-a-vis the Islamic contradictions.

Christ Sends the Paraclete to the World

Muslims believe that Allah sent Muhammad to mankind, whereas Jesus is to send the Paraclete. This fact makes Christ to be Allah. Do Muslims really believe that? Moreover, this would then mean that Christ is greater than Muhammad since Christ stated that, “no servant is greater than his master, nor is a messenger greater than the one who sent him” ([John 13:16](#)).

The Paraclete Glorifies Christ

John’s Gospel account clearly states that the Paraclete was to bring glory to Christ. Yet Muhammad glorified Allah, compelling us to conclude once more that Jesus Christ is Allah the God of Muhammad, the alleged Paraclete. No Muslim would dare accept any of these conclusions, thus showing the weakness behind their claim that Muhammad is the Paraclete of the Bible.

The Paraclete/Holy Spirit did indeed arrive, and not 600 years later, but ten days after the ascension of Christ. The Holy Spirit filled and in dwelled the Apostles, endowing them with the power to perform signs and wonders, establishing the Church of Christ on earth and evangelizing the world with the good news of the Gospel (read [Acts 2:1–41](#).)

In conclusion, we simply state that the Bible portrays Jesus Christ as our Paraclete (Advocate) with the Father and that the Holy Spirit is our Paraclete (Counselor) from the Father. To make the Bible read differently from the context of the Scriptures, and from nearly two thousand years of the Church’s understanding of these passages, simply demonstrates the desperate attempts to prove the indefensible; namely, that the Holy Bible predicts the coming of Muhammad, the Prophet of Islam, a fact which the Bible nowhere alludes to.

AMEN.

The Claim that Muhammad Is Prophesied in [Deuteronomy 33:2](#)

By Andy Bannister

It is a well known fact that Muslims are very keen to find prophecies concerning Muhammad in the pages of the Bible. These claims come up time and time again in discussions with Muslims, on newsgroups such as [soc.religion.islam](#), and in other forums. We can see why Muslims are so keen to find such references when we turn to the Qur’an:

Those who follow the apostle, the unlettered Prophet, whom they find mentioned in the Taurat and the Injil... (Sura 7:157).

For Muslims it is vital that they find a prophecy concerning Muhammad, for otherwise the Qur’an must be wrong. There are a number of verses in the Bible that Muslims claim contain

such prophecies, and I will examine one such claim here. I hope that this will serve to give an idea of just how tenuous these kinds of claims are, and to demonstrate the lengths to which Muslims are prepared to twist and manipulate Scripture to support their prophet.

Table of contents

- They claim that Muhammad is prophesied in [Deuteronomy 33:2](#).
- So *who exactly* is this Bible verse talking about?
- Does [Deuteronomy 33:2](#) speak of a prophet with 10,000 followers?
- Is [Deuteronomy 33:2](#) talking about what God has done in the past, or things that will happen in the future?
- Conclusion.

Muhammad Prophesied in [Deuteronomy 33:2](#)?

This was the claim made by Saqib on the soc.religion.islam newsgroup which started it all:

And Moses said, “The LORD came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them” ([Deuteronomy 33:2](#)).

“It is Muhammad (saaws) who led thousands, bearing a fiery law, from Paran. Paran is part of Arabia. Muhammad (saaws) led ten thousand of his followers from Medina to Mecca. Leading with the ‘fiery law,’ the Quran. It is this Prophet that rose up from the brothers of the Israelites. It is this Prophet about whom both Moses (as) and Jesus (as), among others, prophesied. Believe it if you have the strength to bear the truth.”

Now the problem with this claim is that it totally fails to acknowledge the context of who is being talked about in the passage in question; is this verse claiming that a prophet came from Paran? No, of course not, it is perfectly obvious to even the most casual reader that it is the Lord God who is being talked about here.

A Muslim called Arshad continued with the argument and claimed:

“The Prophets (upon them be peace) are doing what God has commanded of them. They are God’s messengers. This should be easy for anyone to understand.”

Before we examine why this is wrong, it is worth noting the Muslim methodology that is employed here: shifting the subject. This is a common game. Arshad’s discussion about what prophets do is irrelevant, because [Deuteronomy 33:2](#) is not talking about prophets. Yet he subtly tries to introduce an element to the text that is not there. This kind of exegesis lies at the heart of most attempts by Muslims to find prophecies about Muhammad.

Who is Being Talked About in [Deuteronomy 33:2](#)?

Let’s look at [Deuteronomy 33:2](#) in more detail:

And Moses said, “The LORD came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them” ([Deuteronomy 33:2](#)).

The key to understanding who this verse is talking about lies in the first few words of Moses’ speech:

“The LORD came from...”

Now the word LORD is the Hebrew word *YHWH*.

This is the name of God himself. It is not referring to a prophet, or to any man, but to God. It is certainly not talking about Muhammad.

It is quite a mystery how any Muslim can justify saying “Muhammad = YHWH = God.” How would they respond if a Mormon claimed that the name “Allah” in the Qur’an does not mean God, but actually means their prophet, Joseph Smith? I think that there would be an outcry. [Deuteronomy 33:2](#) is talking about God himself, and to try to insert Muhammad’s name here is offensive, blasphemous, and wrong. Rather it is talking about God in this passage, for it was Yahweh who led his people in the wilderness of Paran (on the southern borders of Canaan) by a flaming pillar of fire; it was Yahweh whose covenant with his people dawned like a sunrise in the desert; it was Yahweh who gave Moses his law at Mount Sinai. You can read about it all in the book of Exodus.

I have met Muslims in the past who have come close to deifying Muhammad, but Saqib and Arshad are the first who have actually come right out and said they now believe Muhammad = Yahweh = God. Is *shirk* no longer the crime in Islam that it used to be?

A Prophet with 10,000 Followers?

