

Journal of Biblical Apologetics

Number 4, Winter 2003, Volume 7

Cover Art as Described by Dr. Robert a. Morey

Cover shows the rock in the center of the Dome Mosque in Jerusalem, where supposedly Muhammad landed in his dream. Of course, he never actually stood there.

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

Islam Part 3: The Qur'an

Journal of Biblical Apologetics
No. 4, Winter 2003, Vol. 7
Copyright © CSP 2003 All rights reserved.

ISBN No. 1-931230-15-3

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

Introduction: Who Was Muhammad?

By Dr. Robert Morey

The Message of the Qur'an: Worship of Allah Alone?

By Sam Shamoun

Ahmaddiyya in the Balance

By Sam Shamoun

The Quranic Witness to Biblical Authority

By Sam Shamoun

Muhammad, Aisha, Islam and Child Brides

By Silas

Muhammad and the Female Captives

By Silas

Slavery in Islam

By Silas

Does the Quran Teach a Local Flood?

By Sam Shamoun

Introduction: Who Was Muhammad?

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

As pointed out by Ibn Warraq in his landmark work, *The Quest for the Historical Muhammad*, the “Muhammad” of faith and religion is not the Muhammad of fact and history. Modern Muslims have a legendary and mythological view of the character and life of Muhammad that is in direct contradiction with all the historical accounts.

In my debate with the Muslim apologist, Shabir Ally (to obtain a copy, call 1-800-41-TRUTH), he argued that Muhammad was a prophet because, on one occasion, he ordered his entire caravan to stop while a dog gave birth to a litter of puppies. He offered no historical evidence to back up this tender story.

I pointed out that the story, even if it were true, did not prove that Muhammad was a prophet. But, more to the point, the historical record is 100 percent clear that Muhammad ordered that all dogs be killed!

Bukhari vol. IV, no. 540: Narrated Abdullah bin Umar: Allah’s Apostle ordered that the dogs should be killed.

The tender story of Muhammad holding up his caravan for a dog goes against his edict that all dogs should be killed. Even today, dogs as pets are forbidden by Islamic law. The first thing the Ayatollah did after taking over Iran was to kill all the dogs in the country!

The example above highlights the problem. The Muhammad of myth and legend has so engrained itself into the mindset of modern Muslims that, even when you quote the Qur'an or the Hadith, they will refuse to listen.

A Perfect and Sinless Muhammad

One classic example is the Muslim doctrine that Muhammad was both perfect and sinless. When I stated in my lecture at the University of Texas that Muhammad was not sinless, the Muslims in the audience went crazy. (To obtain a copy of this video, call 1-800-41-TRUTH.)

Can Muslims produce any passages from the Qur'an or the Hadith that state that Muhammad was sinless? No. I have asked for such passages for over twenty years and no Muslim has been able to find one.

I have quoted passages from the Qur'an (see *Islamic Invasion*) that clearly state that Allah commanded Muhammad to repent of his sins and that Allah had forgiven him of his sins. But they ignore them. When I quoted from the Hadith (Bukhari, vol. I., nos. 19, 711, 781) where Muhammad said that he asked for forgiveness for his sins many times a day, they still would not give up their belief that Muhammad was perfect. They just believe it because, well, they just believe it! Even their own sacred books cannot open their minds to the real Muhammad.

The Burden of Proof

Muslim theologians begin by assuming that their beliefs are true. Thus they assume that they do not have to prove anything. But they have it backwards. They have the burden of proof to demonstrate that Muhammad was a true prophet and not just another false prophet.

There are only four logical possibilities.

1. He was who he claimed to be: a prophet and an apostle.
2. He was a liar: he knew he was not a prophet but for money, sex and power, he claimed to be one.
3. He was mentally ill: if he were alive today he would be institutionalized as criminally insane.
4. He was a mentally ill liar: he had delusions of grandeur and he lied when it suited his purposes.

Where's the Beef?

One obvious question that comes to the mind about Islam is: "Why did the seventh century Arabs accept Muhammad as a prophet?" There were no biblical or pagan prophecies that foretold his coming. He was semi-illiterate and only of average intelligence. Why did they follow him?

The natural blood lust of the seventh 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.

Pre-Islamic Arabia

The truth is found in pre-Islamic Arabia. The pagan Arabs, like many other barbaric peoples, believed in shamans (*kahin*) 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 that 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 my book, *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.

Proof No. 1: The Seal of Prophethood

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 or prophet. 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 has the Seal of the prophets: and Allah has full knowledge of all things.

What is the identity of this “Seal of the prophets,” and what is its significance? There are two different ways of asking these questions. If you ask 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 believe that Muhammad was the last of the prophets, i.e. 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 Shi’ites believe in a succession of prophets. This is why the Ayatollahs have so much power in Iran. The Sunnis and Shi’ites fight and kill each other over the issue of future prophets.

We are not asking about future prophets. Instead, we are asking a 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 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. 1:189; 4:741).

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 that signified that he was a prophet.

A mole of an unusual size on the Prophet's back that 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, book 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-Haqq).

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 Prophets 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 illusion 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* [I.B.R.I.: 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 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 are such things ever considered a sign of inspiration. Indeed, [Lev. 21:16–24](#) excludes from holy service anyone who had a physical defect!

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 Hebrew scholar who views [Isaiah 9:6](#) as a prophecy of Muhammad.

The pagan Arabs were looking for prophets who had a physical deformity like a large mole or tumor on his back. Muhammad had such a mole. Thus he was a pagan shaman. That is why he won over so many pagan Arabs.

Proof No. 2: Epileptic Seizures

Another religious tradition among pagan Arabs was that someone who fell down and had a seizure was either possessed by the jinn (i.e. demons) or inspired by the gods or God. Once again, brain seizures, like physical deformities, are not a part of the biblical tradition.

Liberals view the suggestions that Muhammad was an epileptic and that his seizures played a major role in pagan Arabs accepting him as a prophet, as “politically incorrect.” But the historical and medical evidence is drawn from the Muslim sacred writings. *The Dictionary of Islam* (p. 393) explains:

He (i.e. Muhammad) suffered from hallucinations of his senses, and to finish his sufferings, he several times contemplated suicide by throwing down from a precipice. His friends were alarmed at his state of mind. Some considered it as eccentricities of a poetical genius; others thought that he was a *kahin*, or soothsayer; but the majority took a less charitable view (See Surah LXIX:40, XX:5), and declared that he was insane; and, as madness and melancholy are ascribed to supernatural influence in the East, they said that he was in the power of Satan and his agents, the jinn. They called in exorcists; and he himself doubted the soundness of his mind. “I hear a sound,” he said to his wife, “and I see a light. I am afraid there are jinn in me.” And on another occasion he said, “I am afraid that I am a *kahin*.”

According to unimpeachably authentic hadiths found in Bukhari, Muhammad would hear ringing in his ears; his heart would beat rapidly; his face turn red; his breathing would become labored; he would fall to the ground or lie down; he would shake; his eyes would open wide; his lips tremble; spit drool from the corners of his mouth; he would sweat profusely; he saw and heard things no one else ever saw or heard; he would sometimes make a snoring noise like that of a camel; and he would be covered with a sheet (vol. I, nos. 1, 2, 3, 4; vol. II, chapter 16 (pg. 354), 544; vol. III, nos. 17, 829; vol. IV, nos. 95, 438, 458, 461; vol. V, nos. 170, 462, 618, 659; vol. VI, nos. 447, 448, 468, 478, 481, 508).

In *McClintock and Strong’s Encyclopedia* (vol. 6, pg. 406), we read the following:

Muhammad was endowed with a nervous constitution and a lively imagination. It was not at all unnatural for him to come after a time to regard himself as actually called of God to build up his people in a new faith.

Muhammad, as we gather from the oldest and most trustworthy narratives, was an epileptic, and as such, was considered to be possessed of evil spirits. At first, he believed the sayings, but gradually he came to the conclusion, confirmed by his friends, that demons had no power over so pure and pious a man as he was, and he conceived the idea

that he was not controlled by evil spirits, but that he was visited by angels whom he, disposed to hallucinations, a vision, an audition, afflicted with the morbid state of the body and mind, saw in dreams. Or even while awake, he conceived he saw. What seemed to him good and true after such epileptic attacks, he esteemed revelation in which he, at least in the first stage of his pathetic course, firmly believed and which imparted to his pensive, variable character, the necessary courage and endurance to brave all mortifications and perils.

Whenever any scholar brings up the evidence that proves that Muhammad had the classic symptoms of mental illness, the liberals object that to say this is insensitive. But the evidence, like a granite rock, is unmoved by crying and hand wringing. This medical evidence has been gathered and explained by modern science and psychiatry.

One recent example is the book *Life Alert*, (Winepress Publishing 2002), by Dr. Dede Korkut, M.D. His analysis of the medical evidence cannot be overthrown simply because the feelings of Muslims are offended. He certifies that Muhammad suffered from two neurological deficiencies: hydrocephalus and epilepsy.

Conclusion

The claim that Muhammad was a prophet like the biblical prophets falls to the ground under the weight of its own erroneous “proofs,” such as a black mole. The burden is clearly on the Muslims to produce some intellectually respectable proof that Muhammad was anything other than a mentally ill and dangerous sociopath.

