

JESUS IS MUSLIM

108. Say, `O men, now has the truth come to you from your Lord. So whoever follow the guidance, follows it only for the good of his own soul, and whoever errs, errs only against it. And I am not a keeper over you.' (Holy Quran 10:108)

1 Contents

2	ISLAM	6
2.1	WHAT IS ISLAM?	7
2.2	WHAT DOES ISLAM TELL US?	9
2.3	PILLARS OF ISLAM.....	13
2.4	ISLAMIC SOURCES OF LEGISLATION.....	15
3	PROPHET MUHAMMAD	17
3.1	HIS LIFE.....	18
3.2	HIS MORALS.....	19
3.3	HIS MIRACLES.....	23
3.4	HIS FULFILLED PROPHECIES	28
3.5	TESTIMONIES OF CONTEMPORARY JEWS AND CHRISTIANS	29
3.5.1	Abdullah Ibn Salam	29
3.5.2	Heraclius the Roman king	32
3.5.3	Hoyayy Ibn Akhtab	35
3.5.4	Salman of Persia.....	36
3.6	Prophet Muhammad in the Bible	40
3.6.1	A Prophet like Moses	41
3.6.2	Blessing of Ishmael.....	44
3.6.3	Isaiah 42	47
3.6.4	Paran	51
3.6.5	Psalms 45.....	54
3.6.6	A burden upon Arabia.....	56
3.6.8	The Paraclete	57
3.6.9	The Rejected Stone and the Kingdom of God.....	60
4	JESUS	63
4.1	WHAT DOES ISLAM TELL ABOUT JESUS?	63
4.2	JESUS SAYS IT "I AM NOT GOD"	65
4.3	DID JESUS REALLY SAY "I AM GOD"?	68
4.4	IS THE TRINITY TRUE?	74
4.5	IS JESUS THE SON OF GOD?	78

4.6	DID JESUS DIE FOR OUR SINS?	82
4.7	WAS JESUS REALLY CRUCIFIED?.....	87
5	QURAN	90
6	THE BIBLE.....	91
6.1	ISLAMIC VIEW OF THE BIBLE	91
6.2	MUSLIM OBJECTIONS ON THE BIBLE	93
6.3	DO BIBLE MANUSCRIPTS PROVE ITS AUTHENTICITY?.....	94
6.4	DO CHURCH FATHER QUOTES PROVE BIBLE AUTHENTICITY?	96
6.5	JEWISH CORRUPTION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.....	99
6.6	WERE THE BIBLE WRITERS REALLY INSPIRED BY GOD?	101
6.7	BIBLE DIFFICULTIES	102
6.7.1	Bible Corruption of Abraham’s Offered Son to Isaac.....	102
6.7.2	When did Abraham leave Haran?	104
6.7.3	How old was Perez when he married?	106
6.7.4	Genealogy of Jesus.....	107
6.7.5	The Story of Crucifixion	110
	Betrayal by Judas and Seizing Jesus:.....	110
	Peter Denying him	111
	The hour of crucifixion:.....	112
6.7.6	How did Judas die?.....	113
6.8	ANONYMOUS BIBLE WRITERS	115
6.9	TEXTUAL VARIANTS	119
7	MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS.....	122
7.1	WHO IS ALLAH?	122
7.2	IS JIHAD TERRORISM?	124
7.3	WAR IN THE BIBLE.....	127
7.4	POLYGAMY IN THE BIBLE	129
7.5	DOES ISLAM GIVE A GUARANTEE FOR HEAVEN?.....	130
7.6	HOLY SPIRIT AND GUIDANCE	131
7.7	OLD TESTAMENT AND JESUS.....	133
7.8	KAABA IN BIBLICAL SCRIPTURES	135

7.9 CONCEPT OF GOD IN ISLAM..... 137

7.10 CONCEPT OF SALVATION BETWEEN ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY 139

7.11 THE TRINITY AND LOGIC..... 142

7.12 DOES ISAIAH 53 POINT TO THE DEATH OF JESUS? 144

INTRODUCTION

Jesus is Muslim? It may seem to be a weird title. Isn't Jesus Jewish? Didn't he exist before Islam? Then how come that he is a Muslim? Going through this book, I think you can eventually get the answer to your question by browsing different aspects and points of comparison between Muslim and Christian faith.

In this book I will talk about Islam, what Muslims practice and what are Islamic sources, then I shall move in the next section concerning Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him), who is he, what people told about him, and what the Bible told about him. The next step is concerning Jesus (Peace be upon him), how Muslims believe in him, whether he said that he is God or not and discussing the salvation principle Christians believe in. I will then discuss the Quran, and the proof it is the word of God. Then moving to the Bible itself, what is my belief as a Muslim in the Bible, and is it the reliable word sent from God and absolute truth or not. Finally I will discuss the main outlines of questions usually non-Muslims ask about in Islam.

I am sorry again if the book's name offends you, and it may be the first time for you to hear this, but I hope that you go with me to the end to understand what I mean, and you have the choice, but please try to read it, and if you have any inquiries you can [contact me](#), and I'll do my best to answer you, and remember that one day we all will return back to God, and we must be ready for that day, so please don't let anything else has a higher value than God, everything will come to an end, and all of us will die, the only thing that will remain is our faith in God.

2 ISLAM

In this section, a brief introduction to Islam, main Islamic doctrine and how we believe in God and His Prophets, Islamic morals, Islamic practices and rites, and main Islamic sources shall be highlighted.

2.1 WHAT IS ISLAM?

Islam is an Arabic word meaning submission, it means that you totally submit to God, and worship Him only with no other partner.

Here also I must explain what does worship means? It doesn't mean that you only pray, its meaning is much much wider, to worship God is that you look at Him as your master, no other master controlling you, so He is the ONLY one whom you are loyal to, He is the ONLY One whom you rely on, He is the ONLY One whom you fear, He is the ONLY One who judges you and puts rules for you, why? Because He is our Creator, He is the Creator of the Universe and Creator of everything, He is the Mighty, the Compassionate, the Merciful, the Omnipotent, the Omniscient. He is the One who created the Universe.

21. O ye men! Worship your Lord WHO created you and those before you, that you may guard against evil. (Holy Quran 2:21)

How did we know that? God sent prophets to us to teach us the right doctrine and to tell us the laws He gave for us to go along with in our life, and we shall be accounted on this in the Hereafter.

Don't think that the beginning of Islam was only since Muhammad (Peace be upon him), no that's wrong, Islam began from the beginning of creation, God created Adam (Peace be upon him) and Adam was a Muslim, because he really worshipped God only, and began to have a family, all the family were Muslims, and the life went on, then people began to deviate from this meaning and forgot God, began to worship idols, God sent the prophets: Noah, Hud, Saleh, Abraham, Moses, David, Solomon, Jesus, Muhammad and many other prophets (Peace be upon them all), the mission of all these prophets was to restore people back to the right way of God. Prophets may have different laws according to the time and place conditions, but at the end they have one belief.

25. And WE sent no Messenger before thee but WE revealed to him: `There is no god but I; so worship ME alone.' (Holy Quran 21:25)

But at the end all these prophets are not gods, they don't have any divine nature, because Allah is the ONLY God, so when Jews put very wrong concepts of God that made Him like a child they are deviating from concept of worshipping God, because they are insulting Him, and when

Christians say that Jesus is God or God's son, or that God is one in Trinity, they are really deviating from the concept. We in Islam refuse all these forms, if someone said that Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is our God, he is immediately a disbeliever, Allah is the ONLY God.

79. It does not befit a truthful man that ALLAH should give him the Book and Wisdom and Prophethood, and then he should say to men, `Be my worshippers instead of ALLAH; but he would say, `Be solely devoted to the Lord because you teach the book and because you study it.

80. Nor does it befit that he should bid you to take angels and Prophets for lords. What! Would he enjoin you to disbelieve after you have submitted to God. (Holy Quran 3:79)

This is generally What we Muslims believe in.

2.2 WHAT DOES ISLAM TELL US?

God ordered us to be merciful, treat people well, help people, He recommended us to treat our parents well, and to keep always on helping them.

23. Thy Lord has commanded that ye worship none but HIM, and that ye show kindness to parents. If one or both of them attain old age with thee, never say to them as much as ugh nor reproach them, but always address them with kindly speech.

24. And lower them the wing of humility out of tenderness. And say, `My Lord, have mercy on them even as they nourished me when I was a little child.' (Holy Quran 17:23-24)

Even if they were not Muslims we must treat them well but we don't obey them if they ordered us to disobey God.