Saqib and Arshad on soc.religion.islam were not merely content with trying to claim that Muhammad rather than God deserved the credit for the mighty acts recorded in this verse. They went on to explain that the next part of [Deuteronomy 33:2](#) made it very clear that this was Muhammad. They explained that:

“Muhammad (saaws) led ten thousand of his followers from Medina to Mecca.”
and:

“That’s good that you used a Bible translation that mentions 10,000 holy ones, some of the translations coming out now like to omit this figure, perhaps they too realize this prophecy of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) in the Bible.”

This is yet another example of a case where, if they had bothered to check their Hebrew, Muslims would not have got into all this bother. Here is what [Deuteronomy 32:2](#) says:

“... and he came with *ten thousands* of saints ...”

The phrase highlighted in italics is the Hebrew word “rebabah” (RBBH), translated in this case by the King James translation as “ten thousands.”

This word does not simply mean 10,000; rather it means “multitude, myriad, ten thousand,” according to Strong’s Hebrew Dictionary. More modern translations, such as the NIV, translate it in [Deuteronomy 33:2](#) as just that, “myriad.” It does not signify a precise numeric amount, simply a great many. An interesting exercise is to look through the Old Testament at all the occurrences of the word to understand how it is used in this context. Here are the 16 places where it occurs, just for reference:

[Genesis 24:60](#)

[1 Samuel 18:8](#)

[Leviticus 26:8](#)

[1 Samuel 21:11](#)

Numbers 10:36
1 Samuel 29:5
Deuteronomy 32:30
Psalm 3:6
Deuteronomy 33:2
Psalm 91:7
Deuteronomy 33:17
Song of Solomon 5:10
Judges 20:10
Ezekiel 16:7
1 Samuel 18:7
Micah 6:7

In every case above, you will see that the word is used in this figurative, non-exact sense, it simply means a lot! Therefore modern translations which use the word “myriad” in Deuteronomy 33:2 are correct.

Is Deuteronomy 33:2 Talking About what God Has Done in the Past, or Things that Will Happen in the Future?

The next problem for Muslims who make the claim that Deuteronomy 33:2 is talking about Muhammad (other than the problem of turning Muhammad into God) is that this verse is in the past tense; it’s not talking about someone who will do these things, but someone who has already done them. And Moses gave this speech over 1,400 years before Muhammad ever walked the earth. How do Muslims try to get over this hurdle?. Here is how Arshad on soc.religion.islam attempted it:

There were two possibilities I came up with, one, the author of this passage wasn’t clear when he wrote down this passage many years later, it’s pretty easy to forget.

The other possibility is this. God is not constrained by the laws of this world. He knows what will happen in the future. So from his perspective everything is in the past.

I guess you never considered that?

The retort of “I guess you never considered that?” is a common one when discussing alleged prophecies of Muhammad in the Bible, probably because in each of the verses in question one would normally never consider that the verse could ever be twisted to point to a “prophet” born 1,400 years later. It is also tempting to turn this logic on its head and ask: has a Muslim ever considered that it wasn’t the angel Gabriel who appeared to Muhammad, but an alien from the planet Zog? Their answer will be, of course, “No, I’ve never considered that.” And we wouldn’t dream of calling them small-minded, but it is simply that some suggestions are so far out as to be ridiculous.

The context of this passage is perfectly clear; it is the account of Moses blessing the tribes of the Israelites just before his death. He begins by reminding them of what God (Yahweh) has done for them. This is the context of verse 2; it is a reminder to the Israelites of the amazing things God has done for them; Moses is looking back, not forward. Anyone who had read all of chapter 33 would have no problems grasping this.

However, let us briefly look at the two claims made by Arshad:

1. The author of this passage wasn’t clear when he wrote down this passage many years later, it’s pretty easy to forget.

Frankly, the suggestion that “the author wasn’t clear ... it’s pretty easy to forget” is laughable, ludicrous, and a little offensive. Doesn’t the Qur’an tell Muslims to respect the Torah? Wasn’t Muhammad told to ask the People of the Book when he had a question?

... He revealed the Torah and the Gospel ... (Sura 3:3).

And argue not with the People of the Scripture ... say: “We believe in that which hath been revealed unto us and revealed unto you” (Sura 29:46).

Or perhaps we have missed the Sura that says something like:

“Lo, misquote and abuse the Torah where you wish, and twist it (greatly) to suit your own ends.”

Christians, Jews, and (we are led to believe) Muslims, believe the Torah to be revelation from God; and yet here we have Arshad claiming that the person who wrote it forgot. Perhaps we should look at all the events in the Qur’an for which a time gap exists! Given that the Qur’an was written down after the death of Muhammad in 632, and our earliest extant copies date from circa 790 A.D., there are thousands of years between many of the events described in the Qur’an and the date they were recorded. Presumably, Arshad does not trust the Qur’an either, since the time gap is bigger than for Deuteronomy. Maybe Muhammad also forgot; or is there a double standard afoot here?

2. The other possibility is this. God is not constrained by the laws of this world. He knows what will happen in the future. So from his perspective everything is in the past.

From a philosophical point of view, we would disagree slightly here. As a Christian, I believe that God is outside of time, as time is something that he created. So from God’s perspective, he can see everything as now. However, we also know that God works in human history and within time; this is helpful for us as weak and limited human beings.

Thus, God sees and knows all events past, present, and future with equal vividness. This should never cause us to think that God does not see events in time and act in time ... thus God somehow stands above time and is able to see it all as present in his consciousness (Grudem, Wayne: *Systematic Theology*, IVP 1994, p. 171).

Thus, whilst we believe that God is not constrained and restricted by time (hence he can see what for us is the future and therefore there is prophecy), it is quite another thing to say that God acts arbitrarily and leaves us guessing as to whether he is speaking about events past, events present, or events that are to come. God chooses to take into account the frailties of human perception and grammar, and thus makes himself clear when he speaks.