The Message of the Quran: Worship of Allah Alone? By Sam Shamoun

The Quran states

“Say: ‘O People of the Book! come to common terms as between us and you: That we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than Allah.’ If then they turn back, say ye: ‘Bear witness that we (at least) are Muslims (bowing to Allah’s Will)’ ”S. 3:64.

“It is not (possible) that a man, to whom is given the Book, and Wisdom, and the Prophetic Office, should say to people: ‘Be ye my worshippers rather than Allah’s’: On the contrary (he would say) ‘Be ye worshippers of Him (Who is truly the Cherisher of all): For ye have taught the Book and ye have studied it earnestly.’ Nor would he instruct you to take angels and prophets for Lords and patrons. What! would he bid you to unbelief after ye have bowed your will (to Allah in Islam)?” S 3:79–80.

“The Jews call Uzair a son of Allah, and the Christians call Christ the son of Allah. That is a saying from their mouth; (in this) they but imitate what the unbelievers of old used to say. Allah’s curse be on them: how they are deluded away from the Truth! They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords beside Allah, and (they take as their Lord) Christ the son of Mary; yet they were commanded to worship but One God: there is

no god but He. Praise and glory to Him: (Far is He) from having the partners they associate (with Him)” S. 9:30–31.

“Nor did the People of the Book make schisms, until after there came to them Clear Evidence. And they have been commanded no more than this: to worship Allah, offering Him sincere devotion, being true (in faith); to establish regular prayer; and to give Zakat; and that is the Religion Right and Straight” S. 98:4–5.

In fact, associating partners with Allah is to commit the unforgivable sin:

“Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth; to set up partners with Allah is to devise a sin most heinous indeed” S. 4:48.

“Allah forgiveth not (the sin of) joining other gods with Him; but He forgiveth whom He pleaseth other sins than this: one who joins other gods with Allah, hath strayed far, far away (from the right)” S. 4:116.

Yet there are several instances in the Quran where men and angels are addressed as Lord and receive worship:

“There did Zakariya PRAY TO HIS LORD: ‘O MY LORD! Grant unto me from Thee a progeny that is pure: for Thou art He that heareth prayer!’ While he was standing in prayer in the chamber, THE ANGELS CALLED UNTO HIM: ‘Allah doth give thee glad tidings of Yahy—(John) witnessing the truth of a Word from Allah, and (be besides) noble, chaste, and a prophet,—of the (goodly) company of the righteous.’ HE SAID ‘O MY LORD! How shall I have a son, seeing I am very old, and my wife is barren?’ ‘Thus,’ was the answer, ‘Doth Allah accomplish what He willeth.’ HE SAID: ‘O MY LORD! Give me a Sign!’ ‘Thy Sign,’ was the answer, ‘Shall be that thou shalt speak to no man for three days but with signals. Then celebrate the praises of thy Lord again and again, and glorify Him in the evening and in the morning’ ” S. 3:38–41.

Zechariah is said to have prayed to his Lord for a child, with the angels responding to his request. Yet when asking a question Zechariah addresses the speaker(s) as his Lord!

Continuing further in the same chapter, we are told that a group of angels announced Jesus’ birth to Mary:

“Behold! THE ANGELS SAID: ‘O Mary! Allah hath chosen thee and purified thee—chosen thee above the women of all nations. O Mary! worship thy Lord devoutly: Prostrate thyself, and bow down (in prayer) with those who bow down.’ This is part of the tidings of the things unseen, which We reveal unto thee (O Messenger) by inspiration: Thou wast not with them when they cast lots with pens (or arrows), as to which of them should be charged with the care of Mary: Nor wast thou with them when they disputed (the point). Behold! THE ANGELS SAID: ‘O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honor in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah. He shall speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. And he shall be (of the company) of the righteous.’ She said: ‘O MY LORD! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?’ HE SAID: ‘Even so; Allah createth what He willeth: When He hath decreed a plan, He but saith to it, “Be,” and it is!’ ” S. 3:42–47.

This passage claims that a group of angels addressed Mary, with one specific angel (i.e., “He said”) responding to her question. In the parallel passage regarding Jesus’ birth annunciation, the One addressing Mary is said to be the Spirit of God:

“Relate in the Book (the story of) Mary, when she withdrew from her family to a place in the East. She placed a screen (to screen herself) from them; then We sent her Our Spirit (RUH), and he appeared before her as a man in all respects. She said: ‘I seek refuge from thee to (Allah) Most Gracious: (come not near) if thou dost fear Allah.’ HE SAID: ‘Nay, I AM ONLY A MESSANGER FROM THY LORD, (to announce) to thee the gift of a pure son. She said: ‘How shall I have a son, seeing that no man has touched me, and I am not unchaste?’” HE SAID: ‘So (it will be): THY LORD SAITH, “That is easy for Me: and (We wish) to appoint him as a Sign unto men and a Mercy from Us.” It is a matter (so) decreed’ ” S. 19:16–21.

Muslims claim that this Spirit was the angel Gabriel. If this is true this implies that both Zechariah and Mary committed the sin of associating partners with God since they dared to address an angel as their Lord! In fact, the phrase Our Spirit is used elsewhere in reference to One having divine qualities:

“Behold! thy Lord said to the angels: ‘I am about to create man, from sounding clay from mud molded into shape; When I have fashioned him (in due proportion) and breathed into him of My spirit, fall ye down in obeisance unto him’ ” S. 15:28–29.

“He Who created all things in the best, and He began the creation of man from clay, And made his progeny from a quintessence of despised fluid: But He fashioned him in due proportion, and breathed into him of His spirit. And He gave you (the faculties of) hearing and sight and understanding: little thanks do ye give!” S. 32:7–9.

“Behold, thy Lord said to the angels: ‘I am about to create man from clay: When I have fashioned him and breathed into him of My spirit, fall ye down in obeisance unto him’ ” S. 38:71–72.

These passages indicate that after fashioning man, God presumably gave him life by breathing his Spirit into him, echoing [Genesis 2:7](#). This implies that at least in these contexts the Spirit is God’s life-giving Agent. This being the case, how can the Spirit be Gabriel without this implying that God used a finite creature to assist him in the creation of man?

Continuing further, we are told elsewhere that Mary conceived Jesus by God’s Spirit:

“And (remember) her who guarded her chastity: We breathed into her of *Our spirit*, and We made her and her son a sign for all peoples” S. 21:91.

“And Mary the daughter of Īmrām, who guarded her chastity; and We breathed into it of *Our spirit*; and she testified to the truth of the words of her Lord and of His Revelations, and was one of the devout (servants)” S. 66:12.

According to certain Muslim commentators, the Spirit that was used to breathe into Mary was actually the angel Gabriel. Mahmoud M. Ayub mentions several Muslim commentaries regarding the preceding passages:

“... Ibn Kathir interprets the phrase ‘guarded well her generative organ’ to mean: ‘safeguarded and protected it. Guarding well IHSAN signifies chastity and high birth.’ He comments on the phrase, ‘and thus We breathed into it of our spirit’ thus ‘that is,

through the angel Gabriel.’ This is because God sent HIM TO HER, AND HE TOOK FOR HER THE FORM OF A MAN OF GOOD STATURE (S. 19:17). God commanded HIM to breathe into the breast of her chemise. HIS BREATH WENT DOWN AND PENETRATED HER GENERATIVE ORGAN, AND THUS CAUSED HER TO CONCEIVE JESUS. ...” (*Christian-Muslim Encounters*, ed. Yvonne Yazbeck Haddad & Wadi Z. Haddad [University Press of Florida, 1995], p. 67; capital emphasis ours)

And:

“Abu Ja’far al-Tusi, the jurist doctor of the Shi’i community, as well as his well known disciple al-Tabarsi, read the words, ‘We breathed INTO IT’ literally. Al-Tusi says: ‘It has been held THAT GABRIEL BREATHED INTO MARY’S GENERATIVE ORGAN then God created Christ in it’” (Ibid., p. 68; capital emphasis ours).

The following is Ibn Kathir’s commentary on S. 66:12, noting that Jibril is the Arabic pronunciation of Gabriel:

“And Maryam, the daughter of ’Imran who guarded her chastity (PRIVATE PART) meaning who protected and purified her honor, by being chaste and free of immorality,

“And We breathed INTO IT (PRIVATE PART) through Our Ruh, meaning, THROUGH THE ANGEL JIBRIL. Allah sent the angel Jibril to Maryam, and he came to her in the shape of a man in every respect. Allah commanded HIM TO BLOW INTO A GAP OF HER GARMENT and that BREATH went into her womb through her private part; THIS IS HOW’ ISA WAS CONCEIVED. This is why Allah said here,

“And We breathed INTO IT through Our Ruh, and she testified to the truth of her Lord’s Kalimat, and His Kutub, meaning His decree and His legislation.” (Tafsir Ibn Kathir—Abridged, Volume 10, Surat At-Tagabun to the end of the Qur’an, abridged by a group of scholars under the supervision of Shaykh Safiur Rahman Al-Mubarakpuri [Darussalam Publishers & Distributors, Riyadh, Houston, New York, London, Lahore; September 2000], pp. 75–76; capital emphasis ours).