15. And if they contend with thee to make thee set up equals with ME concerning which thou hast no knowledge, obey them not, but be a kind companion to them in worldly affairs, (Holy Quran 31:15)

God ordered us to keep always in contact with our relatives God said:
36. And worship ALLAH and associate naught with HIM, and show kindness to parents, and to kindred and orphans (Holy Quran 4:36)

Also the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said:

" He/She who believes in Allah , the Almighty and Day of Judgment , must communicate , be good, courteous and kind to his kith and kin or relatives." (Narrated by Bukhari and Muslim)

Also we are also recommended to treat the neighbors well, even if they were not Muslims and even if they treated us badly as God said:

And to the neighbor who is a kinsman and the neighbor who is a stranger (Holy Quran 4:36)

Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: **"(Arch Angel) Gabriel, PBUH, pressed on reminding me with the right of the neighbor until I thought he is going to consider him an heir (of mine) ."** (Narrated by Bukhari and Muslim)

He also says: **"The best of neighbors in the sight of Allah, the Almighty, is the one who is best to his neighbor"**(Narrated by Tirmitheh)

God also told us to take care of orphans as in the previous verse:

36. And worship ALLAH and associate naught with HIM, and show kindness to parents, and to kindred and orphans (Holy Quran 4:36)

There was a very severe punishment to those who take money of orphans as God said:

10. Surely they who devour the property of the orphans unjustly, only swallow fire into their bellies, and they shall burn in a blazing fire. (Holy Quran 4:10)

God ordered us to be completely fair with people even if we saw two people having a problem, one of them is Muslim, the other is non Muslim, and we found the right with the non-Muslim, I must judge for the non-Muslim.

135. O ye who believe ! be strict in observing justice and be witnesses for ALLAH, even though it be against yourselves or against your parents or kindred. Whether he, against whom witness is borne, be rich or poor, ALLAH is more regardful of them both than you are. Therefore follow not your low desires that you may be able to act equitably. And if you hide the truth or evade it, then know that ALLAH is Well-Aware of what you do. (Holy Quran 4:135)

God ordered us also not to commit adultery, because it is not a mess, and because it destroys the society and makes people deviate and spoil, that's why God, ordered us to take all the reasons to prevent this to happen, so He ordered women to wear Hijab which covers their body and heads so as not to provoke men to look at her, but to let her appear in a respectful way, as her body is not for free to be seen by all people, but for only the one she accepts to be her husband. Actually Hijab was an old Christian tradition recommended by early church fathers:

Tertullian made a book specially for that issue, and said in its introduction: Having already undergone the trouble peculiar to my opinion, **I will show in Latin also that it behoves our virgins to be veiled from the time that they have passed the turning-point of their age:** that this observance is exacted by truth, on which no one can impose prescription—no space of times, no influence of persons, no privilege of regions. **For these, for the most part, are the sources whence, from some ignorance or simplicity, custom finds its beginning; and then it is successionally confirmed into an usage, and thus is maintained in opposition to truth.**

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf04.iii.iv.i.html>

Also in the didascalia apostolorum, which is supposed to be a reliable source for the Orthodox, it says:

Thou therefore that art a Christian, (p. 9) do not imitate such women; but if thou wouldst be a faithful woman, please thy husband only. **And when thou walkest in the street, cover thy head with thy robe, that by reason of thy veil thy great beauty may be hidden. And adorn not thy natural face; but walk with downcast looks, being veiled.**

<http://www.bombaxo.com/didascalia.html>

Also Allah ordered women when talking with men, not to be soft in speech but to talk in a serious way.

31. And say to the believing women that they restrain their looks and guard their private parts, and that they display not their beauty or their embellishment except that which is apparent thereof, and that they draw their head-coverings over their bosoms (Holy Quran 24:31)

So be not soft in speech, lest he, in whose heart is a disease, should feel tempted; and speak decent words. (Holy Quran 33:32)

As God ordered women to cover their body, he ordered men not to look at women, because this arises their sexual desire, and may lead them to adultery, or at least may them go astray from their duties in this life.

30. Say to the believing men that they restrain their looks and guard their private parts. That is purer for them. Surely, ALLAH is Well-Aware of what they do. (Holy Quran 24:30)

God ordered us not to lie or to promise with something and don't do, Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) said that this is a sign of hypocrisy:

119. O ye who believe ! fear ALLAH and be with the truthful.(Holy Quran 9:119)

And fulfill the covenant; for the covenant shall be questioned about:

35. And give full measure when you measure and weigh with a right balance; that is best and most commendable in the end.(Holy Quran 17:34)

70. O ye who believe ! Fear ALLAH and say the straightforward word.

71. HE will set right you actions for you and forgive you your sins. And whoso obeys ALLAH and HIS Messenger shall, surely, attain a supreme triumph.(Holy Quran 33:70-71)

God ordered us to say good words and avoid bad words and emphasized much on this because the slip of the tongue may cause many problems:

24. Dost thou not see how ALLAH sets forth a parable of a good word ? It is like a good tree, whose root is firm and whose branches reach into heaven ?

25. It brings forth its fruit at all times by the command of its Lord. And ALLAH sets forth parables for men that they may be reminded.

26. And the case of an evil word, is like that of an evil tree, which is uprooted from above the earth and has no stability. (Holy Quran 14:24-26)

God ordered us not to be arrogant but to be modest:

37. And walk not in the earth haughtily, for thou canst not thus rend the earth, nor canst thou reach the mountains in height. (Holy Quran 17:37)

63. And the true servants of the Gracious God are those who walk on the earth humbly and when the ignorant address them, they avoid them gracefully by saying, `Peace !' (Holy Quran 25:63)

Finally God orders us to do everything good and avoid everything bad:

90. Verily, ALLAH enjoins justice, and the doing of good to others; and giving like kindred; and forbids indecency and manifest evil and transgression. HE admonishes you that you may take heed. (Holy Quran 16:90)

2.3 PILLARS OF ISLAM

There are five pillars of Islam:

1. Witnessing that Allah is the only God and that Muhammad (Peace be upon him) is His messenger: as I explained in the beginning.

2. Praying: We pray to God five times a day in the mosques, from the benefits of praying:

a. Having communication with God who created us

b. Meeting with Muslims periodically every day, connecting with each other, which strengthens the Islamic society.

c. Helps us to stop sinning.

45. Recite that which has been revealed of the Book and observe Prayer. Surely, Prayer restrains one from indecency and manifest evil; and the remembrance of ALLAH is the greatest virtue. And ALLAH knows what you do. (Holy Quran 29:45)

3. Zakat: Every mature able Muslim pays 2.5% of his income to help in building Islamic society, this is the minimum, God promised us with high rewards for paying more and more.

39. Whatever you lay out at interest that it may increase the wealth of the people, it does not increase in the sight of ALLAH; but whatever you give in Zakat, seeking the pleasure of ALLAH – it is these who will increase their wealth manifold. (Holy Quran 30:39)

4. Fasting: Every healthy mature able Muslim must fast Ramadan (one of the Islamic months), all Muslims fast together in this month by stopping eating and drinking along the day, they begin fasting at the dawn, they have breakfast at the Sunset. This really builds the Muslim character, trains him to control his desire and his passion, besides when all Muslims fast together, this gives a beautiful picture of the Muslims being uniform, and it also makes the rich feel the hunger and thrusts of poor and motivates them to help the poor.

183. O ye who believe ! fasting is prescribed for you, as it was prescribed for those before you, so that you may guard against evil.(Holy Quran 2:183)

5. Finally, the pilgrimage: Every healthy able Muslim must do it once in his life. It is the annual Muslim conference where about 2 million Muslims meet in leaving rest their countries answering God's call, wearing simple clothes, declaring their total obedience to God.

The rites of the Hajj include circling the Kaaba seven times and going seven times between the hillocks of Safa and Marwa, as Hagar did during her search for water. Then the pilgrims stand

together in Arafah and ask God for what they wish and for His forgiveness, in what is often thought of as a preview of the Day of Judgment.

The end of the Hajj is marked by a festival, Eid Al-Adha, which is celebrated with prayers. This, and Eid al-Fitr, a feast-day commemorating the end of Ramadan, are the two annual festivals of the Muslim calendar.

96. Surely the first House founded for all mankind is that at Becca, abounding in blessings and a guidance for all peoples. 97. In it are manifest Signs; it is the place of Abraham; and whoso enters it, is safe. And pilgrimage to the House is a duty which men – those who can find a way thither – owe to ALLAH. And whoso disbelieves, let him remember that ALLAH is surely Independent of all creatures.(Holy Quran 3:96-97)

2.4 ISLAMIC SOURCES OF LEGISLATION

We in Islam have three main sources of legislation:

1. The Quran:

We believe that Quran is Allah's final word to all humanity.