Hence in the Bible when we find prophecy, God generally describes it as such. If Muslims took the trouble to read the rest of [Deuteronomy 33](#) and not merely their “proof text,” they would see how this is the case; there are prophecies, and Moses prophesies over Zebulun (v [18–19](#)), Naphtali (v [23](#)) and Israel as a whole (v [29](#)) for example. The context is clear. However, in verse [2](#), Moses is talking about the past. Like many of these Muslim arguments, an interesting exercise is to turn their argument around and fling it straight back at them. For example, suppose we were to apply Arshad’s principle to claim in the Qur’an that Muhammad is the last (or seal) of the prophets. By Arshad’s reasoning, we could quite rightly say that Muslims have no right claiming Muhammad is the last of the prophets; after all, God might be speaking from the perspective of

the future, and thus the last and greatest prophet is still to come! Would many Muslims go along with this line of reasoning? I think probably not.

Conclusion

The only possible way that Muslims can claim that [Deuteronomy 33:2](#) is talking about Muhammad is to admit that they believe that Muhammad = God, which all Jews, Christians, and (I hope) Muslims would consider to be blatantly offensive. This is the only possible interpretation of this passage, and to try to argue otherwise like Saqib, Arshad, and others have done is not only erroneous, but is also blasphemous.

The Death Of Muhammad

By Silas

Introduction

Muhammad died in 632 A.D. He died as a result of being poisoned following his attack upon and conquest of the Jewish settlement of Khaibar. About two months before his attack on Khaibar, Muhammad failed in an attempt to go to Mecca. This failure resulted in the Treaty of Hudaibiyya with the Meccans. He returned humiliated in the eyes of the Meccans and in the minds of his people. To lift their defeated spirits, Muhammad told his followers that the events at Hudaibiyya were really a victory. In fact, another convenient “revelation” was given to Muhammad as proof that it really was a victory (Sura 48:1). However, Allah was not able to deliver the Meccans’ goods as booty, so Muhammad told his followers that they were going to attack and plunder the weaker Jewish settlement of Khaibar.

About six weeks later, Muhammad led his army and attacked the Jews while they were on their way to work on their date palms. Khaibar was a settlement defended by a number of forts spread apart from each other. One by one, Muhammad’s army took the forts. Finally, the last few surrendered to him. Muhammad had several of the leaders of the Jewish settlement beheaded, one leader (Kinana) was tortured to reveal where buried treasure was hidden. Then when Kinana was near death, Muhammad commanded that he be beheaded. Many of the women and children were enslaved. Muhammad even took the most beautiful woman for himself and married her (Safiyah).

Some of Khaibar’s residents made a deal with Muhammad. Instead of enslaving them, which would leave the rich orchards of Khaibar to go untended and unproductive, the Jews would give Muhammad and the Muslims half of all of what they produced. Muhammad accepted the deal, with the stipulation that they could be expelled at his slightest whim. Years later, Umar expelled the last remaining Jews from Khaibar.

Immediately following the conquest of Khaibar, a Jewish woman prepared a dinner for Muhammad and some of his men. Unknown to the Muslims was that she had put a poison into the lamb (some say goat) that was served at dinner. Muhammad ate some of the poisoned lamb and died as a result three years later.

Presentation of Islamic Sources

Part A—The poisoning of Muhammad

Part B—Premonitions of his death

Part C—Muhammad and Gabriel pray for healing

Part D—The advent of Muhammad's death

I will use quotes from five highly respected Islamic writings:

1) "Sahih Bukhari." This Hadith is considered to be the most important Islamic book, after the Quran.

2) Ibn Ishaq's biography, the "Sirat Rasul Allah," (*The Life of the Prophet*), translated by A. Guillaume as *The Life of Muhammad*, is the most authentic Sirat (biographical) literature recognized in Islam.

3) Ibn Sa'd's biography, the "Kitab al-Tabagat al-Kabir" (*Book of the Major Classes*), Volume 2. Of the three, Ibn Sa'd's Sirat contains the most information relative to Muhammad's death. I will not attempt to cover the spectrum of subjects Ibn Sa'd addresses in his book. However, I will cover and present his relevant material.

4) Tabari's "History." Tabari is one of the most highly respected authors in Islamic writings. His "History" is 39 volumes.

5) "Sahih Muslim." This collection of Hadith is considered to be equal to, or slightly below Bukhari's collection of Hadith.

NOTE: I have quoted quite a bit of material. Some of it is redundant, but I feel that each quote I present provides an important detail concerning Muhammad's poisoning and death. Please forgive the tedious nature of the quotes; it is essential that I present the source material as accurately as possible.

NOTE: My comments appear in [] type brackets. Frequently the authors themselves enclose comments in () type brackets. I will copy them as they appear in the text.

NOTE: In some cases I will leave out the chain of narrators because they are quite long, and not necessary for the context of the story.

Also, I will present quotes from the sources in as much of a chronological sequence as possible.

Part A—The Poisoning of Muhammad

A1

From Bukhari's Hadith 3.786:

Narrated Anas bin Malik: A Jewess brought a poisoned (cooked) sheep for the Prophet who ate from it. She was brought to the Prophet and he was asked, "Shall we kill her?" He said, "No." I continued to see the effect of the poison on the palate of the mouth of Allah's Apostle.

A2

From Bukhari's Hadith 4.394:

Narrated Abu Huraira: When Khaibar was conquered, a roasted poisoned sheep was presented to the Prophet as a gift (by the Jews). The Prophet ordered, "Let all the Jews who have been here, be assembled before me." The Jews were collected and the Prophet said (to them), "I am going to ask you a question. Will you tell the truth?" They said, "Yes." The Prophet asked, "Who is your father?" They replied, "So-and-so." He said,

“You have told a lie; your father is so-and-so.” They said, “You are right.” He said, “Will you now tell me the truth, if I ask you about something?” They replied, “Yes, O Abu Al-Qasim; and if we should tell a lie, you can realize our lie as you have done regarding our father.” On that he asked, “Who are the people of the (Hell) Fire?” They said, “we shall remain in the (Hell) Fire for a short period, and after that you will replace us.” The Prophet said, “You may be cursed and humiliated in it! By Allah, we shall never replace you in it.” Then he asked, “Will you now tell me the truth if I ask you a question?” They said, “Yes, O Abu Al-Qasim.” He asked, “Have you poisoned this sheep?” They said, “Yes.” He asked, “What made you do so?” They said, “We wanted to know if you were a liar in which case we would get rid of you, and if you are a prophet then the poison would not harm you.”