Finally, al-Tabari’s comments on Mary’s conception:

“... She entered the cave, and found Gabriel there—God made him appear to her as a shapely human—and he said to her, ‘O Mary, God has sent me to you to give you a boy most pure.’ At this she exclaimed, ‘I take refuge in the All Merciful from you, if you fear God!’ (She had thought that he was a man, a mortal.) But he said, ‘I am but a messenger come from your Lord.’ She then said, ‘How shall I, whom no mortal has touched, have a son; neither have I been unchaste?’ He replied, ‘Even so. The Lord has said, “Easy is that for Me, and We may appoint him a sign unto men and a mercy from Us; it is a thing decreed.”’

“That is, God has decreed that it is so. When the angel spoke thus, she submitted to the divine decree, and he breathed into HER BOSOM. Then he left her, and she filled her pitcher.

“According to Muhammad b. Sahl b. ’Askar al-Bukhari-Isma’il b. ’Abd alKarim-’Abd al-Samad b. Ma’qil, the son of the brother of Wahb-Wahb: When God sent Gabriel to Mary, he appeared to her as a shapely man. She then said, ‘I take refuge in the All Merciful from you, if you fear God!’ Then he breathed into the opening of her garment, THE BREATH REACHED HER WOMB, and she conceived Jesus...” (*The*

History of al-Tabari, Volume IV, The Ancient Kingdoms, trans. Moshe Perlmann [State University of New York Press, Albany, 1987], pp. 112–113; and capital emphasis ours). And:

“... ‘Then We sent unto her Our Spirit [that is, the angel Gabriel] that presented himself to her a man without fault’ ...

“She wore a gown. He held her sleeves and breathed into the opening of her garment which was split in front. The breath entered her breast, and she conceived ...” (Ibid., p. 119; bold emphasis ours).

The claim that Gabriel breathed into Mary would logically make Gabriel the speaker in S. 21:91 and 66:12. According to these passages the One speaking states that he will breathe his Spirit into Mary. Nowhere do the passages even hint to someone else being used to impregnate Mary. Seeing that Muslims claim that the Quran is the word of Allah, implying that Allah is the One speaking here, logically makes Gabriel Allah!

This also means that Gabriel has a Spirit that he uses to create and impart life. This would therefore make Gabriel the Creator, since Muslims claim that Allah was the one who created Jesus by breathing his Spirit into Mary’s womb! Otherwise the text would imply that Allah actually breathed Gabriel into both Mary and Adam since, as Muslims claim, the Spirit of Allah is actually Gabriel.

Furthermore, seeing that Muslims do not equate Gabriel with Allah inevitably leads to more than one Creator. Yet the Quran clearly states that there is no other Creator besides Allah:

“It is He Who created you from a single person, and made his mate of like nature, in order that he might dwell with her (in love). When they are united, she bears a light burden and carries it about (unnoticed). When she grows heavy, they both pray to Allah their Lord, (saying): ‘If Thou givest us a goodly child, we vow we shall (ever) be grateful.’ But when He giveth them a goodly child, they ascribe to others a share in the gift they have received: but Allah is exalted high above the partners they ascribe to Him. Do they indeed ascribe to Him as partners things that can create nothing, but are themselves created?” S. 7:189–191.

“Those whom they invoke besides Allah create nothing and are themselves created” S. 16:20.

“Yet have they taken, besides him, gods that can create nothing but are themselves created; that have no control of hurt or good to themselves; nor can they control death nor life nor resurrection” S. 25:3.

“O men! Remember the grace of Allah unto you! Is there a Creator, other than Allah, to give you sustenance from heaven or earth? There is no god but He: how then are ye perverted?” S. 35:3.

“He created you (all) from a single person: then created, of like nature, his mate; and He sent down for you eight head of cattle in pairs: He creates you, in the wombs of your mothers, in stages, one after another, in three veils of darkness. Such is Allah, your Lord and Cherisher: to Him belongs (all) dominion. There is no god but He: then how are ye turned away (from your true Lord)?” S. 39:6.

Therefore, the only plausible explanation is that the Spirit of Allah is not the angel Gabriel. Yet this view would leave us with an irreconcilable contradiction. According to S. 3:42–48 it was a group of angels that appeared to Mary, whereas in S. 19:16–21 it isn’t a group of angels but God’s Spirit that announced the Messiah’s birth.

In order to avoid attributing a contradiction to the Quran, some Muslims claim that the two passages refer to two different episodes. For example, some Muslims like Shabir Ally claim that S. 3:42–48 refers to the time when Mary was told that she would eventually conceive a child, whereas in S. 19:16–21 the Spirit was sent to inform her that the time of conception had arrived.

The only problem with this view is that it would imply that Mary disbelieved God’s ability to cause a supernatural birth on two separate occasions. Compare the following:

“Behold! The angels said: ‘O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honor in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah. He shall speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. And he shall be (of the company) of the righteous.’ ” She said: ‘O my Lord! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?’ He said: ‘Even so; Allah createth what He willeth: When He hath decreed a plan, He but saith to it, ‘Be,’ and it is!’ ” S. 3:45–47.

And:

“He said: ‘Nay, I am only a messenger from thy Lord, (to announce) to thee the gift of a pure son.’ She said: ‘How shall I have a son, seeing that no man has touched me, and I am not unchaste?’ He said: ‘So (it will be): thy Lord saith, “That is easy for Me: and (We wish) to appoint him as a Sign unto men and a Mercy from Us.” It is a matter (so) decreed’ ” S. 19:19–21.

Hence, either Muslims must accuse Mary of twice questioning the ability of Allah in causing a supernatural conception to take place without the aid of a man. This, in spite of the fact that the angels explicitly told her the first time that Allah is able to do all that he wills! Or Muslims must face up to the music and admit that the Quran contains a bona fide contradiction.

Returning to our original point regarding the problem of addressing others besides Allah as Lord, here is Mahmoud M. Ayoub’s commentary on S. 3:40. In light of what Ayoub will shortly say one readily sees the difficulty Muslims faced in trying to deal with the fact that others besides Allah are addressed as Lord:

“Two issues have concerned commentators in this verse. The first is the question of whether it is God or Gabriel whom Zechariah addresses as Lord. The second is how Zechariah, as a prophet, could have any doubt in God’s power to cause an old, barren woman to bear a child? ...

“Ibn Kathir does not raise the question of Zechariah’s doubt. He rather interprets Zechariah’s query as expressing his wonderment at God’s power. He writes, ‘When Zechariah became certain of the happy news, he began to marvel at the possibility of his having a child in such advanced age.’ Ibn Kathir assumes that Zechariah’s dialogue was with an angel, not with God ...

“Qurtubi begins by relating on the authority of al-Kalbi that the word ‘Lord’ in this verse refers to Gabriel. He says, ‘Zechariah said to Gabriel “my lord,” ’ meaning ‘my master’ ...

“Razi begins with the question of Zechariah’s dialogue and whether it was with God or with Gabriel. The question is important because it concerns the theological debate about God’s transcendence and the problem of anthropomorphism. If God hears and speaks in a manner familiar to human beings, then the question arises as to whether God has similar organs of hearing and speech. Razi argues that it is equally possible that Zechariah was addressing either God or the angel in this verse. He presents two

explanations which he attributes to the MUFASSIRUN, that is, other commentators. The first is: ‘When the angels called to Zechariah and gave him the good news, he wondered and turned to God for reassurance. Zechariah was actually addressing the angel Gabriel, and not God. The invocation ‘my lord’ is here addressed to a superior or master and not to God.’ (Ayoub, *The Qur’an and Its Interpreters, Volume II, The House of ‘Imran* [State University of New York Press, Albany 1992], pp. 112, 113).

The problem with asserting that the prophet is actually addressing Allah is that instead of Allah responding, it is either the angel(s) or the Spirit that answers. When responding to the questions, both the angel(s) and the Spirit clearly make a distinction between their words and the words of Allah:

“Behold! THE ANGELS SAID: ‘O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honor in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest TO ALLAH. He shall speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. And he shall be (of the company) of the righteous.’ She said: ‘O my Lord! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?’ HE SAID: ‘Even so; ALLAH createth what HE willeth: When HE hath decreed a plan, HE but saith to it, “Be,” and it is! And ALLAH will teach him the Book and Wisdom, the Torah and the Gospel’ ” S. 3:45–48.

“She said: ‘How shall I have a son, seeing that no man has touched me, and I am not unchaste?’ HE SAID: ‘So (it will be): THY LORD SAITH, “That is easy for Me: and (We wish) to appoint him as a Sign unto men and a Mercy from Us.” It is a matter (so) decreed’ ” S. 19:20–21.

Furthermore, the assertion that Gabriel is called Lord in the sense of being one’s master or superior does not solve the problem for the Muslim. Neither the Quran nor the Hadiths allow for even this type of respect to be given to anyone besides Allah:

“They have taken as lords beside Allah their rabbis and their monks and the Messiah son of Mary, when they were bidden to worship only One Allah. There is no Allah save Him. Be He Glorified from all that they ascribe as partner (unto Him)!” S. 9:31 Pickthall.

The only sense in which Jews and Christians would ever consider rabbis or monks as Lords would be in the sense of a superior or a master. They would have never viewed them as Lords in the same way they viewed God.