Blessed is HE who has sent down Al-Furqan to HIS servant, that he may be a Warner to all the worlds – (Holy Quran 25:1)

God sent the Quran to His servant and Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) through His angel Gabriel distributed within 23 years. It has been taught to the Prophet's disciple, where some of them memorized it, others kept on writing it. Then it was collected in one book immediately after the Prophet's death. And through all ages, there have been many Muslims who memorized the Quran, and those who memorized the Quran had tests to make sure that they thoroughly memorized it. And it has been transmitted through generations that way, simultaneously with writing.

This is a link for a full Quran translation:

<http://www.islam101.com/quran/yusufAli/>

2. The Sunna (Hadiths):

Which is the documentation of the Prophet's life, quotes and deeds, what he did, what he ordered us to do, and forbidden us not to do, and every Muslim must follow it as God told us in the Quran:

31. Say 'If you love ALLAH, follow me; then will ALLAH love you and forgive you your sins.' And ALLAH is Most Forgiving and Merciful. 32. Say, 'Obey ALLAH and HIS Messenger;' but if they turn away, then remember that ALLAH loves not the disbelievers. (Holy Quran 3:31-32)

The word "Say" here is directed to Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him).

It had been transmitted through documenting narrations from the Prophet's disciples to generations after them, and there were severe conditions for a hadith to be accepted, the documentation began nearly after 100 years from the Prophet's death, but within this time, anyone who tells any hadith must be known within the Islamic society that he is righteous, that he doesn't lie at all, that he memorizes well and doesn't forget quickly, and he must say who told him that hadith to know what is his source and examine it and there must be evidence that these two narrators really met each other. There are many

documentations about all narrators to examine them and know if they are really accepted or not. The result is that at the end of every hadith, we have a chain of narrators, for that chain to be accepted, it must be continuous (i.e. each narrator saw the one before him and heard from him), and the narrators must have the conditions mentioned before.

The main books of hadith, are Sahih Bukhari, Sahih Muslim which have no false hadith, then there are Al Tirmithee, Ibn Majah, Al Nasa'i, Abu Dawood, Ahmad, Al Bayhaqi, and other books, these books may have weak or false hadith, scientists examine hadiths, and see if it is really right or good or weak or false, actually the science of Hadith is a huge science, and many books have been written about it.

Here is a link for translations of main hadith hadith books but not all:

http://www.searchtruth.com/hadith_books.php

3. Consensus:

Which means that all Muslim accepted scholars agreed on something, then we consider it a source of legislation, because Allah said in the Quran:

115. And whoso opposes the Messenger after guidance has become manifest to him, and follows a way other than that of the believers, WE shall let him pursue the way he is pursuing and shall cast him into Hell, and an evil destination it is. (Holy Quran 4:115)

And Muhammad (Peace be upon him) said: "My ummah will never agree upon an error" Narrated by al-Tirmidhi, ibn Majah and Abu Dawood.

3 PROPHET MUHAMMAD

This section shall talk about Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) including his life as shown in the book ([This is Muhammad](#)), then a brief account of his morals and the miracles he performed. Then it shall talk about what the contemporary Jews and Christians said about Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him). The final section shall talk about the prophecies in the Bible foretelling about Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) as the final prophet.

3.1 HIS LIFE

Prophet Muhammad's life can't be told that briefly on a single page, since it's really a very eventful life that needs more than one page, but make sure that when you know about Muhammad (Peace be upon him), you must love him and appreciate him, that's why I preferred to give you that link that talks about his life. It may take some time from you, but I think it worths that time, because you either appreciate Muhammad (Peace be upon him), and know that he is really a prophet from God, or you will get more sure of your belief, but I really don't think that the second possiblity will occur. Anyway, I will leave you now to read his life. You can click [here](#). Or you can download it from [here](#) as a pdf format.

3.2 HIS MORALS

Here in this section, I will talk about the morals of Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) were, and you can judge by yourself, is it normal that all these morals were collected in a normal person?

God describes Muhammad (Peace be upon him) in the Quran by saying:

4. And thou dost, surely, possess sublime moral excellences. (Holy Quran 68:4)

When we look at the life of Muhammad(Peace be upon him), we will understand this. I will give some hadiths telling about his morals, and how his disciples described him.

Mercy:

Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was merciful, he used to forgive people. This hadith in Bukhari shows how he forgave people who tried to kill him.

Narrated by Jabir bin ‘Abdullah:

We took part in the Ghazwa of Najd along with Allah’s Apostle and when the time for the afternoon rest approached while he was in a valley with plenty of thorny trees, he dismounted under a tree and rested in its shade and hung his sword (on it). The people dispersed amongst the trees in order to have shade. While we were in this state, Allah’s Apostle called us and we came and found a bedouin sitting in front of him. The Prophet said, “This (Bedouin) came to me while I was asleep, and he took my sword stealthily. I woke up while he was standing by my head, holding my sword without its sheath. He said, ‘Who will save you from me?’ I replied, ‘Allah.’ So he sheathed it (i.e. the sword) and sat down, and here he is.” But Allah’s Apostle did not punish him.

Although the pagans of Mecca kept on harming him, he didn’t pray against them, he kept on praying for them for he really wanted them to be saved. During the Battle of Uhud, when the pagans found a gap in Muslim army, and attacked the Prophet (Peace be upon him), the Prophet was beaten, and blood was wiping from his face, he said: My Lord, forgive my people, for they do not know. (Muslim)

Also when the Prophet (Peace be upon him) went to preach people in Al Tai'f, and they rejected him, and kept on beating him and throwing him with stones, angel Gabriel came to him and said: God, the Honoured and Glorious, has heard what thy people have said to thee, and how they have reacted to thy call. And He has sent to thee the angel in charge of the mountains so that thou mayest order him what thou wishest (him to do) with, regard to them. The angel in charge of the mountains (then) called out to me, greeted me and said: Muhammad, God has listened to what thy people have said to thee. I am the angel in charge of the mountains. and thy Lord has sent me to thee so that thou mayest order me what thou wishest. If thou wishest that I should bring together the two mountains that stand opposite to each other at the extremities of Mecca to crush them in between, (I would do that). But the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) said to him: I rather hope that God will produce from their descendants such persons as will worship Allah, the One, and will not ascribe partners to Him. (Muslim)

Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) didn't aim to kill those who rejected him, he was keen on guiding them to the right way and saving them from Hell. Even when he conquered the polytheists and entered Mecca he didn't aim to take revenge from those who tortured him and rejected him, but he forgave them with no blame.

And when he came back to Mecca as a conquerer, he asked those who rejected him, and kept on harming him for 21 years, he asked them: "What do you think I shall do with you?", they said: "Well, you are an honorable brother, and the son of an honorable brother.", he said: "No blame on you today, go, you are free" (Ibn Hisham)

Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was merciful with his servants and with people.

Anas Ibn Malik reported: I served the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) for ten years, and, by Allah, he never said to me any harsh word, and he never said to me about a thing as to why I had done that and as to why I had not done that. (Al Bukhari)

Jabir b. 'Abdullah reported: It never happened that Allah's Messenger (may peace be upon him) was asked for anything and he said: No. (Al Bukhari)

The Prophet never took revenge (over anybody) for his own sake but (he did) only when Allah's Legal Bindings were outraged in which case he would take revenge for Allah's Sake. And

henever used bad language. He used to say “The best amongst you are those who have the best manners and character.” He never criticized any food (presented him), but he would eat it if he liked it; otherwise, he would leave it (without expressing his dislike). (Al Bukhari more than one hadith)

Generosity:

Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was very generous, Ibn Abbas narrates:

The Prophet was the most generous of all the people, and he used to become more generous in Ramadan when Gabriel met him. Gabriel used to meet him every night during Ramadan to revise the Qur’an with him. Allah’s Apostle then used to be more generous than the fast wind. (Al Bukhari)

Modesty:

Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was very modest, he was never seen extending his legs in front of his disciples, and he refused that they stand up when he comes, his life was very simple, he used to milk his goat, mend his clothes, repair his shoes, help with the household work, and visit poor people when they got sick. He also helped his companions in digging a trench by moving sand with them. His life was an amazing model of simplicity and humbleness. (A collection of many hadiths)

He also said:” 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.”(Al Bukhari)

Simple life of Prophet Muhammad:

The life of Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was very simple, Aa’isha, Muhammad’s wife, said, “O my nephew, we would sight three new moons in two months without lighting a fire (to cook a meal) in the Prophet’s houses.” Her nephew asked, “O Aunt, what sustained you?” She said, “The two black things, dates and water, but the Prophet had some Ansar neighbors who had milk-giving she-camels and they used to send the Prophet some of its milk.” (Al Bukhari)

Although he was God's Prophet, he didn't depend on that to be lazy in worshipping God, The Prophet used to stand (in the prayer) or pray till both his feet or legs swelled. He was asked why (he offered such an unbearable prayer) and he said, "should I not be a thankful slave." (Al Bukhari).