A3

From Ibn Sa’d page 249:

Verily a Jewish woman presented poisoned (meat of) a she goat to the apostle of Allah. He took a piece from it, put it into his mouth, chewed it and threw it away. Then he said to the Companions: “Halt! Verily, its leg tells me that it is poisoned.” Then he sent for the Jewish woman and asked her: “What induced you to do what you have done?” She replied, “I wanted to know if you are true; in that case Allah will surely inform you, and if you are a liar I shall relieve the people of you.”

A4

From Ibn Sa’d page 249: [different narrator]

The apostle of Allah and his companions ate from it. It (goat) said: “I am poisoned.” He [Muhammad] said to his Companions, “Hold your hands! because it has informed me that it is poisoned!” They withdrew their hands, but Bishr Ibn alBara expired. The apostle of Allah sent for her (Jewess) and asked her, “What induced you to do what you have done?” She replied, “I wanted to know if you are a prophet, in that case it will not harm you and if you are a king, I shall relieve the people of you. He gave orders and she was put to death [See Note 1*].

A5

From Ibn Sa’d page 250: [different narrator]

Verily a woman of the Jews of Khaibar presented poisoned (meat of) goat to the apostle of Allah. Then he recognized that it was poisoned, so he sent for her and asked her, “What induced you to do what you have done?” She replied, “I thought if you are a prophet, Allah will inform you, and if you are a pretender, I shall relieve people of you. When the apostle of Allah felt sick, he got himself “cupped.” [See Note 2*].

A6

From Ibn Sa’d pages 251, 252 [different narrator]:

* There is disagreement over whether or not Muhammad had the woman who poisoned him put to death. In short, he had her put to death for the death of the other Muslim—Bishr, who quickly died from the poisoning. See the reports by Ibn Sa’d, p. 250.

* Cupping is essentially drawing a small amount of blood from your body. Muhammad believed that bleeding oneself was “the best of medicines.”

...When the apostle of Allah conquered Khaibar and he had peace of mind, Zaynab Bint al-Harith, the brother of Marhab, who was the spouse of Sallam Ibn Mishkam, inquired, "Which part of the goat is liked by Muhammad?" They said, "The foreleg." Then she slaughtered one from her goats and roasted it (the meat). Then she wanted a poison which could not fail... The apostle of Allah took the foreleg, a piece of which he put into his mouth. Bishr took another bone and put it into his mouth. When the apostle of Allah ate one morsel of it, Bishr ate his and other people also ate from it. Then the apostle of Allah said, "Hold back your hands! because this foreleg; ... informed me that it is poisoned." Thereupon Bishr said, "By Him who has made you great! I discovered it from the morsel I took. Nothing prevented me from emitting it out, but the idea that I did not like to make your food unrelishing. When you had eaten what was in your mouth I did not like to save my life after yours, and I also thought you would not have eaten it if there was something wrong."

Bishr did not rise from his seat but his color changed to that of "taylsan" (a green cloth)... The apostle of Allah sent for Zaynab and said to her, "What induced you to do what you have done?"

She replied, "You have done to my people what you have done. You have killed my father, my uncle and my husband, so I said to myself, 'If you are a prophet, the foreleg will inform you;' and others have said, 'If you are a king we will get rid of you...'"

The apostle of Allah lived after this three years till in consequence of his pain he passed away. During his illness he used to say, "I did not cease to find the effect of the (poisoned) morsel, I took at Khaibar and I suffered several times (from its effect) but now I feel the hour has come of the cutting of my jugular vein."

A7

From Tabari Volume 8, page 123, 124:

When the messenger of God rested from his labor, Zaynab bt. al-Harith, the wife of Sallam b. Mishkam, served him a roast sheep. She had asked what part of the sheep the messenger of God liked best and was told that it was the foreleg. So she loaded that part with poison, and she poisoned the rest of the sheep too. Then she brought it. When she set it before the messenger of God, he took the foreleg and chewed a bit of it, but he did not swallow it. With him was Bishr b. al-Bara b. Marur, who, like the messenger of God, took some of it; Bishr, however, swallowed it, while the messenger of God spat it out saying, "This bone informs me that it has been poisoned." He asked, "What led you to do this?" She said: "How you have afflicted my people is not hidden from you. So I said, If he is a prophet, he will be informed; but if he is a king, I shall be rid of him." The prophet forgave her. Bishr died of the food he had eaten.

A8

From Tabari Volume 8, page 124: [different narrator]

The messenger of God said during the illness from which he died—the mother of Bishr had come in to visit him—"Umm Bishr, at this very moment I feel my aorta being severed because of the food I ate with your son at Khaybar" [See Note 3*].

* The note on quote A8 states that the expression, "it severed his aorta" need not be taken literally; it is used metaphorically for extreme pain.

Part B—Premonitions of His Death

B1

From Bukhari's Hadith 5.713:

Narrated Ibn Abbas:

'Umar bin Al-Khattab used to let Ibn Abbas sit beside him, so 'AbdurRahman bin 'Auf said to 'Umar, "We have sons similar to him." 'Umar replied, "(I respect him) because of his status that you know." 'Umar then asked Ibn 'Abbas about the meaning of this Holy Verse:—"When comes the help of Allah and the conquest of Mecca..." (110.1).

Ibn 'Abbas replied, "That indicated the death of Allah's Apostle which Allah informed him of." 'Umar said, "I do not understand of it except what you understand."

Narrated 'Aisha: The Prophet in his ailment in which he died, used to say, "O 'Aisha! I still feel the pain caused by the food I ate at Khaibar, and at this time, I feel as if my aorta is being cut from that poison."

B2

From Ibn Sa'd page 244:

... and there has been no prophet but he has lived half the life of the prophet preceding him. Jesus the son of Mary lived for one hundred and twenty five years, and this is the sixty second year of my life. He (prophet) died half the year after this.