This is supported by the following Muslim tradition, a hadith quoted by Ibn Kathir regarding the meaning of S. 9:31:

“They took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allah, and the Messiah, son of Maryam” [9:31].

“Imam Ahmad, At-Tirmidhi and Ibn Jarir At-Tabari recorded a Hadith via several chains of narration, from ‘Adi bin Hatim, may Allah be pleased with him, who became a Christian during the time of Jahiliyyah. When the call of the Messenger of Allah reached his area, ‘Adi ran away to Ash-Sham, and his sister and several of his people were captured. The Messenger of Allah freed his sister and gave her gifts. So she went to her brother and encouraged him to become Muslim and to go to the Messenger of Allah. ‘Adi, who was one of the chiefs of his people (the tribe of Tai’) and whose father, Hatim At-Ta’I, was known for his generosity, went to Al-Madinah. When the people announced

his arrival, ‘Adi went to the Messenger of Allah wearing a silver cross around his neck. The Messenger of Allah recited this Ayah;

“They took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allah.

“ ‘Adi commented, I said, ‘They did not worship them.’ ” The Prophet said,

“((Yes they did. They (rabbis and monks) prohibited the allowed for them (Christians and Jews) and allowed the prohibited, and they obeyed them. This is how they worshipped them.)) ...

“They took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allah....

“that the Christians and Jews obeyed their monks and rabbis in whatever they allowed or prohibited for them....” (*Tafsir Ibn Kathir, Abridged, Volume 4, Surat Al-A’raf to the end of Surah Yunus*, May 2000, pp. 409–410).

Therefore, to even address either the angel(s) or the Spirit as one’s superior or master is unacceptable within the Monotheism (TAUHID) taught by Muhammad and his Companions. In fact, addressing anyone besides Allah as one’s Lord in prayer is a violation of the three aspects of Islamic Monotheism: *Tauhid-al-Rububiyyah*, *Tauhid-al-Uluhiyyah*, and *Tauhid-al-Asma’ was-Sifat*.

Dr. Muhammad Taqi-ud-Din Al-Hilali and Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan define the meaning behind each of the three aspects:

(A) Oneness of the Lordship of Allah; *Tauhid-al-Rububiyyah*: To believe there is only one Lord for all the universe, Who is the Creator, Organizer, Planner, Sustainer, and the Giver of security, etc., and that is Allah.

(B) Oneness of the worship of Allah; TAUHID-ULUHIYYAH: To believe that none has the right to be worshiped (e.g., praying, invoking, asking for help from the unseen, swearing, offering sacrifice, giving charity, fasting, pilgrimage) but Allah.

(C) Oneness of the Names and Qualities of Allah: TAUHID AL-ASMA’ WAS-SIFAT: To believe that:

We must not name or qualify Allah with what He or His messenger ... has named or qualified Him;

None can be named or qualified with the Names and Qualifications of Allah; e.g. AL-KARIM....

(*Translation of the Meanings of The Noble Qur’an, In the English Language, A Summarized Version of At-Tabari, Al-Qurtubi and Ibn Kathir with comments from Sahih Al-Bukhari*, by Dr. Muhammad Taqi-ud-Din Al-Hilali, Ph.D. and Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan [King Fahd Complex for the Printing of The Holy Qur’an, Madinah K.S.A.], Appendix II, p. 892).

Seeing that both Zechariah and Mary addressed someone other than Allah as Lord when asking about the possibility of having a child implies that both parties violated Muhammad’s conception of Tauhid.

Another passage in which Gabriel is actually given divine status includes:

“By the Star when it goes down,—Your Companion is neither astray nor being misled. Nor does he say (ought) of (his own) Desire. It is no less than inspiration sent down to him: He was taught by one Mighty in Power, Endued with Wisdom: FOR HE APPEARED (in stately form); While he was in the highest part of the horizon: THEN HE APPROACHED HIM AND CAME CLOSER, And was at a distance of but two bow-

lengths or (even) nearer; SO DID HE CONVEY THE INSPIRATION TO HIS SERVANT—(conveyed) what He (meant) to convey” S. 53:1–10.

This passage clearly states that Muhammad saw someone whom Muslims claim was the Angel Gabriel. Abdullah Yusuf Ali on S. 53:5 notes:

“... This is referred by the Commentators to the angel Gabriel, through whom the inspiration came....” (Ali, *The Holy Qur’an, Translation and Commentary*, p. 1443, f. 5087).

Ibn Kathir states:

“The Trustworthy Angel brought Allah’s Revelation to the Trustworthy Messenger.

“Allah the Exalted states that the Message His servant and Messenger Muhammad brought to his people was taught to him by,

“(mighty in power), he is Jibril, peace be upon” (*Tafsir Ibn Kathir, Abridged, Volume 9, Surat Al-Jathiyah to the end of Surat Al-Munafiqun*, September 2000, p. 308).

Yet this interpretation will not work without this making Gabriel the god of Muhammad. The passage clearly states that the person that appeared to Muhammad was Muhammad’s sovereign as indicated by the last part of the sentence, “SO DID HE CONVEY THE INSPIRATION TO HIS SERVANT.” Seeing that Muslims insist that the being that appeared to Muhammad was Gabriel implies that Muhammad is a slave of Gabriel. There is simply no way of avoiding this inescapable conclusion.

Therefore, Muslims must now accept the fact that it was actually Allah who appeared to Muhammad, which would then force them to accept the idea of Allah appearing visibly. If Muslims still insist that it was Gabriel who appeared then they must also accept that Gabriel and/or Muhammad committed the sin of associating partners with Allah.

The problem that this passage presents becomes evident from Ibn Kathir’s comments:

“And was at a distance of two bow lengths or less. So (Allah) revealed to His servant whatever He revealed.

“Zirr said, ‘Abdullah narrated to us that Muhammad saw Jibril having six hundred wings.’

“SO HE REVEALED TO HIS SERVANT WHATEVER HE REVEALED means, Jibril conveyed to Allah’s servant Muhammad whatever he conveyed. OR, the meaning here could be: Allah revealed to His servant Muhammad whatever He revealed through Jibril. Both meanings are correct....” (Ibid., pp. 311–312; capital emphasis ours).

The reader will notice that the word Allah is inserted in parentheses to presumably avoid the ambiguity of the text. This is despite the fact that the word does not appear in the Arabic original, as indicated by its second occurrence within Kathir’s citation! It becomes obvious why this would be done, namely to avoid the implication that Muhammad is Gabriel’s servant or that Allah appeared in visible form. The Muslims must safeguard from either interpretation if they are to maintain their belief in the absolute transcendence of Allah and/or the pure devotion that is to be given to him alone.

Islamicist FE. Peters notes:

“None of the pronouns is identified in these verses, though there is little doubt that the recipient of the vision was Muhammad. Who was seen is less clear, and if Muhammad’s being referred to as his ‘servant’ in verse 10 suggests that it is God Himself, the Muslim tradition preferred to understand that it was Gabriel in all the other instances, chiefly because later in his own career Muhammad, as we shall see, had unmistakably come to

the same conclusion. But there is no other mention of Gabriel in the Meccan suras, and it appears far more likely that God Himself first appeared to Muhammad ‘on the high horizon’ and then on a second occasion by the lotus tree near the ‘garden of the dwelling’ to show him ‘the signs of his Lord.’ Muhammad was clearly earthbound when he had his first experience, but where the latter vision took place, whether in a known locality in Mecca or, as is often thought, in some heavenly venue, is not further indicated. Neither is there anything to suggest that it was on either of these occasions that Muhammad received the words of the Quran.

“If Sura 53:1–18 seems to say that Muhammad believed that on two distinct occasions he had a vision of God, who there-by prompted him and showed to him His signs, the second vision is referred to only in briefing in passing (Quran 81:19–27).

“Although verse 10 appears to refer back to the same vision ‘on the high horizon’ mentioned in 53:7–9, the Muslim commentators saw in the first three verses of this passage from Sura 81 an unmistakable reference to Gabriel. But there is abundant evidence that Muhammad not only did not identify Gabriel as the agent of revelation until his Medina days, but that while at Mecca he was criticized for the fact that God had not sent an angelic messenger: ‘They said: “If your Lord had so pleased, He would certainly have sent down angels; as it is, we disbelieve your mission”.’ (Quran 41:14).

“Muhammad’s earliest response did not encourage them to think that there was in fact an angel in God’s revelation to him:

“They say: ‘You to whom the Reminder is being sent down, truly you are jinn-possessed! Why do you not bring angels to us if you are one of those who possess truth? We do not send down the angels except when required, and if they came, there would be not respite.’ (Ibid., 15:6–8).

“ ‘And before you as well the Messengers we sent down were but men, to whom We granted inspiration. And if you do not understand that, ask the people who possess the Reminder.’ (Ibid., 16:43)” (Peters, *Muhammad and the Origins of Islam* [State University of New York Press, Albany 1994], pp. 142–143).

Hence, no matter from what angle Muslims look at this passage they are beset with problems either way.

On the Worship of Others Besides Allah

Both the Quran and Muslim sources furnish examples of others besides Allah receiving worship. The first example is Adam:

“And when We said unto the angels: Prostrate yourselves before Adam, they fell prostrate, all save Iblis. He demurred through pride, and so became a disbeliever” S. 2:34.