3.3 HIS MIRACLES

By Imam Al Nawawi:

The Messenger of Allah possesses many manifest miracles and signs demonstrating [his veracity], reaching thousands and they are well known.

From amongst them was the Qur'an, the manifest and clear miracle and brilliant proof, falsehood cannot approach it from before it or behind it. It is a revelation from One Who is All-Wise and Praiseworthy. It incapacitated the most eloquent of people in the most eloquent of times to produce a single chapter that would be comparable to it, even if the whole of creation were to gather for that purpose. Allah, the Exalted says,

“Say: If the whole of mankind and the jinn gathered in order to produce the like of this Qur'an, they could not produce the like of it, even if they assisted each other.” [Al-Israa' (17): 88]

It challenged them to this despite their large numbers, their eloquence and their severe enmity, and it challenges them to this day.

As for the other miracles, it is not possible to enumerate them all due to their huge number and renewing and increasing nature. However, I will mention some examples:

The splitting of the moon^[1], water flowing from between his fingers, increasing the quantity of food and water, the glorification of the food, the palm tree yearning for him, stones greeting him,

the talking of the poisoned leg [of roasted sheep], trees walking towards him, two trees that were far apart coming together and then parting again, the barren [and therefore dry] sheep giving milk, his returning the eye of Qatidah bin an-Nu`man to its place with his hand after it had slipped out, his spitting lightly into the eye of Ali when it had become inflamed and its being cured almost immediately, his wiping the leg of `Abdullah bin `Atiq whereupon he was immediately cured.

His informing of the places of death of the Day of Badr saying, ‘this is the place of such polytheists on the and-such a person.’ His informing of his killing Ubayy bin Khalaf, that a group of his nation would traverse an ocean and Umm Haram would be amongst them and this

occurred. That all that was drawn together for him of the ends of the earth and displayed to him would be opened for his nation, that the treasures of the Chosroes would be spent by his nation in the Way of Allah, the Mighty and Magnificent. That he feared for his nation that they would be tempted by the wealth and allurements of this world and that the treasures of the Persians and Romans would be ours and that Suraqah bin Malik would wear the trousers of Chosroes.

He informed us that Hasan bin `Ali would reconcile between two large warring parties of the Muslims, that Sa'd bin Abi Waqqas would live such that nations would benefit by him and others would be harmed. That an-Najashi had died on this particular day while he was in Ethiopia and that al-Aswad al-`Ansi had been killed on this particular day while he was in Yemen.

That the Muslims would fight the Turks who were described as having small eyes, wide faces and small, chiseled noses and that Yemen, Syria and Iraq would be conquered by the Muslims.

He informed us that the Muslims would comprise three armies, an army in Syria, and army in Yemen and an army in Iraq. That they would conquer Egypt, a land whose [unit of land measurement] was the Qirat, that they should deal with their people well for they have protection [being Copts] and ties of kinship [through Hajar]. That Awais al-Qarni would come to you from the auxiliaries of Yemen, he would be afflicted with leprosy and it would be healed except for the space of a dirham, and he indeed arrived during the rule of `Umar.

He informed us that a group of his nation would always be upon the truth and that mankind would become many in number and that the Ansar would diminish in number and that the Ansar would not be given their due [with regards distribution of wealth and leadership]. That mankind would keep on asking questions until they would say, "Allah created the creation..." [Referring to the hadeeth, "the people would continue asking until they say, 'this is Allah Who created everything...but who created Allah?'" (al-Bukhari and Muslim)]

He informed us that Ruwayfi` bin Thabit would live a long life, that Ammar bin Yasir would be killed by the transgressing group, that this nations shall divide into sects and that they would fight each other.

He informed us that a fire would emanate from the land of Hijaz and the likes of this. All of this occurred exactly as he (sallallahu `alayhe wa sallam) said it would.

He said to Thabit bin Qays, “You will live being praised... and you will die as a martyr”, and he lived being praised and was martyred at al-Yamamah. He said to `Uthman, “He would be afflicted by a severe trial.” [The meaning of severe trial is his being imprisoned in his house and his being killed by the transgressors.]

He said about a person amongst the Muslims who had just fought a severe fight that “He would be from amongst the denizens of the Fire”, and later he committed suicide. Wabisah bin Ma`bad came to him in order to ask him about righteousness and sin upon which he asked, “Have you come to ask about righteousness and sin?”

He said to `Ali, az-Zubair and al-Miqdad, “Go to the garden of Khakh for indeed there is Dha`inah” who has a book with her. [Dha`inah is the woman with whom Hasib al-Balta`ah (radhiAllahu `anhu) sent a letter to the people of Mecca in order to inform them of the plans of the Messenger of Allah (sallallahu `alayhe wa sallam) to fight them. It was concerning this that the first verses of Surah Mumtahinah were revealed.

The garden of Khakh is a place falling between Mecca and Madinah. Refer to Bukhari [no. 3983] and Muslim [no. 2494] and Tafsir ibn Kathir [4/344]]

They found her there but she initially denied having the book and then took it out from within her braids.

He said to Abi Hurayrah, when Satan had stolen some dates, “Indeed he shall return” and he did. He said to his wives, “The most prolific of you in giving charity will be the quickest of you to join me.” and it was so [Zaynab bint Jahsh (radhi Allahu `anha) was the most prolific of them in giving charity and was the first to die. Refer to Muslim [no. 2452].]

He said to `Abdullah bin Sallam, “You will remain upon Islam until you die.”

He (sallallahu `alayhe wa sallam) supplicated for Anas that his wealth and sons increase and that he should live a long life and it was so. He lived for more than one hundred years and not one of the Ansar was richer than he and one hundred and twenty of his children had already

been buried before the arrival of al-Hajjaj [to Basrah]. This is detailed further in Sahih Bukhari and others. [Bukhari no. 1982]

He supplicated that Islam be strengthened through 'Umar bin al-Khattab or Abu Jahl, and Allah strengthened it through `Umar (radiyAllahu `anhu). He supplicated against Suraqah bin Malik and the feet of his horse sank into the earth and he was thrown off, he called out asking for safe conduct and was granted it, then he asked the Prophet to make a supplication for him.

He supplicated that Allah remove feeling the bitter cold and heat from `Ali and so never did he feel cold or hot. He supplicated for Hudhayfah, the night that he sent him to spy on the Confederates, that he not feel the cold and he did not until he had returned. He supplicated for ibn `Abbas that Allah grant him understanding of the religion and it was so. He supplicated against `Utbah bin Abi Lahb... that Allah cause a dog from amongst his dogs to overcome him and he was killed by a lion at az-Zarqa`. [This is how it is in all of the printed editions; perhaps the author means `Utaybah bin Abi Lahb for this description fits him. As for `Utbah, he accepted Islaam in the year of the Conquest of Mecca.]

He supplicated for the descent of rain when they asked him to at the time of drought. There was not a single cloud in the sky, and then when he had supplicated, the clouds gathered like mountains and it rained until the next Friday. It rained so much that they had to come back and ask him to supplicate and stop the rain, so he supplicated and the rain stopped and they walked out into the glaring sun.

He (sallallahu `alayhi wa sallam) supplicated for Abu Talhah and his wife, Umm. Sulaym, that he bless them in the night they had spent together and she became pregnant and gave birth to `Abdullah. He had nine children and all of them were scholars.

He supplicated for the mother of Aba Hurayrah (radhi Allahu `anhu) that she be guided and Aba Hurayrah left to find her performing the ritual bath because she had accepted Islam. He supplicated for Umm Qays bint Muhsin, the sister of `Ukkasha, that she live a long life and we do not know of another woman who lived as long as she did. This was reported by an-Nasa'i the chapter concerning washing the deceased.

On the Day of Hunain he threw a handful of dirt at the disbelievers and said, “May the faces be disfigured”, and Allah, the Exalted, vanquished them, filling their eyes with dirt. He once went out to one hundred of the Quraysh who were waiting to do something horrible to him and he put dirt on their head and went on his way without their seeing him.