B3

From Ibn Sa'd page 239:

The appointed hour (of death) of the apostle of Allah came near and he was ordered to recite repeatedly "tasbih" (lit. glorification) and ask for His forgiveness.

B4

From Ibn Sa'd page 240:

When (the Surah) Allah's succor and the triumph comes; was revealed he (prophet) said: (It signifies) call from Allah and departure from the world.

B5

From Tabari Volume 9 page 108:

When the prophet returned to Medina after performing the Pilgrimage of Completion, he began to have a complaint of illness. As travel was allowed (after the pilgrimage), the news of the prophet's illness spread ... Then in Muharram the prophet complained of the pain from which he died.

Part C—Muhammad and Gabriel Pray for Healing

Note: It was already quoted from Ibn Sa'd above (page 250) that Muhammad tried to get himself healed of the poisoning.

C1

From Ibn Sa'd page 263:

Verily during his illness the prophet recited “al-Mu’awwadhatayn” [Sura 113 and 114], and blew his breath upon his body while rubbing his face. [This was done in an effort to be healed].

C2

From Sahih Muslim Volume 3, No. 5440:

Aisha reported that when Allah’s Messenger fell ill, he recited over his body Mu’awwidhatan and blew over him and when his sickness was aggravated I used to recite over him and rub him with his hand with the hope that it was more blessed. Also ref. Hadith No. 5441.

C2

From Ibn Sa’d page 265:

The apostle of Allah fell ill and he, i.e. Gabriel, chanted on him, saying, “In the name of Allah I chant on to ward off from you every thing that harms you and (to ward off you) against every envier and from every evil eye and Allah will heal you.

C3

From Ibn Sa’d page 265: [Different narrator]:

Aisha, the wife of the prophet used to say, When the apostle of Allah fell ill, Gabriel chanted on him saying, “In the name of Allah Who will cure you and Who will heal you from every malady (and will ward off) the evil of envier who envies and from smite of the evil eye.”

C4

From Ibn Sa’d page 322:

Verily, whenever the apostle of Allah fell ill, he asked for recovery, from Allah. But in the illness as a result of which he died, he did not pray for recovery; he used to say, “O soul! What has happened to thee that thou are seeking refuge in every place of refuge?”

Part D—The Advent of Muhammad’s Death

D1 [again quoting from Bukhari’s Hadith 5.713:]

Narrated ’Aisha:

The Prophet in his ailment in which he died, used to say, “O ’Aisha! I still feel the pain caused by the food I ate at Khaibar, and at this time, I feel as if my aorta is being cut from that poison.”

D2

From Ibn Hisham page 678:

While matters were thus the apostle began to suffer from the illness by which God took him to what honor and compassion He intended for him shortly before the end of Safar or in the beginning of Rabi’ul-awwal. It began, so I have been told, when he went to Bagi’u’l-Gharqad in the middle of the night and prayed for the dead. Then he returned to his family and in the morning his sufferings began.

D3

From Ibn Hisham page 679:

Then the apostle's illness worsened and he suffered much pain. He said, "Pour seven skins of water from different wells over me so that I may go out to the men and instruct them." We made him sit down in a tub belonging to Hafsa d. Umar and we poured water over him until he cried, "Enough, enough!"

... then he [Muhammad] said, "God has given one of his servants the choice between this world and that which is with God and he has chosen the latter."

D4

From Ibn Hisham page 680:

Then some of his wives gathered to him. ... while his uncle Abbas was with him, and they agreed to force him to take medicine. Abbas said, "Let me force him," but they did it. When he recovered he asked who had treated him thus. When they told him it was his uncle he said, "This is a medicine which women have brought from that country," and he pointed in the direction of Abyssinia [Ethiopia]. When he asked why they had done that his uncle said, "We were afraid that you would get pleurisy;" he replied, "That is a disease which God would not afflict me with. Let no one stop in the house until they have been forced to take this medicine, except my uncle." Maymuna [one of Muhammad's wives] was forced to take it although she was fasting because of the apostle's oath, as a punishment for what they had done to him.

D5

From Ibn Sa'd page 294:

Umm Bishr [the mother of the Muslim man who also died eating poison], came to the prophet during his illness and said, "O apostle of Allah! I never saw fever like it in any one." The prophet said to her, "Our trial is double and so our reward [in heaven], is double. What do the people say about it [his illness]?" She said, "They say it is pleurisy." Thereupon the apostle said, "Allah will not like to make His apostle suffer from it (pleurisy) because it indicates the possession of Satan, but (my disease is the result of) the morsel that I had taken along your son. It has cut my jugular vein." See Note 4*.

D6

From Ibn Hisham page 682:

... that he heard Aisha [one of Muhammad's wives] say: "The apostle died in my bosom during my turn: [the night Muhammad was to spend sleeping with her] I had wronged none in regard to him. It was due to my ignorance and extreme youth that the apostle died in my arms."

D7

From Ibn Sa'd page 322:

When the last moment of the prophet was near, he used to draw a sheet over his face; but when he felt uneasy, he removed it from his face and said: "Allah's damnation be on the Jews and the Christians who made the graves of their prophets objects of worship."

Summary of the Sources

* Pleurisy is an infection of a lung membrane. It is painful. I don't know why Muhammad considered this infection to be from Satan, but poisoning would not be from Satan.

Muhammad attacked Khaibar. He destroyed, tortured, murdered, plundered, and enslaved those people. They were not preparing to attack him. A Jewish woman, whose family had been wiped out by Muhammad, put poison into a lamb and fed it to Muhammad and the other Muslims. Muhammad ingested some of the poisoned lamb and began to feel its effects. He died three years later as a result of the poisoning.

Discussion

What needs to be investigated here are the circumstances of Muhammad's death. The Jews were planning to murder him. The Jews believed that a real prophet would be forewarned of their deed but an impostor wouldn't be warned by God. The Muslims also believed this; the other Muslim who died said that he didn't think Muhammad would eat of something that was poisoned (see quote in A6).