“And We created you, then fashioned you, then told the angels: Fall ye prostrate before Adam! And they fell prostrate, all save Iblis, who was not of those who make prostration. He said: What hindered thee that thou didst not fall prostrate when I bade thee? (Iblis) said: I am better than him. Thou createdst me of fire while him Thou didst create of mud. He said: Then go down hence! It is not for thee to show pride here, so go forth! Lo! thou art of those degraded” S. 7:11–13.

“And (remember) when thy Lord said unto the angels: Lo! I am creating a mortal out of potter’s clay of black mud altered, So, when I have made him and have breathed into

him of My Spirit, do ye fall down, prostrating yourselves unto him. So the angels fell prostrate, all of them together Save Iblis. He refused to be among the prostrate. He said: O Iblis! What aileth thee that thou art not among the prostrate? He said: I am not one to prostrate myself unto a mortal whom Thou hast created out of potter's clay of black mud altered!" S. 15:28–33.

"And when We said unto the angels: Fall down prostrate before Adam and they fell prostrate all save Iblis, he said: Shall I fall prostrate before that which Thou hast created of clay?" S. 17:61.

"And when We said unto the angels: Fall prostrate before Adam, they fell prostrate (all) save Iblis; he refused." S. 20:116.

All these verses state that it was Allah who commanded the angels to prostrate before Adam. The word signifying prostration is only used in relation to a believer prostrating before God in adoration and worship. Abdiyah Akbar Abdul Haqq comments on S. 7:12:

"The story, as a whole, involves a difficult issue. Why did God order all His angels to fall prostrate before a being inferior to them in nature? The manner of prostration is reserved for the worship of God. It was not proper, therefore, to employ it in showing respect to creatures, including Adam. Realizing the problem involved in the use of the term 'Sajda' (prostration) in the passage under discussion, Jalal al-Din made the following observation:

"The original word signifies properly, to prostrate one self till the forehead touches the ground, which is the humblest posture of adoration and strictly due to God only; but it is sometimes used to express civil worship or homage which may be paid to creatures" (W.T. Wherry, *A Comprehensive Commentary on the Quran*, Vol. I, p. 301).

"Despite Jalal al-Din's apology, strictly speaking, 'Sajda' (prostration) is due only to God. That is why the commentator did not support adequately the exception he has made to the rule, from the Koran. The 'Wahhabis,' who consider themselves strict Muslims and true Monotheists, forbid worship of any creature. God alone deserves to be worshipped, according to them. They would not allow 'Sajda' to a civil authority—the kind of prostration which is meant to be used in prayers to God.... Moreover, it is true that strictly speaking prostration before any being other than God is a practice against monotheism and spirit of the Koran, as Wahhabis would say" (Haqq, *Sharing Your Faith With a Muslim* [Bethany House Publishers, Minneapolis, MN 1980], p. 78).

In fact, not only do we find Adam receiving sajda but Joseph as well:

"Then when they entered the presence of Joseph, he provided a home for his parents with himself, and said: 'Enter ye Egypt (all) in safety if it please Allah.' And he raised his parents high on the throne, and they fell down in prostration, (all) before him (wa kharruu lahuu sujjadaa). He said: 'O my father! this is the fulfillment of my vision of old! Allah hath made it come true! He was indeed good to me when He took me out of prison and brought you (all here) out of the desert, (even) after Satan had sown enmity between me and my brothers. Verily my Lord is Gracious to whom He wills, for verily He is full of knowledge and wisdom" S. 12:99–100.

The other example is Jesus. The Quran announces the birth of John the Baptist as a messenger sent to prepare the way for Jesus Christ:

“And the angels called to him (Zechariah) while he was standing at prayer in the sanctuary, ‘God gives you glad tidings of John, confirming a word of God, a master, chaste man and a prophet, one of the righteous’ ” S. 3:39 Mahmoud’s Translation.

Islamic scholars almost unanimously hold that the Word of God here, which John came to confirm, is Jesus Christ. Mahmoud Ayoub citing Muslim Tabarsi states:

“Tabarsi argues that John was obligated *by God* to be a witness to the fact that Jesus was in truth the word of God and His Spirit” (*Ayoub, The Qur’an and Its Interpreters, Volume II*, p. 109).

Muslim exegete al-Zamakshari substantiates this by saying:

“It is related that John *was the first to believe in Jesus*. Jesus was called *Word*... because he came to being only by God’s word. It was His saying, ‘KUNN’ (be), and no other cause” (Ibid, p. 108; italic emphasis ours).

The interesting part of all of this is that Muslim commentators claim that John actually worshiped Jesus while both were still in their mothers’ wombs! For instance, Al-Qurtubi mentions Elizabeth’s visitation (called Mary’s sister) shortly after both women had conceived:

“The sister visited Mary and said, ‘O Mary, do you perceive that I am with child?’ Mary answered, ‘Do you see that I am also with child?’ Her sister went on, ‘*I feel the child in my womb bowing down to the child in your womb.*’ ”

Qurtubi continues:

“It is reported that she felt the fetus in her womb bow down with its head turned toward Mary’s womb” (*Ayoub*, p. 108).

Al-Tabari concurs:

“She [Sam-Mary] came to her sister who was then pregnant and to whom the birth of the Baptist had been announced. When the two met, the Baptist’s mother felt that her child was bowing within her in recognition of Jesus...” (*History of Al-Tabari, Volume IV*, p. 114).

And:

“... Her sister, the wife of Zechariah, came to visit her at night. When Mary opened the door for her, the sister clung to her. The wife of Zechariah said, ‘Oh Mary, do you know I am with child?’ Mary replied, ‘Do you know, that I too am with child?’ Zechariah’s wife then said, ‘I felt that the child in me was bowing to the child in you,’ as it is written, ‘confirming the Word of God’ ” (Ibid., p. 119).

Muhammad had warned his followers not to praise him as Christians praise Jesus:

“Narrated ’Umar:

“I heard the Prophet saying, ‘Do not exaggerate in praising me as the Christians praised the son of Mary, for I am only a Slave. So, call me the Slave of Allah and His Apostle’” (*Sahih Bukhari*, Volume 4, Book 55, Number 654).

In light of the preceding considerations, what will Muslims do with the fact that John not only bowed in praise to Jesus but did so while both were still in the womb? What will Muslims do with Allah commanding angels to bow down to Adam?

It will not do to say that the homage given to these individuals is not the same kind of homage one gives to God. If this is the case, then why is this practice deemed unacceptable for Muslims? Why did Muhammad forbid his followers from showing this kind of reverence to others who are worthy to receive it?

Furthermore, both Adam and Joseph received sajda, the prostration that God alone is supposed to receive. This act was in direct violation of Tauhid-al-Uluhiyyah. Yet, in the case of Adam, the one who actually commanded the angels to violate this concept was Allah himself!

Further Examples of Plurality of Gods

As we had indicated earlier, Muslims claim that the Quran is the pure word of Allah, containing nothing but the speech of Allah alone. One will not find the words of either humans or angels mixed in with the words of Allah. Commenting on the different types of material found in the Holy Bible, Muslim polemicist Ahmad Deedat contrasts that with the Quran:

You do not have to hunt for examples of these different types of evidences in the Bible. The following quotations will make the position crystal clear:

The FIRST Type:

(a) “*I* will raise them up a prophet ... and *I* will put my words in ... and he shall speak unto them all that *I* shall command him” (Deuteronomy 18:18).

(b) “*I* even, *I* am the Lord, and beside *me* there is no saviour” (Isaiah 43:11).

(c) “Look unto *me*, and be ye saved, all the end of the earth: for *I* am God, and there is none else” (Isaiah 45:22).

Note the first person pronoun singular (highlighted in italics) in the above references, and without any difficulty you will agree that the statements seem to have the sound of being GOD’S WORD.

The SECOND Type:

(a) “*Jesus* cried with a loud voice, saying ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTANI? ...” (Matthew 27:46).

(b) “And *Jesus* answered him, The first of all the commandments is, *Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord*” (Mark 12:29).

(c) “And *Jesus* said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God” (Mark 10:18).

Even a child will be able to affirm that: Jesus “cried,” Jesus “answered” and Jesus “said” are the words of the one to whom they are attributed, i.e. the WORDS OF A PROPHET OF GOD.

The THIRD Type:

“And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, *he*, (JESUS) came, if haply *he* (JESUS) might find anything thereon: and when he (JESUS) came *to it*, (Jesus) found nothing but leaves...” (Mark 11:13)

The bulk of the Bible is a witnessing of this THIRD kind. These are the words of a third person. Note the italicized pronouns. They are not the Words of God or of His prophet, but the WORDS OF A HISTORIAN.

For the Muslim it is quite easy to distinguish the above types of evidence, because he also has them in his own faith. But of the followers of the different religions, *he is the most fortunate in this that his various records are contained in separate Books!*

ONE: The first kind—THE WORD OF GOD—is found in a Book called *The Holy Qur an*.

TWO: The second kind—THE WORDS OF THE PROPHET OF GOD, (Muhummed, may the peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) are recorded in the Books of Tradition called *The Hadith*.

THREE: Evidence of the third kind abounds in different volumes of Islamic history, written by some of high integrity and learning, and others of lesser trust worthiness, but the Muslim advisedly keeps his Books in separate volumes!