[1]

Recently they discovered a split in the moon, it may be that split:

http://antwrp.gsfc.nasa.gov/apod/image/0210/rille_apollo10.jpg

3.4 HIS FULFILLED PROPHECIES

There have been many prophecies fulfilled by Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him), these are two prophecies as an example:

Prophet (Peace be upon him) predicted that we will fight the Mongols. Narrated 'Amr bin Taghlib:

- The Prophet said, "One of the portents of the Hour is that you will fight with people wearing shoes made of hair; and one of the portents of the Hour is that you will fight with broad-faced people whose faces will look like shields coated with leather." (Al-Bokhary Book)
- The hour will not be established till the Turks Moslems fight with people with whose faces will look like the shields with coated with leather .they will wear uniforms made of hair and they will wear shoes made of hair . (Saheih Moslem)

The Turks mentioned are not the Turks present now in Asia Minor, but their origin was Mangolia which was the home land of Turks and Mongols, this was from the sixth to 13 th century see [here](#)).

Another prophecy which was fulfilled in our age is that mentioned in Bukhari when Gabriel came to the Prophet (Peace be upon him) in a form of man in front of his disciples, he came and asked the Prophet (Peace be upon him) (as an educative way to the disciples), from these questions that he asked him: When will the Hour (Last Day) come? the Prophet (Peace be upon him) said: I don't know (since God only knows it), so Gabriel asked him: So tell me about its signs? the Prophet (Peace be upon him) answered him: That the maid would beget her master, and that the bare footed naked shepherds exceed in buildings. Now let's look at a city like Dubai or Abu Dhabi or Riyadh or Kuwait or Jeddah, look at the Gulf cities and compare their picture nowadays with their picture 40 years ago, you will see how this prophecy was exactly fulfilled.

3.5 TESTIMONIES OF CONTEMPORARY JEWS AND CHRISTIANS

3.5.1 Abdullah Ibn Salam

Abdullah ibn Salam was a Jewish rabbi in Yathrib who was widely respected and honoured by the people of the city even by those who were not Jewish. He was known for his piety and goodness, his upright conduct and his truthfulness.

Al-Husayn lived a peaceful and gentle life but he was serious, purposeful and organized in the way he spent his time. For a fixed period each day, he would worship, teach and preach in the temple. Then he would spend some time in his orchard, looking after date palms, pruning and pollinating. Thereafter, to increase his understanding and knowledge of his religion, he would devote himself to the study of the Torah.

In this study, it is said he was particularly struck by some verses of the Torah which dealt with the coming of a Prophet who would complete the message of previous Prophets. Al-Husayn therefore took an immediate and keen interest when he heard reports of the appearance of a Prophet in Makkah. He said:

“When I heard of the appearance of the Messenger of God, peace be on him, I began to make enquiries about his name, his genealogy, his characteristics, his time and place and I began to compare this information with what is contained in our books. From these enquiries, I became convinced about the authenticity of his prophethood and I affirmed the truth of his mission. However, I concealed my conclusions from the Jews. I held my tongue...

Then came the day when the Prophet, peace be on him, left Makkah and headed for Yathrib. When he reached Yathrib and stopped at Quba, a man came rushing into the city, calling out to people and announcing the arrival of the Prophet. At that moment, I was at the top of a palm tree doing some work. My aunt, Khalidah bint al-Harith, was sitting under the tree. On hearing the news, I shouted:

‘Allahu Akbar! Allahu Akbar! (God is Great! God is Great!’ When my aunt heard my takbir, she remonstrated with me: ‘May God frustrate you...By God, if you had heard that Moses was coming you would not have been more enthusiastic.’

‘Auntie, he is really, by God, the ‘brother’ of Moses and follows his religion. He was sent with the same mission as Moses.’ She was silent for a while and then said: ‘Is he the Prophet about whom you spoke to us who would be sent to confirm the truth preached by previous (Prophets) and complete the message of his Lord?’ ‘Yes,’ I replied.

Without any delay or hesitation, I went out to meet the Prophet. I saw crowds of people at his door. I moved about in the crowds until I reached close to him. The first words I heard him say were:

‘O people! Spread peace...Share food...Pray during the night while people (normally) sleep... and you will enter Paradise in peace...’

I looked at him closely. I scrutinized him and was convinced that his face was not that of an imposter. I went closer to him and made the declaration of faith that there is no god but Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah.

The Prophet turned to me and asked: ‘What is your name?’ ‘Al-Husayn ibn Sailam,’ I replied.

‘Instead, it is (now) Abdullah ibn Sallam,’ he said (giving me a new name). ‘Yes,’ I agreed. ‘Abdullah ibn Sailam (it shall be). By Him who has sent you with the Truth, I do not wish to have another name after this day.’

I returned home and introduced Islam to my wife, my children and the rest of my household. They all accepted Islam including my aunt Khalidah who was then an old lady. However, I advised them then to conceal our acceptance of Islam from the Jews until I gave them permission. They agreed.

Subsequently, I went back to the Prophet, peace be on him, and said: ‘O Messenger of God! The Jews are a people (inclined to) slander and falsehood. I want you to invite their most prominent men to meet you. (During the meeting however), you should keep me concealed from them in one of your rooms. Ask them then about my status among them before they find out of my acceptance of Islam. Then invite them to Islam. If they were to know that I have become a Muslim, they would denounce me and accuse me of everything base and slander me.’

The Prophet kept me in one of his rooms and invited the prominent Jewish personalities to visit him. He introduced Islam to them and urged them to have faith in God...They began to dispute and argue with him about the Truth. When he realized that they were not inclined to accept Islam, he put the question to them:

‘What is the status of Al-Husayn ibn Sailam among you?’

‘He is our sayyid (leader) and the son of our sayyid. He is our rabbi and our alim (scholar), the son of our rabbi and alim.’

‘If you come to know that he has accepted Islam, would you accept Islam also?’ asked the Prophet.

'God forbid! He would not accept Islam. May God protect him from accepting Islam,' they said (horrified).

At this point I came out in full view of them and announced: 'O assembly of Jews! Be conscious of God and accept what Muhammad has brought. By God, you certainly know that he is the Messenger of God and you can find prophecies about him and mention of his name and characteristics in your Torah. I for my part declare that he is the Messenger of God. I have faith in him and believe that he is true. I know him.'

'You are a liar,' they shouted. 'By God, you are evil and ignorant, the son of an evil and ignorant person.' And they continued to heap every conceivable abuse on me..."

Abdullah ibn Sailam approached Islam with a soul thirsty for knowledge. He was passionately devoted to the Quran and spent much time reciting and studying its beautiful and sublime verses. He was deeply attached to the noble Prophet and was constantly in his company.

Much of his time he spent in the masjid, engaged in worship, in learning and in teaching. He was known for his sweet, moving and effective way of teaching study circles of Sahabah who assembled regularly in the Prophet's mosque.

Abdullah ibn Sallam was known among the Sahabah as a man from ahl-al-Jannah "- the people of Paradise. This was because of his determination on the advice of the Prophet to hold steadfastly to the "most trustworthy handhold" that is belief in and total submission to God.

3.5.2 Heraclius the Roman king

This was a hadith in Bukhari telling about the conversation of Abu Sufyan (who was pagan who kept on fighting Islam at that time, then he converted after), when he went to Syria for trade and there he met Heraclius. Here is the hadith from Al Bukhari.

Volume 1, Book 1, Number 6:

Narrated 'Abdullah bin 'Abbas:

Abu Sufyan bin Harb informed me that Heraclius had sent a messenger to him while he had been accompanying a caravan from Quraish. They were merchants doing business in Sham (Syria, Palestine, Lebanon and Jordan), at the time when Allah's Apostle had truce with Abu Sufyan and Quraish infidels. So Abu Sufyan and his companions went to Heraclius at Ilya (Jerusalem). Heraclius called them in the court and he had all the senior Roman dignitaries around him. He called for his translator who, translating Heraclius's question said to them, "Who amongst you is closely related to that man who claims to be a Prophet?" Abu Sufyan replied, "I am the nearest relative to him (amongst the group)."

Heraclius said, "Bring him (Abu Sufyan) close to me and make his companions stand behind him." Abu Sufyan added, Heraclius told his translator to tell my companions that he wanted to put some questions to me regarding that man (The Prophet) and that if I told a lie they (my companions) should contradict me." Abu Sufyan added, "By Allah! Had I not been afraid of my companions labeling me a liar, I would not have spoken the truth about the Prophet. The first question he asked me about him was:

'What is his family status amongst you?'