The Jews were right, Muhammad did eat of the poison, and did die from it. They proved, according to their test, that Muhammad was not a prophet. As they said (quote A2):

“We wanted to know if you were a liar in which case we would get rid of you, and if you are a prophet then the poison would not harm you.”

These Jews were convinced that a real prophet would know what was going on. In this case Muhammad didn't know. Only after Muhammad ate from the lamb did the lamb “talk to him.” I don't think that that was anything miraculous in itself; even the other Muslim knew it was bad before Muhammad ate from it. Most adults know when they are eating something that is bad. So for Muhammad to say the sheep “talked” to him is not prophetic at all. Even a child spits out bad tasting food.

Many times previously, Muhammad claimed to have had “revelations” that warned him of danger. He even used one of these convenient “revelations” as grounds to attack the Jewish settlement of Banu Nadhir. Yet at Khaibar the revelation came too late: too late to save his own life, too late to save Bishr's life.

As his illness wore on, Muhammad began to pray for healing—he even rubbed his “healing” hand upon himself. Gabriel also got into the act and prayed for his healing (see quotes C2 & C3). Muhammad even got himself “cupped” (the best of all medicines!) (quote A5). Obviously, at this point in time, Muhammad wanted to be healed.

But it didn't help. As he progressively got worse, Muhammad realized that he was dying, ceased praying for healing (quote C4), and claimed that Allah had given him a choice of going to Paradise, or living on earth. Muhammad said he then wanted to go to Paradise. Knowing the game was up, he made the best out of a failed situation.

Muhammad's earlier premonitions of his death read more like the cosmic words of a mystic. Nothing definite is ever said about them until after his approaching death. Perhaps he had seen this type of death before and knew the outcome. It doesn't take a prophet or a “revelation” to know that death is near.

My basic point is this: the Jews proved that Muhammad was not a real prophet. He ingested the poison, so did at least one of his followers. He attempted to be healed, he tried his medicine, and his form of “laying on of hands,” his prayer, Aisha's prayer, and even Gabriel's prayer, but in the end, he died from the poison.

Questions

- 1) If Muhammad were a real prophet of God, why didn't he catch the poison before he ate it?
- 2) If you believe that it was God's will for Muhammad to have eaten the poison, along with Bishr, why then did Muhammad try to get well? Even Gabriel prayed for Muhammad to get better, but Allah didn't answer that prayer either.
- 3) Why did Gabriel not know the will of Allah? Why would Gabriel pray if Allah had decided death?
- 4) Why did Muhammad force the other Muslims to drink the medicine he was given? One of them was one of his wives, and she was fasting. He forced her to break her fast and drink the medicine as well. Doesn't this sound vindictive and petty?
- 5) Why, when just before his death, did Muhammad have to utter a curse upon the Christians and the Jews? Wouldn't it have been better for Muhammad to pray for guidance for them? This also sounds like a jealous, bitter prayer to Allah. Muhammad prayed for and uttered curses instead of asking Allah to guide people.
- 6) Why would pleurisy, which is a normal infection of the lung membrane, be considered to be from Satan, but being poisoned would not be from Satan?

Conclusion

Muhammad was not a real prophet; he was a false prophet. He died as a result of eating poison that he didn't know about. The poisoned lamb "spoke" to him too late. Only when he realized he was dying did Muhammad "spiritualize" his suffering and coming death. Prior to that he tried to get well.

Moses knew about his coming death ([Deut. 34:1-5](#)). Jesus also knew of His future death ([Mark 8:32, 32](#)). Yet Muhammad was in the dark until he himself realized he was going to die.

Paul the apostle was bitten by a poisonous snake ([Acts 28:1-6](#)), but Paul suffered no ill effects from the bite. God had his hand of protection on Paul, to finish the work laid out for him. Muhammad died so suddenly that there was confusion as to who would be the next ruler of the Islamic state. To this day, part of that confusion remains. The Islamic world is divided in part because of this issue (Shia vs. Sunni). Wouldn't Allah, who abhors division within the Ummah have protected Muhammad long enough to insure that his state remain unified, and a clearly defined successor be named?

Jesus predicted false prophets would come into the world and mislead many ([Matthew 24:24](#)). Muhammad was such a false prophet. Both Jesus and Moses knew God face to face, Muhammad only had a spirit or angel he called "Gabriel" speaking to him. In the end, even this angel's prayers were not answered by Allah. Could it be that this "Gabriel" was preaching a false religion ([Galatians 1:8](#)) to Muhammad? Could Gabriel have been a deceptive demon or Satan himself?

For more articles by Silas see the Answering Islam home page at www.answeringislam.org

Common Logical Fallacies Made by Muslims

By Dr. Robert Morey

When witnessing to Muslims, Christians must be prepared to answer the typical objections made against the Gospel. Most of the objections are based on simple logical fallacies. The following is a list of some of the most common fallacies used by Muslims.

Note: The average Muslim does not know that his arguments are logically erroneous. He is sincere in his beliefs. Thus you must be patient and kind in sharing with him why his arguments are invalid.

No. 1. The fallacy of false assumptions: In logic as well as in law, “historical precedent” means that the burden of proof rests on those who set forth new theories and not on those whose ideas have already been verified. The old tests the new. The already established authority judges any new claims to authority.

Since Islam came along many centuries after Christianity, Islam has the burden of proof and not Christianity. The Bible tests and judges the Qur’an. When the Bible and the Qur’an contradict each other, the Bible must logically be given first place as the older authority. The Qur’an is in error until it proves itself.

Some Muslims violate the principle of historical precedent by asserting that Islam does not have the burden of proof and that the Qur’an judges the Bible.

No. 2. Arguing in a circle: If you have already assumed in your premise what you are going to state in your conclusion, then you have ended where you began and proven nothing.

If you end where you began, you got nowhere.

Examples

No. 1. Proving Allah by the Qur’an and then proving the Qur’an by Allah.

No. 2. Proving Muhammad by the Qur’an and then proving the Qur’an by Muhammad.