The Muslim keeps the above three types of evidence jealously apart, in their proper gradations of authority. He never equates them. On the other hand, the “Holy Bible” contains a motley type of literature, which composes the embarrassing kind, the sordid, and the obscene—all under the same cover—A Christian is forced to concede equal spiritual import and authority to all, and is thus unfortunate in this regard (Deedat, —*Is the Bible God’s Word?*, pp 4–6; see this article; italic emphasis ours).

This being the case we are forced to conclude that the Quran presents a plurality of deities. Compare the following passages with the claims made by Deedat:

“Such is Allah, your Lord. There is no God save Him, the Creator of all things, so worship Him. And He taketh care of all things. Vision comprehendeth Him not, but He comprehendeth (all) vision. He is the Subtile, the Aware. Proofs have come unto you from your Lord, so whoso seeth, it is for his own good, and whoso is blind is blind to his own hurt. And I am not a keeper over you” S. 6:102–104.

Allah claims that he is not a keeper over man, implying that someone else is. That someone must be God also. Otherwise the Quran would be committing the sin of association, attributing the work and sustaining power of the Creator to someone other than Allah. Or worse still, the Quran might be suggesting that man has no keeper at all, implying that man must sustain himself!

“Shall I seek other than Allah for judge, when He it is Who hath revealed unto you (this) Scripture, fully explained? Those unto whom We gave the Scripture (aforetime) know that it is revealed from thy Lord in truth. So be not thou of the waverers” S. 6:114.

If Deedat is correct, this means that Allah is asking whether he should seek some other judge besides Allah. Allah shifts into the first person plural indicating that he is the one that revealed all the Scriptures. This implies that the Quran reveals more than one Allah.

“Glorified be He Who carried His servant by night from the Inviolable Place of Worship to the Far distant place of worship the neighbourhood whereof We have blessed, that We might show him of Our tokens! Lo! He, only He, is the Hearer, the Seer” S. 17:1.

We have Allah praising another Being for taking Muhammad on a night journey. From there Allah reverts to the first person plural whereby he once again glorifies the One who took Muhammad on the night journey as being the Hearer and the Seer.

“I am commanded only to serve the Lord of this land which He hath hallowed, and unto Whom all things belong. And I am commanded to be of those who surrender” S. 27:1.

Again, Allah claims that he is commanded to worship the Lord of the land.

“We come not down save by commandment of thy Lord. Unto Him belongeth all that is before us and all that is behind us and all that is between those two, and thy Lord was never forgetful” S. 19:64.

We have Allah only coming down at the command of Muhammad’s Lord.

“Lo! verily, ye and that which ye worship, Ye cannot excite (anyone) against Him. Save him who is to burn in hell. There is not one of us but hath his known position. Lo! we, even we are they who set the ranks, Lo! we, even we are they who hymn His praise” S. 37:161–166.

This passage has Allah acknowledging his subjection and praise to another.

The final example includes:

“By no means! For We have created them out of the (base matter) they know! Now I do call to witness THE LORD OF ALL POINTS IN THE EAST AND THE WEST that WE can certainly Substitute for them better (men) than they; And WE are not to be defeated (in Our Plan)” S. 70:39–41.

The Creator here swears by the Lord of all the points of the East and West. There is no break in the text to indicate that someone else is interspersing his comments with the words of the Creator. This means that there is more than one Lord and that Allah actually swears by this other Lord!

In light of the preceding examples we really do not see how Muslims can evade being accused of idolatry or polytheism. Either they will have to change their position regarding the nature of the Quran and admit that it contains more than just the words of Allah. Or they will have to settle for the fact that the Quran teaches that there are several Lords, Allahs, and Creators.

In the service of our risen Lord and eternal Savior, Jesus Christ, for ever and ever. Amen. Come Lord Jesus. We will always love you, for you are our Eternal Lord forever.

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

Ahmaddiyya In the Balance By Sam Shamoun

The Ahmaddiyya sect of Islam was founded in 1882 by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of India. At first, Ghulam had no intention of starting a new religious sect, but focused instead on refuting Christianity and Christian missionaries throughout India. From there, Ghulam wrote a book in 1879/80 titled *Baraheen Ahmadiyya*. In this two-volume work, Mirza promoted the Orthodox Islamic conception of Christ, Muhammad, Prophets, revelation, etc., while attempting to present a case against Christianity.

By the time his third volume was published in 1882, he claimed to have received revelations from God, eventually proclaiming himself to be God's reformer and chosen Messiah for this age. This caused an uproar amongst the Orthodox Muslims, since it is an article of faith for all Muslims to believe that Muhammad was the last messenger of God and the seal of revelation (S. 33:40).

Thus, for Mirza to make such claims was apostasy. Ghulam eventually died in 1908, leaving behind a group of dedicated followers who have since that time increased dramatically.

After his death, Mirza's first disciples Hakim Noor-ud-din led the movement until the latter's demise in 1914.

The group eventually split into two with the newly formed sect settling in Lahore, calling itself Anjuman Ishaate Islam (also known as the Lahori Party). This group tried to play down Mirza's self-styled prophetic claims, stating that Ghulam was nothing more than a reformer. The other group, calling itself Qadiani, continued to emphasize Ghulam's prophethood.

Unfortunately for both groups, they have been labeled heretics by conservative Muslims such as Sunnis and Shiites.

This has led to their persecution and to a denial of the Ahmaddiyyas' rights in Pakistan and in Islamic countries such as Saudi Arabia. For instance, Ahmaddiyyas are not allowed to enter Mecca to make Hajj, a required tenet of Islam. Further, in 1974 the National Assembly of Pakistan declared them non-Muslims.

In spite of all this, many Muslims have adopted their approach and polemics in defending Islam from Christianization and evangelization.

It will be our intention to contrast some of the Ahmaddiyya claims and teachings with that of the Bible and even the Quran in order to see for ourselves whether Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was indeed the Messiah of this age, or simply one of many false Christs that were prophesied to come before the great and terrible day of the Lord.

Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's Claims

A. Prophet

Mirza claimed to be a Muhaddith, a kind of prophet. Although a Muhaddith is, in the words of Ghulam, a partial prophet, this nonetheless contradicts the Quran (S. 33:40) (*Tawzih Maram*, p. 18; Trans. "Explanation of Objectives," p. 11).

His claims outraged many, branding him a heretic. To avoid controversy he publicly denied prophethood, suggesting that his usage of the title "Prophet" was for the sake of simplicity (*Tabligh-i-Risalat*, Vol. II, p. 95).

Yet, shortly afterward he would go on to say that he had been given the names and attributes of all the prophets:

"No prophets came into this world whose name was not given to me. In Burahin-i-Ahmadiya God has affirmed me as Adam, Noah, Ibrahim, Ishaque, Yaqub, Ismail, Moses, Dawud, Isa, son of Mary, and Muhammad (Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). I am the incarnation of all those prophets (Maududi, *The Qadiani Problem*, p. 119). He later declared:

"Wherever I have denied being a prophet (Nubuwat), I have denied it in the sense that I am no independent bearer of a Law or Shariah nor am I an independent prophet in my

own right... I am a Rasul (apostle, messenger) and Nabi (prophet) without a new Shariah” (Ek Ghalati Ka Tzala, *A Misunderstanding Removed*, pp. 11–12).

Thus in one sense, Mirza denies prophethood and in another affirms it.

B. Krishna of Hinduism

Mirza believed that he was Krishna as recorded in the Haqiqat-ul-Wahi:

“I am Krishna whose advent the Aryans are waiting for in these days. I do not make this claim on my own. God Almighty has conveyed to me repeatedly that I am Krishna, King of the Aryans, who was to appear in the latter days” (Appendix, p. 85).

C. God and Son of God

Mirza claimed to have a vision in which God is supposed to have told him:

“You are to me in the position of offspring. You have a relation with me which the world does not know...”¹ “You are to me like my unity and uniqueness...”² “To me you are like my son...”³

“God addressed me with these words: ‘Listen! O my Son.’”⁴ “In a vision I saw that I was God and believed myself to be such... Divinity coursed through my veins and muscles... I then created the heavens and the earth... then I said: ‘We shall now create man.’”⁵

D. Mirza is both Mary and Jesus

“In the third volume of *Baraheen Ahmadiyya* he (God) named me as Mariam. Then, as is evident from *Baraheen*... I was reared in the image of Mary for two years... Then I was filled with the soul of Christ and I became pregnant in a metaphorical sense. At last after a period of many months—I was delivered from Mary into the form of Christ... Hence in this way I became the Son of Mary” (*Kashti—Noh*, pp. 46–47).

Mirza stated that God told him, “I created you from the same essence as Jesus was” (*Hamamit-il—Bushra*, p. 14).

Some other incredible claims either made by Mirza or his followers include the following:

- “Heaven and earth can move away but it is not possible that his (Ghulam’s) promise may not be fulfilled” (Zafrulla Khan, *Ah-madiyyat: The Renaissance of Islam*, p. 38).
- “I am the water that has descended from heaven at its due time. I am the divine light that has illuminated the day” (Ahmad, *Baraheen Ahmadiyya*, Vol. 5, p. 115).

¹ *Fountain of Christianity*, 9.63.

² *Baraheen Ahmadiyya*, Vol. IV, p. 489 (footnote).