I replied, 'He belongs to a good (noble) family amongst us.'

Heraclius further asked, 'Has anybody amongst you ever claimed the same (i.e. to be a Prophet) before him?'

I replied, 'No.'

He said, 'Was anybody amongst his ancestors a king?'

I replied, 'No.'

Heraclius asked, 'Do the nobles or the poor follow him?'

I replied, 'It is the poor who follow him.'

He said, 'Are his followers increasing decreasing (day by day)?'

I replied, 'They are increasing.'

He then asked, 'Does anybody amongst those who embrace his religion become displeased and renounce the religion

afterwards?'

I replied, 'No.'

Heraclius said, 'Have you ever accused him of telling lies before his claim (to be a Prophet)?'

I replied, 'No. '

Heraclius said, 'Does he break his promises?'

I replied, 'No. We are at truce with him but we do not know what he will do in it.' I could not find opportunity to say anything against him except that.

Heraclius asked, 'Have you ever had a war with him?'

I replied, 'Yes.'

Then he said, 'What was the outcome of the battles?'

I replied, 'Sometimes he was victorious and sometimes we.'

Heraclius said, 'What does he order you to do?'

I said, 'He tells us to worship Allah and Allah alone and not to worship anything along with Him, and to renounce all that our ancestors had said. He orders us to pray, to speak the truth, to be chaste and to keep good relations with our Kith and kin.'

Heraclius asked the translator to convey to me the following, I asked you about his family and your reply was that he belonged to a very noble family. In fact all the Apostles come from noble families amongst their respective peoples. I questioned you whether anybody else amongst you claimed such a thing, your reply was in the negative. If the answer had been in the affirmative, I would have thought that this man was following the previous man's statement. Then I asked you whether anyone of his ancestors was a king. Your reply was in the negative, and if it had been in the affirmative, I would have thought that this man wanted to take back his ancestral kingdom.

I further asked whether he was ever accused of telling lies before he said what he said, and your reply was in the negative. So I wondered how a person who does not tell a lie about others could ever tell a lie about Allah. I, then asked you whether the rich people followed him or the poor. You replied that it was the poor who followed him. And in fact all the Apostle have been

followed by this very class of people. Then I asked you whether his followers were increasing or decreasing. You replied that they were increasing, and in fact this is the way of true faith, till it is complete in all respects. I further asked you whether there was anybody, who, after embracing his religion, became displeased and discarded his religion. Your reply was in the negative, and in fact this is (the sign of) true faith, when its delight enters the hearts and mixes with them completely. I asked you whether he had ever betrayed. You replied in the negative and likewise the Apostles never betray. Then I asked you what he ordered you to do. You replied that he ordered you to worship Allah and Allah alone and not to worship any thing along with Him and forbade you to worship idols and ordered you to pray, to speak the truth and to be chaste. If what you have said is true, he will very soon occupy this place underneath my feet and I knew it (from the scriptures) that he was going to appear but I did not know that he would be from you, and if I could reach him definitely, I would go immediately to meet him and if I were with him, I would certainly wash his feet.'

Heraclius then asked for the letter addressed by Allah's Apostle which was delivered by Dihya to the Governor of Busra, who forwarded it to Heraclius to read. The contents of the letter were as follows: "In the name of Allah the Beneficent, the Merciful (This letter is) from Muhammad the slave of Allah and His Apostle to Heraclius the ruler of Byzantine. Peace be upon him, who follows the right path. Furthermore I invite you to Islam, and if you become a Muslim you will be safe, and Allah will double your reward, and if you reject this invitation of Islam you will be committing a sin by misguiding your Arisiyin (peasants). (And I recite to you Allah's Statement:)

'O people of the scripture! Come to a word common to you and us that we worship none but Allah and that we associate nothing in worship with Him, and that none of us shall take others as Lords beside Allah. Then, if they turn away, say: Bear witness that we are Muslims (those who have surrendered to Allah).' (3:64).

Abu Sufyan then added, "When Heraclius had finished his speech and had read the letter, there was a great hue and cry in the Royal Court. So we were turned out of the court. I told my companions that the question of Ibn-Abi-Kabsha) (the Prophet Muhammad) has become so prominent that even the King of Bani Al-Asfar (Byzantine) is afraid of him. Then I started to become sure that he (the Prophet) would be the conqueror in the near future till I embraced Islam (i.e. Allah guided me to it)."

3.5.3 Hoyayy Ibn Akhtab

This man was a Jew, who knew that Muhammad(Peace be upon him) is the final prophet sent by God, but his jealousy made him arrogant and kept on fighting him till he died. Our Mother Safiyyah the daughter of Hoyayy, whom the Prophet (Peace be upon him) married her afterwards said:

“I was my father’s and my uncle’s favorite child. When the Messenger of Allah came to Madinah and stayed at Quba, my parents went to him at night and when they looked disconcerted and worn out. I received them cheerfully but to my surprise no one of them turned to me. They were so grieved that they did not feel my presence. I heard my uncle, Abu Yasir, saying to my father, ‘Is it really him (the final prophet) ?’ He said, ‘Yes, by Allah’. My uncle said: ‘Can you recognize him and confirm this?’ He said, ‘Yes’. My uncle said, ‘How do you feel towards him?’ He said, ‘By Allah I shall be his enemy as long as I live.’” (Ibn Hisham, As-Sirah an-Nabawiyah)

3.5.4 Salman of Persia

This is a story of a seeker of Truth, the story of Salman the Persian, gleaned, to begin with, from his own words:

I grew up in the town of Isfahan in Persia in the village of Jayyan. My father was the Dihqan or chief of the village. He was the richest person there and had the biggest house.

Since I was a child my father loved me, more than he loved any other. As time went by his love for me became so strong and overpowering that he feared to lose me or have anything happen to me. So he kept me at home, a veritable prisoner, in the same way that young girls were kept.

I became devoted to the Magian religion so much so that I attained the position of custodian of the fire which we worshipped. My duty was to see that the flames of the fire remained burning and that it did not go out for a single hour, day or night.

My father had a vast estate which yielded an abundant supply of crops. He himself looked after the estate and the harvest. One day he was very busy with his duties as dihqan in the village and he said to me:

“My son, as you see, I am too busy to go out to the estate now. Go and look after matters there for me today.”

On my way to the estate, I passed a Christian church and the voices at prayer attracted my attention. I did not know anything about Christianity or about the followers of any other religion throughout the time my father kept me in the house away from people. When I heard the voices of the Christians I entered the church to see what they were doing. I was impressed by their manner of praying and felt drawn to their religion. “By God,” I said, “this is better than ours. I shall not leave them until the sun sets.”

I asked and was told that the Christian religion originated in Ash-Sham (Greater Syria). I did not go to my father’s estate that day and at night, I returned home. My father met me and asked what I had done. I told him about my meeting with the Christians and how I was impressed by their religion. He was dismayed and said:

“My son, there is nothing good in that religion. Your religion and the religion of your forefathers is better.”

“No, their religion is better than ours,” I insisted.

My father became upset and afraid that I would leave our religion. So he kept me locked up in the house and put a chain on my feet. I managed however to send a message to the Christians asking them to inform me of any caravan going to Syria. Before long they got in touch with me and told me that a caravan was headed for Syria. I managed to unfetter myself and in disguise accompanied the caravan to Syria. There, I asked who was the leading person in the Christian religion and was directed to the bishop of the church. I went up to him and said:

“I want to become a Christian and would like to attach myself to your service, learn from you and pray with you.”

The bishop agreed and I entered the church in his service. I soon found out, however, that the man was corrupt. He would order his followers to give money in charity while holding out the promise of blessings to them. When they gave anything to spend in the way of God, however, he would hoard it for himself and not give anything to the poor or needy. In this way he amassed a vast quantity of gold. When the bishop died and the Christians gathered to bury him, I told them of his corrupt practices and, at their request, showed them where he kept their donations. When they saw the large jars filled with gold and silver they said.

“By God, we shall not bury him.” They nailed him on a cross and threw stones at him. I continued in the service of the person who replaced him. The new bishop was an ascetic who longed for the Hereafter and engaged in worship day and night. I was greatly devoted to him and spent a long time in his company.

(After his death, Salman attached himself to various Christian religious figures, in Mosul, Nisibis and elsewhere. The last one had told him about the appearance of a Prophet in the land of the Arabs who would have a reputation for strict honesty, one who would accept a gift but would never consume charity (sadaqah) for himself. Salman continues his story.)