No. 3. Proving Islam by the Qur’an and then proving the Qur’an by Islam.

No. 3. False analogy: Comparing two things as if they are parallel when they are not really the same at all.

Examples

No. 1. Many Muslims erroneously assume that Muslims and Christians share the same concepts of God, revelation, inspiration, textual preservation, the Bible, prophethood, biblical history, conversion, etc.

No. 2. Because a false analogy is drawn between Islam and Christianity, some Muslims think that any argument which refutes the Qur’an will likewise refute the Bible; any argument which refutes Muhammad will also refute Jesus Christ, etc.

No. 3. For example, many Muslims claim that Muhammad and all prophets were sinless. They even deny that Abraham was an idol worshipper. Thus when a Christian points out all the wicked things that Muhammad did (mass murder, child abuse, lying, etc.), the Muslims will say, “If you are right, then you must also reject your biblical prophets for doing wicked things as well.”

What he is really saying is, “if you reject my prophet, then you must reject your prophets as well. If Muhammad was a false prophet, then your prophets are false as well.”

The root problem is that the Muslim concept of prophethood is not the same as the Christian concept of prophethood. We teach that prophets sin like anyone else. Thus while Islam is refuted by the sins of Muhammad, Christianity is not jeopardized at all. The Muslim is guilty of setting up a “false analogy.”

Whenever a Muslim responds to a Christian attack on the Qur’an, Muhammad, or Allah by flipping the argument around and applying it to the Bible, Jesus or the Trinity as if Islam and

Christianity either stand or fall together, he is guilty of the fallacy of false analogy. Islam can be false and Christianity be true at the same time.

No. 4. The fallacy of irrelevance: When you introduce issues which have no logical bearing on the subject under discussion, you are using irrelevant arguments.

Examples

No. 1. Some Muslims argue: “The Qur’an is the Word of God because the text of the Qur’an has been preserved perfectly.” This argument is erroneous for two reasons:

a. Factually, the text of the Qur’an has not been preserved perfectly. The text has additions, deletions, conflicting manuscripts, and variant readings like any other ancient writing.

b. Logically, it is irrelevant whether the text of the Qur’an has been preserved because preservation does not logically imply inspiration. A book can be perfectly copied without implying its inspiration.

No. 2. When Muslims attack the character and motives of anyone who criticizes Islam, they are using irrelevant arguments. The character of someone is no indication of whether he is telling you the truth. Good people can lie and evil people can tell the truth. Thus whenever a Muslim uses slurs such as “mean,” “dishonest,” “racist,” “liar,” “deceptive,” etc., he is not only committing a logical fallacy but also revealing that he cannot intellectually defend his beliefs.

No. 3. When confronted with the pagan origins of the Qur’an, some Muslims defend the Qur’an by answering: “But Christians celebrate Christmas and it was originally a pagan holiday! Thus both Muslims and Christians get their rites from the pagans.”

This argument is erroneous for several reasons.

a. It is a false analogy to parallel the pagan origins of the rites commanded in the Qur’an with the present day holidays nowhere commanded in the Bible. What some modern day Christians do on Dec. 25th has no logical bearing on what the Qur’an commands Muslims to do (eg. the Pilgrimage, the Fast, etc.).

b. It is irrelevant that some Christians choose to celebrate the birth of Christ. Since the Bible nowhere commands it, it is a matter of personal freedom. But Muslims are commanded in the Qur’an to believe and practice many things which came from the paganism of that day.

c. The Muslim by using this argument is actually admitting that the Qur’an was not “sent down,” but fabricated from pagan sources. This means he has become an unbeliever (Surah 25:4–6).

No. 4. Some Muslims argue that the Qur’an is the Word of God because it contains some historically or scientifically accurate statements. This argument is irrelevant. Just because a book is correct on some historical or scientific point does not mean it is inspired. You cannot take the attributes of a part and apply it to the whole. A book can be a mixture of true and false statements. Thus it is a logical fallacy to argue that the entire Qur’an is true if it makes one true statement.

When a Muslim argues that history or science “proves” the Qur’an, this actually means that he is acknowledging that history and science can like wise refute the Qur’an. If the Qur’an contains just one historical error or one scientific error, then the Qur’an is not the Word of God. Verification and falsification go hand in hand.

No. 5. The present meaning of a word is irrelevant to what it meant in ancient times. The word “Allah” is a good example. When confronted by the historical evidence that the word was used by pagan Arabs in pre-Islamic times to refer to a high god who was married to the sun-goddess and had three daughters, some Muslims will quote dictionaries, encyclopedias, etc. to prove (sic) that “Allah means God.” They are thus using modern definitions to define what the

word meant over a thousand years ago! What “Allah” means now has no bearing on what it meant before Muhammad.

When some Muslims realize that they have been intellectually defeated they will use two tricks:

1. They will avoid having to deal with citations by claiming that they were taken out of context. They count on the audience not having the books in their possession and thus they can wave aside the evidence by merely chanting “out of context.” This is an old ruse. Each time a Muslim apologist says, “This is taken out of context,” it only means that he cannot refute what is quoted.

2. If the Christian does not know Arabic, some Muslims will avoid arguments by saying: “You don’t know Arabic. Thus you can’t criticize the Qur’an or the Hadith.” But they seldom know Koine Greek and yet they feel free to criticize the New Testament! The Qur’an and the Hadith have been translated by Muslim scholars into English, and unless all these Muslim scholars are dishonest, they are valid translations.

No. 5. The fallacy of equivocation: If we assume that everyone has the same definition of such words as God, Jesus, revelation, inspiration, prophet, miracle, etc., we are committing a very simple logical fallacy.

No. 1. When a Muslim says, “Christians and Muslims worship the same God,” he is committing the fallacy of equivocation. While Christians worship the Triune God of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Muslims worship a Unitarian deity. Obviously, they are worshipping different Gods.