³ *Haqiqat-ul-Wahi*, p. 86.

⁴ *Al-Bushra*, Vol. 1, p. 49.

⁵ *Kitab al-Bariyah*, pp. 85–87.

- “He who does not accept me, does not disobey me, but disobeys him who has prophesied my coming” (Ahmad, *Haqiqat-ul-Wahi*, p. 178).
- “We gave thee glad tiding of a gentle son, a manifestation of the true and high as if Allah had descended from heaven. His name is Emmanuel. A son will be born to thee and grace will come close to thee” (Ahmad, *Anjam Athem*, p. 62).

The claims of Ahmad and his followers leave little imagination as for the reason why Muslims consider the Ahmaddiyyas heretics.

A Denial of the Miraculous

Ahmaddiyya’s founder denied the miracles of Jesus and the prophets. His reason for denying the miraculous nature of the prophets’ lives becomes obvious from his own words:

“A matter which is not possible for the Holy prophet [Muhammad]—the best of prophets... how can it be so for the Messiah! [Jesus]? It would be so derogatory to the Holy Prophet to think that what is impossible for him to attain, is possible for the Messiah” (*Tawzih Miram*, English translation, pp. 6–77).

Thus, Mirza denies both the Biblical and the Quranic evidence for Jesus’ miracles (cf. S. 5:110, 3:50; [John 10:25, 32](#); [Matthew 11:20–24](#)).

Denial of Jesus’ Death, Resurrection and Ascension

Although the Bible and Quran disagree on the crucifixion of Christ, both books confirm the bodily ascension of Christ into heaven (cf. [Acts 1:9–11](#); S. 3:55).

The Bible states that Christ was crucified and killed for our sins and that he arose on the third day, never to die again (cf. [Luke 24:36–48](#); [Rev. 1:17–18](#)). The Quran, however, declares that Christ was neither crucified nor killed but it so appeared to his enemies (S. 4:157–158).

Ahmaddiyyas on the other hand accept Jesus’ crucifixion on the cross, but deny he ever died. Instead, Christ swooned, only to resuscitate three days later. From there he went to India where he lived to a ripe old age and died in Kashmir.

There is a difference of opinion as to when Jesus actually died. According to Mirza, Muhammad said: “Jesus was 125 years of age when he died” (Ahmad, *Jesus in India*, p. 53).

Yet Shams, Mirza’s follower, states that Muhammad claimed that “Jesus died at the age of one hundred twenty years” (Shams, *Where Did Jesus Die?*, p. 153).

This is further complicated by the fact that in one of Mirza’s earlier writings, AZALA AUHAM, Ghulam stated that Jesus died in Galilee shortly after escaping death on the cross at the age of sixty or seventy (pp. 473–474, 623–625).

Mirza confuses his readers even more by stating in *Atman-ul-Hujjat* that Imam Malik (one of the founders of Islamic jurisprudence) believed that Jesus died at the age of 33, alleging that Jesus was buried in Syria sometime later (pp. 17–19).

To make matters worse than what they already are, Mirza abandons the early age and Galilean death theory for Kashmir India (*Jesus in India*, pp. 15–16).

The reader might be wondering as to the reason for such confusion and contradiction surrounding the Ahmaddiyyas’ theory on Jesus’ final days on earth. The answer is simple:

Ahmaddiyyas are committed to disproving Jesus' bodily resurrection and ascension since this would destroy their faith and position:

“It is impossible for us to think that Jesus the Messiah, is alive in Heaven, while Muhammad, our Holy Prophet, lies buried in the earth. We cannot think so... If it is true that Jesus is alive in Heaven, we cannot feel more dead. We cannot tolerate the thought that our Master is dead and buried, while Jesus is alive and in Heaven. We feel humiliated before Christians” (Bashir-ud-din, *Invitation to Ahmadiyyat*, p. 15).

“Prove to Christians that Christ in reality is forever dead. Through the victory to be gained by this argument you will be able to wipe the Christian religion off the face of the earth... Do not entangle with other ideas to talk about with Christians. Just concentrate upon the arguments regarding the death of Jesus Christ, and by the use of powerful arguments put the Christians to silence. The day you will imprint this fact on the minds of Christians, you will know that the Christian religion has made its exit from the world” (Ghulam, *Azala Auham*, pp. 560–61).

The Return of Christ

Another point where Christians and Muslims agree upon is on the return of Jesus Christ to the earth as Judge and Executioner. This fact is documented in nearly every book of the New Testament and alluded to in the Quran (cf. [Matthew 25:31–45](#); [Mark 13:26–27](#); [Acts 1:10–11](#); S. 43:54, 61). This is further elaborated in the authentic Traditions of Muhammad:

“Abu Huraira reported God's messenger as saying: ‘By him in whose hand my soul is, the son of Mary will soon descend among you as a just judge. He will break crosses, kill swine and abolish the jizya (poll tax), and wealth will pour forth to such an extent that no one will accept it’ ” (*Sahi Muslim*, Vol. 1, p. 92).

After his descension, the Muslims believe that Christ will marry, have children, die and be buried next to Muhammad in between Abu Bakr and Umar b. Al-Kattab, the first two caliphs.

Since Ahmaddiyyas do not believe in Jesus' ascension, it comes as no surprise that they also deny his Second Coming. They believe that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has replaced Jesus as the Messiah and that all must turn to this Indian Messiah for hope. Claiming to be the answer to the anti-Islamic attacks he states:

“No wonder, therefore, God Almighty has chosen from amongst the true Muslims of our time this humble one, and blessed him with his revealed word and with other divine favors that this vicious magic may be undone” (Ahmad, *Victory of Islam*, p. 4).

Addressing the West, Mirza declared:

“Ye Christians of Europe and America, and ye seekers after truth know for certain that the Messiah who was to come has come and it is he who is speaking to you at this moment” (Ahmad, *A Review of Christianity*, pp. 40–41).

False Prophecies

Believing himself to be Al-Masih Mawud (*The Promised Messiah*) and a prophet, it is not surprising to find Mirza attempting to prophesy future events. Unfortunately, none of these prophecies came to pass, exposing him as a false prophet. Embarrassed by this fact,

Ahmaddiyyas have tried desperately to explain away these false predictions but to no avail as the following examples prove:

Maulvi Sana-Ullah

Fierce opposition broke out between Ghulam and one Maulvi Sana-Ullah over Mirza's claim. In 1907 Mirza advertised a prayer he made against the Maulvi:

“O, my beloved Master!... If my claim to being the Christ is my own innovation then I am a liar... I pray to thee to kill me in Maulvi Sana-Ullah's lifetime and ... if Sana-Ullah is not truthful in his allegations against me then I pray to annihilate him in my lifetime... not through human hands but through bubonic plague and cholera...”
(advertisement, April 15, 1907, *Majmua Ishtiharat*, Vol. 3, p. 579).

Exactly one year and twenty-one days later, Ghulam died, whereas Sana-Ullah lived on for an additional forty years.

A Former Disciple

Dr. Abdul Hakim had been Mirza's pupil for nearly twenty years when he soon thereafter rebelled against his mentor, writing two books, *Al-Masih Ad Dajjal* and *Kana Masih*. On July 12, 1906, Hakim published an advertisement stating that Ghulam would die within three years. Mirza retaliated by warning Hakim that calamity would soon befall and that the angels were ready to take his life with swords (advertisement, August 16, 1906, *Majmua Ishtiharat*, Vol. 3, p. 559).

Intending to put fear into Ghulam's heart, Abdul predicted that Mirza would die by August 4, 1908. In response to this, Ghulam predicted that God would increase his age while decreasing the age of his enemy (*Chashma Marifat*, p. 321 ff.).

Yet in May 1908 Mirza died unexpectedly, unlike Hakim, who continued to live on for several more years after that.

Marriage Made in Heaven

Mirza prophesied that he was going to marry a young Muslim woman named Muhammadi Begum. Although the father refused, Ghulam claimed that like Muhammad's marriage to Zainab, Muhammadi was given to him in wedlock by God Almighty Himself:

“God Almighty will bring Muhammadi Begum to you as a virgin or a widow... He will certainly fulfill this and no one can stop him” (*Azala Auham*, p. 396).

After discovering that Begum was to marry someone else, another revelation from the Lord was given to warn the girl's father:

“Tell him to establish a relationship with you by giving his elder daughter in marriage to you and thus obtain light from light... Tell him that if he persists in carrying out any different design, his household will become subject to some serious misfortunes, the last of which would be his death within three years of the marriage of his daughter to someone else... the husband of his daughter will also die within two years and a half. This is a divine decree” (*Ayenh Kamalat Islam*, pp. 572–573).

In spite of all these threats, the marriage never materialized and the father did not die as stated in the prediction, nor did the husband suffer any harm.

The Great Debate

In 1893, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad engaged in a series of debates with a Muslim convert to Christianity named Abdullah Atham lasting several weeks.

“On the last day of the debate, Ghulam prophesied that whichever debater was lying would die within fifteen months unless that individual were to recant and accept the truth” (advertisement June 5, 1893, *Majmua Ishtiharat*, Vol. 1, p. 434).

Keeping in mind that Atham was an elderly man of sixty-five years and in poor health, the probabilities of him dying within fifteen months was surely high. Yet, fifteen months passed and nothing ever happened to Atham.