A group of Arab leaders from the Kalb tribe passed through Ammuriyah and I asked them to take me with them to the land of the Arabs in return for whatever money I had. They agreed

and I paid them. When we reached Wadi al-Qura (a place between Madinah and Syria), they broke their agreement and sold me to a Jew. I worked as a servant for him but eventually he sold me to a nephew of his belonging to the tribe of Banu Qurayzah. This nephew took me with him to Yathrib, the city of palm groves, which is how the Christian at Ammuriyah had described it.

At that time the Prophet was inviting his people in Makkah to Islam but I did not hear anything about him then because of the harsh duties which slavery imposed upon me.

When the Prophet reached Yathrib after his hijrah from Makkah, I was in fact at the top of a palm tree belonging to my master doing some work. My master was sitting under the tree. A nephew of his came up and said:

“May God declare war on the Aws and the Khazraj (the two main Arab tribes of Yathrib). By God, they are now gathering at Quba to meet a man who has today come from Makkah and who claims he is a Prophet.”

I felt hot flushes as soon as I heard these words and I began to shiver so violently that I was afraid that I might fall on my master. I quickly got down from the tree and spoke to my master’s nephew.

“What did you say? Repeat the news for me.”

My master was very angry and gave me a terrible blow. “What does this matter to you? Go back to what you were doing,” he shouted.

That evening, I took some dates that I had gathered and went to the place where the Prophet had alighted. I went up to him and said:

“I have heard that you are a righteous man and that you have companions with you who are strangers and are in need. Here is something from me as sadaqah. I see that you are more deserving of it than others.”

The Prophet ordered his companions to eat but he himself did not eat of it. I gathered some more dates and when the Prophet left Quba for Madinah I went to him and said: “I noticed that

you did not eat of the sadaqah I gave. This however is a gift for you.” Of this gift of dates, both he and his companions ate.

The strict honesty of the Prophet was one of the characteristics that led Salman to believe in him and accept Islam .

3.6 Prophet Muhammad in the Bible

This section shall be dedicated to illustrate some of the prophecies in the Bible foretelling about Prophet Muhammad. You might ask, if you as Muslims don't believe in the Bible, how do you claim that it talks about Prophet Muhammad? This may be answered in detail in the article talking about [how we as Muslims believe in the Bible](#). Actually when we say that Prophet Muhammad is foretold in the Bible, that doesn't mean we believe that the Bible is true the way it is now. We believe that the Bible still has some truth, but it is not fully true, nor is it a reliable source from God unless in parts where it agrees with the Quran. I myself think that these prophecies were much more clear than the way they are in now especially when I see that many early Muslim writings used to quote very clear verses foretelling about Prophet Muhammad. I myself think that these verses (although many of their signs pointing to Prophet Muhammad are still remaining which shall be shown below) as well as many issues in the Bible were subjected to a strong campaign of corruption and mutilation by both Jews and Christians. You may look at this as a conspiracy theory, but actually many of their signs are shown, for example we find that there were [accusations pointing to the Jews by Christians of corruptions of the Old Testament in verses telling about Jesus](#). There is an evidence that [Jews corrupted the name of the offered son to Isaac](#). There is many evidence proving [the Bible cannot be considered a reliable source from God](#).

3.6.1 A Prophet like Moses

This is a major prophecy in the Bible foretelling about a prophet like Moses who shall come from the brothers of Israel. God says in the Bible to Moses:

Deu 18:18 I will raise them up a prophet **from among their brethren, like unto thee;and I will put my words in his mouth**, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.

In this verse, God was talking to Moses (Peace be upon him), the word them refers to the Israelites. Now let's see the words I bolded.

I will begin with the first one:

“From among their brothers”: This means that the prophet foretold above shall not be from Israel, but from their brothers. This was also proved by what was mentioned in Deuteronomy 34:10

Deu 34:10 **And there hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses**, whom Jehovah knew face to face, Deu 34:11 in all the signs and the wonders, which Jehovah sent him to do in the land of Egypt, to Pharaoh, and to all his servants, and to all his land,

The word “brethren” is not particular with the Israelites as some may think, but it can sometimes mean the brothers of Israelites, for example it was mentioned concerning children of Esau, so there is no problem at all if it was mentioned for the Ishmaelites, especially that it's very clear here.

Deu 2:4 And command thou the people, saying, Ye are to pass through the border of **your brethren the children of Esau**, that dwell in Seir; and they will be afraid of you: take ye good heed unto yourselves therefore;

So was there any prophet sent from Esau descendants? No. Was there any prophecy concerning blessing of the descendants of Esau? No, and not only that, but also the blessing was taken away from him as mentioned in Genesis 27. Was there a prophet who came from the Ishmaelites? Yes, Prophet Muhammad. Was there any blessing concerning Ishmael in the Bible? Yes, **Ishmael was blessed in the Bible.**

Then we move to the next part, putting the words in his mouth, this is the way of revelation, since Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was illiterate, archangel Gabriel (Peace be upon him) taught him the verses of Quran in this way, by mouth.

Now we let's examine the words (like unto thee), and let's compare between Muhammad and Jesus (Peace be upon them) in this point, resemblance to Moses (Peace be upon him):

1. Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was born naturally as Moses (Peace be upon him), while Jesus (Peace be upon him) was born miraculously from no father.
2. Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was a political leader as Moses (Peace be upon him), while the Bible tells that Jesus said: "Give back to Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and to God the things that are God's." So he was not a political leader.
3. According to the Christian belief, Jesus (Peace be upon him) is God, while no one believed that Moses or Muhammad (Peace be upon them) were God.
4. Muhammad (Peace be upon him) came with a new law as Moses (Peace be upon him), while Jesus (Peace be upon him) didn't come to abolish but to fulfill.
5. Muhammad and Moses (Peace be upon them) died naturally, while Jesus (Peace be upon him) was raised to heaven.
6. Muhammad and Moses (Peace be upon him) married, but Jesus (Peace be upon him) didn't marry.
7. Muhammad and Moses (Peace be upon them) fought their enemies, while Jesus (Peace be upon him) didn't fight.

Some might say that the verse in Deuteronomy 18:15 says that the Prophet will be from Israel:

Deu 18:15 Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken;

Well, Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was raised within the Jews of Medina after his migration, and the verse reasserts in the same point again, and then in verse 18, by saying: "from unto their brothers", and since the word "their" was referred in this situation to the whole Israel, then it doesn't mean some tribes than others, but it means the brothers of the Israelites who can be no one but the Ishmaelites from where Muhammad(Peace be upon him) was raised.

Someone else might say that Peter quoted it in Acts in reference to Jesus, well the quote itself is not a proof, for example, Matthew quoted the Immanuel's prophecy and it had nothing to do with Jesus. Besides, the quote itself is not accurate:

Act 7:37 This is that Moses, who said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me.

It doesn't contain "from the midst of thee", besides the prophecy tells that the one raised is a prophet, it didn't say for example:"I will descend to them", but " I will raise them a prophet", so even if this prophecy if it didn't prove the prophecy of Muhammad (Peace be upon him), it disproves the divinity of Jesus (Peace be upon him) whom Christians always get upset when Muslims consider him a prophet. But the prophecy clearly tells about Muhammad (Peace be upon him) as shown above.

And look also at what the Jews said to John the Baptist:

Joh 1:19 And this is the witness of John, when the Jews sent unto him from Jerusalem priests and Levites to ask him, Who art thou? Joh 1:20 And he confessed, and denied not; and he confessed, **I am not the Christ.** Joh 1:21 And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elijah? And he saith, I am not. **Art thou the prophet?** And he answered, No.

Joh 1:25 And they asked him, and said unto him, Why then baptizest thou, if thou art not the Christ, neither Elijah, neither the prophet?

This means that the Jews knew that the Christ is other than the prophet, some might say that since the Jews asked John, this will mean that the Prophet is Israelite, this is not necessary as it may happen that the Jews misinterpret the prophecies, but on the other hand, John the Baptist didn't deny that the prophet is someone other than the Christ, and since he is not the prophet, he only said no, I am not the prophet, but he didn't correct their misunderstanding and say that the Christ is the Prophet.

3.6.2 Blessing of Ishmael

The Bible tells what God said about the blessing of Ishmael's descendants:

Gen 17:20 And as for Ishmael, I have heard thee: behold, **I have blessed him**, and will make him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly; twelve princes shall he beget, and I will make him a great nation.

Gen 17:7 And I will establish my covenant **between me and thee and thy seed** after thee throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.

Gen 21:13 And also of the son of the handmaid will I make a nation, **because he is thy seed**.

Gen 21:17 And God heard the voice of the lad. And the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, What aileth thee, Hagar? Fear not. For God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Gen 21:18 Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thy hand. For I will make him **a great nation**.