No. 2. When a Muslim says, “We believe in Jesus too,” he is committing the fallacy of equivocation. The “Jesus” of the Qur’an is not the Jesus of the Bible. Islam preaches “another Jesus” (2 Cor. 11:4). The Jesus of the Bible is God the Son who died on the cross for our sins. But the “Jesus” of the Qur’an is not God the Son and he did not die on the cross for our sins. Thus it is erroneous for Muslims to tell Christians that they believe in Jesus too.

No. 3. When a Muslim assumes that Christians have the same concept of revelation as Muslims, he is guilty of the fallacy of equivocation. According to Islam, the Qur’an was written in heaven by Allah and has no earthly sources. When we prove that it comes from earthly sources, this threatens the inspiration of the Qur’an.

On the other hand, the Bible does not claim that it dropped out of heaven one day. It openly quotes from earthly sources. It uses pre-existing sources without any difficulty whatsoever. Thus while the Qur’an is threatened by historical sources, the Bible is actually confirmed by them.

No. 4. When a Muslim tells you that the word “Allah” has only one meaning: “the one, true, universal God,” he is assuming a fallacy. The word “allah” has many different meanings.

a. It can be used as a generic term like the English word “god.” Thus it can be applied to any god or goddess regardless if a true or false god is in view. (ex. The “allahs” of Hinduism.)

b. The Nation of Islam uses it to refer to Wallace Dodd Ford, Elijah Muhammad, and Louis Farrakhan as “allah” and teaches that all black people are “allahs.”

c. It has been used by some Christians in Arabic speaking countries as a generic name for the Holy Trinity.

d. It was used in pre-Islamic times by pagan Arabs to refer to the moon-god who was the father of al-Lat, al-Uzza and Manat.

e. It is used by Muslims to refer to their god. Islam and Christianity do not worship the same god. The Christian worships the Holy Trinity while the Muslim worships a unitarian deity.

No. 6. The fallacy of force: The Qur'an commands Muslims to wage war against non-Muslims and apostates (Surah 5:33; 9:5, 29).

Some Muslims use a false analogy to answer this argument. They respond by saying: "Well, what about the Crusades? You Christians use violence just like Muslims."

It is logically erroneous to set up a parallel between Muslims killing people in obedience to the Qur'an, and Christians killing people in disobedience to the Bible. While the Qur'an commands Jihad, the New Testament forbids it.

No. 7. The fallacy of confusing questions of fact with questions of relevance: Whether something is factually true is totally different from the issue of whether you feel it is relevant. The two issues must be kept separate.

Examples

No. 1. When a Christian argues that some of the beliefs and rituals of the Qur'an came from pre-Islamic Arab paganism, the Muslim will deny it at first. But as more and more evidence is given, the Muslim will often do a flip-flop and begin arguing: "So what! Didn't you Christians get Christmas from the pagans?" The Muslim has now committed three fallacies:

a. The "so what!" argument is dealing with the issue of relevance, not fact. You must stop the Muslim at that point and ask him, "Since you are now dealing with the issue of whether the pagan origins of the Qur'an are relevant, does this mean that you are now agreeing to the fact of the pagan origins of Islam?"

b. The Muslim has also committed the fallacy of equivocation. The Bible is not threatened by historical sources. It freely refers to them and even quotes them ([Acts 7: 28](#)). But the Qur'an denies that it has any earthly historical sources (Surah 25:4–6).

c. He also committed the fallacy of false analogy. The Bible and the Qur'an are two totally different books. The inspiration of the Bible does not depend upon the fate of the Qur'an because what Muslims claim for the Qur'an is not what Christians claim for the Bible.

No. 8. Phonic fallacies: The phonetic sound of a word should not be used to twist its meaning. For example:

a. Some Muslims try to prove that the word "Allah" is in the Greek New Testament because of the Greek word *alla*. But while the word is pronounced "alla," it only means "but" in Greek. It has nothing to do with the Arabic "Allah."

b. Some Muslims have claimed that the word "Allah" is in the Bible because of the biblical word "Allelujah." They then mispronounce the word as "Allah-lujah!" But "Allelujah" is not a compound Arabic word with "Allah" being the first part of the word. It is a Hebrew word with the name of God being "JAH" (or Yahweh) and the verb "alle" meaning "praise to." It means "praise to Yahweh." The Arabic word "Allah" is not in the word.

c. The same error is found in the Muslim argument that the word "Baca" ([Psa. 84:6](#)) really means "Mecca." The valley of Baca is in northern Israel.

d. Some Muslims have tried to go from "Amen" to "Ahmed" to "Muhammed!" Such nonsense is beyond belief.

No. 9. "Red Herring" arguments: When a Muslim is asked to defend the Qur'an, if he turns around and attacks the reliability of the Bible, the Trinity, the deity of Christ, the Crusades, etc., he is introducing irrelevant issues that have no logical bearing on the truthfulness of Islam. He is trying to divert attention from Islam to other issues.

Furthermore, he is assuming that if he can refute the Bible, then the Qur'an wins by default. If he can refute the Trinity, then Allah wins by default. But this is logically erroneous. You

cannot prove your position by refuting someone else's position. The Bible and the Qur'an could both be wrong. Muslims must prove their own book.

No. 10. Straw Man arguments: When you put a false argument into the mouth of your opponent and then proceed to knock it down, you have only created a "straw man" argument. Muslims sometimes either misunderstand or deliberately misquote the arguments Christians give them.

Example:

Some Muslims have built a "straw man" argument that claims that we teach: "The Qur'an teaches that Allah is the Moon-god and that Muslims knowingly believe in and worship the Moongod and his daughters."

They then knock down this "straw man" argument and claim victory. Of course, we never said such nonsense. What we have said is that while the Qur'an claims that Allah is God and Muslims think they are worshipping the one true God, in reality they are worshipping a false god preached by a false prophet according to a false book.

Conclusion

The average Muslim has been deceived by Muslim apologists who use such logical fallacies without regard to reason, fact or honesty. But be patient. There are many Muslims who want to be rational in their religion, and thus have an open mind to rational discourse. Once they see that their arguments are based on logical fallacies, they will be open to the wonderful news that Jesus Christ is the Son of God who died for our sins on the cross.