This embarrassment led Mirza to state that although appearing alive, Abdullah was in fact spiritually dead, being afflicted with inner fear and guilt (*Anjam Atham*, pp. 10–11).

Ghulam’s son, Bashir-ud-din, boldly claimed that Atham “stopped all his work in support of Christianity. He started doubting Jesus’ divinity and began to realize the truth of Islam, thus escaping death” (*Invitation to Ahmaddiyat*, pp. 249–251).

Yet these statements were simply untrue, since within those fifteen months Atham completed his book, *Khulasa Mubahisa*, in which he presented solid evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity and for Jesus’ divinity. In a letter that Atham wrote to a local newspaper, he publicly stated that he was still a Christian and praising God for it (Prof. M.E. Burney, *Qadiani Madhab ka Elmi Muhasabah*, Ed. 9th, p. 325).

Hence, in briefly examining Ghulam’s predictions one thing is certain: Mirza is not the Messiah nor a divine-sanctioned prophet of the true God, since God would never allow any of his prophets to make false predictions. ([Deuteronomy 18:20–23](#)).

Conclusion

After reviewing the claims made by Ahmaddiyyas in regard to their founder, and reading Ghulam’s own writings, we are reminded of the Lord Jesus’ warning to his disciples:

“And Jesus answered them, ‘Take heed that no one leads you astray. For many will come in my name, saying, “I am the Christ”: and they will lead many astray... and many false prophets will arise and lead many astray... Then if anyone says to you, “Lo, here is the Christ!” or “There he is!” Do not believe it. For false Christs and false prophets will arise and show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect. Lo, I have told you beforehand... So, if they say, “Lo, he is in the wilderness,” do not go out; if they say, “Lo, he is in the inner rooms,” do not believe it. For as the lightning comes from the east and shines as far as the west, so will the coming of the Son of Man be. Wherever the body is, there the eagles will be gathered together’ ” ([Matthew 24:5, 11, 23–28](#)).

We submit in love that Mirza was not another Messiah, but one of the many pretenders that our Lord Jesus foretold who were coming into the world. The Bible and the Quran know of only one Messiah, Jesus the Lord (cf. [Matthew 16:16](#); S. 3:45). There shall be none after him, for

“there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). That name being Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, King of kings.

The Quranic Witness To Biblical Authority

By Sam Shamoun

A common accusation leveled by Muslims against Christians is the belief that the Holy Bible in our possession today, has been corrupted and no longer represents the original teachings of God’s messengers. Hence, Muslims believe that God sent down the Quran as a criterion to judge and correct the Bible, exposing the corruption made to it. Accordingly, anything contained within the Holy Bible that is confirmed by the Quran can be trusted and is acceptable to Muslims. At the same time, the passages of the Bible that disagree with the Quran are rejected as interpolations added on later by the community of believers expressing their personal beliefs and experiences.

Doctrines such as Original Sin, the Trinity, the divinity of Jesus, His vicarious death and atonement, are ideas foreign to the original, pristine teaching of Jesus and His first followers, whom the Quran agrees, were Muslims submitted to the exclusive worship of the One True God. Since the Bible teaches the above-mentioned doctrines, it could not have possibly been preserved from deliberate textual corruption, since it would have agreed with the Quran in every detail.

This assumption is fallacious for the following reasons:

- There are nearly 25,000 whole or fragmentary copies of the individual books of the Bible in our possession today, with some dating back four, six, and even eight centuries before the compilation of the Quran. Due to the fact that everything was hand-copied, thousands of variants arose. Yet, textual critics who are not necessarily Christians, have carefully examined these variants and have concluded that we have 98.33 percent of the original reading, with the 1.77 percent still remaining intact within the variants. Hence, we have virtually 100 percent of the original reading faithfully preserved via the manuscript copies. Further, the critics have also established the fact that none of these variants affect any major doctrine, since most of them are nothing more than misspellings, numerical discrepancies, and scribal notes which were assumed to be part of the text by later scribes.

An example of a variant is given here for further clarification:

Y*u hav on a illion llars
Yo ave w*n mill dollars
You have won a * dollars
You * million ars

A careful examination of these variants would lead us to the conclusion that the original document read, “You have won a million dollars.” This exemplifies the majority of the variants found in the Bible, and clearly demonstrates that these in no way affect any tenet of faith whatsoever.

● The Quran itself bears witness to the fact that the Bible we have today is the uncorrupted Word of God. Before proceeding to the evidence for this claim, we will quote the common assumptions made by Muslims and respond to them:

1. The Quran confirms the *Torah* of Moses and the *INJIL* (Gospel) given to Jesus. It never mentions the Gospels (plural) or the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Old Testament).

Response:

The Quran affirms the Torah that was available at the time of Muhammad, and the Gospel in usage at that time:

Sura 7:156–157

“And I will write down (my mercy) for those who are righteous and give alms and who believe in our signs; who follow the apostle, the unlettered prophet, whom they find written in the *Torah and the Gospel* THAT IS WITH THEM.”

Remark: This verse states that there is a prophecy of Muhammad to be found in the Gospel [singular] available during that time. This destroys the Muslim contention that the Quran mentions the Gospel given to Jesus, not the gospels written about him, since the only Gospel in usage at the time of Muhammad were the same four-fold Gospel accounts contained within our modern-day New Testaments.

Sura 53:36

“Nay is he not acquainted with what is IN THE BOOKS OF MOSES.”

Sura 5:46:

“But why do they (the Jews) come to thee for decision, when they have the Torah in which IS the command of God.”

Sura 5:50:

“And let the People of the Gospel judge by what God has revealed in it. If any fail to judge by what God has revealed, they are licentious.”

Sura 5:71:

“Say, O People of the Book! You are not (founded) on anything UNTIL you PERFORM the TORAH and the GOSPEL, and what was revealed to you from your Lord.”

Sura 3:93–94:

“All food was lawful to the children of Israel except what Israel made unlawful for itself before the Torah was revealed. Say, ‘BRING the TORAH and READ it, if you are men of truth.’ If any, after this, invent a lie and attribute it to God, they are indeed transgressors.”

Sura 28:48–49:

“But when the truth has come to them from Us, they say: ‘why is he not given the like of what was given to Moses?’ Did they not disbelieve in that which was given to Moses before? They say: ‘Two kinds of magic (the Torah and the Quran) each helping the other!’ And they say: ‘Verily! In both we are disbelievers.’ Say (to them, O Muhammad): ‘Then bring a Book from Allah, which is a better guide than these TWO (the Torah and the Quran), that I may follow it, if you are truthful.’ ”

Remark: Notice how Muhammad is commanded to defend both the Quran and the Torah of Moses that was available to him as a guidance from God. No mention of textual corruption whatsoever.

Sura 32:23:

“We did indeed aforetime give the Book to Moses: Be not then in doubt of its REACHING (THEE): And we made it a guide to the Children of Israel.”

These verses presuppose that an uncorrupted Torah and Gospel exist which both Jews and Christians are commanded to study and adhere to.

The only Torah the Jews have ever known, and Gospel that Christians have possessed are that which make up the five books of Moses and the four gospel accounts* found in our modern Bibles today.

[*The Gospel of Jesus is not a book, but the Good News that God sent His Son into the world to atone for sin and make reconciliation between God and man. Hence, Jesus is the living Gospel sent to the world. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are not four different gospels, but four different perspectives on the one Gospel of God revealed in the person of Christ. The authors, writing under inspiration, give mutually complementary, not contradictory, material on the life and passion of Christ. This multiple attestation serves the purpose of fulfilling the requirement of the Mosaic Law that, “by the mouth of two or three witnesses the matter shall be established” [Deuteronomy 19:15.](#)]

In fact, God personally states to Muhammad in 32:23 that he should have no doubt that the Torah of his time is the very same Torah of Moses.

This is solidified by the fact that we have copies of these books that are both prior to and contemporary with the time of Muhammad, and are identical to what we have today. It is purely wishful thinking to suppose that the Torah and Gospel referred to at the time of Muhammad were something totally different in content from what we have in our possession.

2. The Quran never alludes to the Bible, only the revelation originally given to the Prophets, i.e. Moses, David, Jesus, etc.

Response: This is another unsubstantiated assumption. It is presumed that since the word “Bible” does not appear in the Quran, then what the Judeo-Christian communities commonly refer to as God’s Word is not acceptable to the Muslims.

Yet, if one were to trace the word *Bible* back to the Greek, one would discover that the word itself comes from the term *BIBLIA*, meaning “books.” Hence, in time the collection became classified as *the Book* due to the fact that although the Bible consisted of 66 individual writings, the author was one, the Holy Spirit, having one unifying theme: the advent of God’s Messiah-Deliverer.

Not surprisingly, we find the Quran mentioning the Book (Arabic—al-Kitab) of the Jews and Christians:

Sura 2:113:

“The Jews say, ‘The Christians are not (founded) upon anything.’ And the Christians say, ‘The Jews are not (founded) upon anything.’ And yet THEY READ THE BOOK.”

Sura 3:79:

“It is not for a man to whom is given the Book and wisdom and prophecy that he should then say to people, ‘Be worshipers of me in place of God.’ But rather, ‘Be true