As we see here, God in the Bible is talking about Ishmael as being blessed, and that he will have a great nation, blessing according to the Bible is prophecy in his descendants, for example if we looked at Genesis 27 at the story when Jacob took the blessing from Esau. No prophets were raised from Esau's descendants, but many prophets were raised from Isaac's seed. And [Prophet Muhammad was raised from Ishmael's descendants who are the brothers of Israel](#) as the Bible tells in Deuteronomy 18:18.

Someone might say that this prophecy was fulfilled in that verse which say that Ishmael shall have 12 sons:

Gen 25:13 And these are the names of the sons of Ishmael, by their names, according to their generations: the first-born of Ishmael, Nebaioth, and Kedar, and Adbeel, and Mibsam, Gen 25:14 and Mishma, and Dumah, and Massa, Gen 25:15 Hadad, and Tema, Jetur, Naphish, and Kedemah. Gen 25:16 These are the sons of Ishmael, and these are their names, by their villages, and by their encampments. Twelve princes according to their nations.

Well, look at what is said in Genesis 17:

Gen 17:7 And I will establish my covenant **between me and thee and thy seed** after thee throughout their generations for an everlasting covenant, to be a God unto thee and to thy seed after thee. Gen 17:8 And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee, the land of thy sojournings, all the land of Canaan, for an everlasting possession; and I will be their God. Gen 17:9 And God said unto Abraham, And as for thee, thou shalt keep my covenant, thou, and thy seed after thee throughout their generations. Gen 17:10 This is my covenant, which ye shall keep, between me and you and thy seed after thee: **every male among you shall be circumcised**. Gen 17:11 And ye shall be circumcised in the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of a covenant betwixt me and you. Gen 17:12 And he that is eight days old shall be circumcised among you, every male throughout your generations, he that is born in the house, or bought with money of any foreigner that is not of thy seed. Gen 17:13 He that is born in thy house, and he that is bought with thy money, must needs be circumcised: and my covenant shall be in your flesh for an **everlasting covenant**. Gen 17:14 And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin, **that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant**.

So it clearly tells that the sign of this covenant is circumcision, this covenant is everlasting and that the one who don't circumcise breaks God's covenant, which Muslims already do while according to Christians , Paul cancelled circumcision.

Other might say that the covenant is with Isaac only as it says:

Gen 17:21 But my covenant will I establish with Isaac, whom Sarah shall bear unto thee at this set time in the next year.

Well, this was in the beginning, then it was transferred to Ishmael's descendants, and that's what is told in the New Testament when Jesus said to the Jews that the kingdom of God shall be taken away from them:

Mat 21:43 Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.

Calling Ishmael as a fruitful, and have a great nation is very clear in praising him, otherwise, if God knew that a false prophet came from his descendants where a great nation followed him, why did He describe this nation as great?

Besides the Bible tells in another part:

Gen 12:3 and I will bless them that bless thee, and him that curseth thee will I curse: and in thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed.

We Muslims bless Abraham everyday in our prayer. At the end of every prayer, a Muslim must say:

“All the compliments, prayers and good things are due to Allah; peace be upon you, O Prophet, and Allah’s Mercy and Blessings be upon you. Peace be on us and on the true pious devotees of Allah. I testify that none has the right to be worshipped but Allah and I also testify that Muhammad is His slave and His Messenger. O Allah! send your Salat (Blessings, Graces, Honors and Mercy) on Muhammad and the family of Muhammad as **You sent Your Salat on Abraham and the family of Abraham.** O Allah! Send Your Blessings on Muhammad and the family of Muhammad as **You sent Your Blessings on Abraham and the family of Abraham.** You are Praiseworthy, Most Gracious.”

So if Muslims bless Abraham, the Bible says that God blesses who bless him, how come that the followers of a false prophet be blessed?

3.6.3 Isaiah 42

Isaiah 42 is an interesting prophecy telling about Muhammad (Peace be upon him). This prophecy was told in the Hadiths, there is a lot of variation between it and what is said in Isaiah, but textual variants are present much in the Bible, and there are many inaccurate quotes made by writers of the NT, lets look at the hadith in Bukhari:

“O Prophet ! We have sent you as a witness (for Allah’s True religion) And a giver of glad tidings (to the faithful believers), And a warner (to the unbelievers) And guardian of the illiterates(gentiles). You are My slave and My messenger (i.e. Apostle). I have named you “Al-Mutawakkil” (who depends upon Allah). You are neither discourteous, harsh Nor a noise-maker in the markets And you do not do evil to those Who do evil to you, but you deal With them with forgiveness and kindness. Allah will not let him (the Prophet) Die till he makes straight the crooked people by making them say: “None has the right to be worshipped but Allah,” With which will be opened blind eyes And deaf ears and enveloped hearts.”

Now let’s examine the Biblical prophecy:

Isa 42:1 Behold, my servant, whom I uphold; my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my Spirit upon him; he will bring forth justice to the Gentiles.

The first thing the prophecy tells about is that the one being foretold is that he is a servant for God, which can’t be applied for Jesus(Peace be upon him) by the Christian view since Christians say that he is God, it may be said that this is for the human nature, this won’t be logical because if God wants to foretell about his coming, He would have foretold about the divine nature not the human nature, since all of us are humans, so there won’t be something new in the prophecy.

Then the prophecy tells that he will bring justice to the gentiles, this also is not Jesus (Peace be upon him) because he said:

“I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel. “(Mat 15:24)

Some might say that he ordered the disciples to preach the gospel to the whole world, well these are the disciples not him, and this was confirmed by Albert Barnes in his commentary on Mat 15:24:

“Mat_15:24 But he answered and said, I am not sent ... – This answer was made to the woman, not to the disciples.

The “lost sheep of the house of Israel” were the Jews. **He came first to them. He came as their expected Messiah. He came to preach the gospel himself to the Jews only. Afterward it was preached to the Gentiles, but the ministry of Jesus was confined almost entirely to the Jews.”**

<http://www.sacred-texts.com/bib/cmt/barnes/mat015.htm>

Isa 42:2 He will not cry, nor lift up his voice, nor cause it to be heard in the street. Isa 42:3 A bruised reed will he not break, and a dimly burning wick will he not quench: he will bring forth justice in truth.

Then the prophecy tells about his morals, you can read the [morals](#) section to see how was the Prophet’s actions, see for example these hadiths:

Anas Ibn Malik reported: I served the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) for ten years, and, by Allah, he never said to me any harsh word, and he never said to me about a thing as to why I had done that and as to why I had not done that. (Al Bukhari)

The Prophet never took revenge (over anybody) for his own sake but (he did) only when Allah’s Legal Bindings were outraged in which case he would take revenge for Allah’s Sake. And he never used bad language. He used to say “The best amongst you are those who have the best manners and character.” He never criticized any food (presented him), but he would eat it if he liked it; otherwise, he would leave it without expressing his dislike. (Al Bukhari more than one hadith)

Isa 42:4 He will not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set justice in the earth; and the isles shall wait for his law.

He kept on telling about Islam, and faced a lot of harm, but he wasn’t discouraged till God gave him the victory. This may be shown by reading [the life of Prophet Muhammad](#).

The prophecy approaches and says that the isles shall wait for his law, Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) came with the final law, while Jesus (Peace be upon him) didn’t come to

abolish but to fulfill, and then Christians claimed that the Mosaic law was for the Jews only but they are not committed to it, that's why they don't circumcise, eat pork,...etc. At the same time, Jesus said that he just came to fulfill the law, not that he came with a new detailed law as Moses and Muhammad (Peace be upon them). Besides, the Christian faith is mainly concerning on the concept of salvation through faith only not law and works, so when we say that the isles shall wait for his law, this couldn't be applied on Jesus.

Isa 42:11 Let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up their voice, the villages that Kedar doth inhabit; let the inhabitants of Sela sing, let them shout from the top of the mountains.

Then the prophecy gives 2 special places, Kedar and Sela, Kedar is the second son of Ishmael (Genesis 25:13), [Sela](#) is a mountain in Medina, and it was mentioned in hadiths as [this](#) for example. You may say that the Bible's dictionary tells that it is Petra. Well there may be more than one Sela as Seir for example:

H8165

say-eer'

Formed like H8163; rough; Seir, a mountain of Idumaea and its aboriginal occupants, also one in Palestine: – Seir.(Strong's dictionary)

Besides according to what I know nothing happened in Petra with Jesus (Peace be upon him), and even if it was Petra, Petra is in Jordan which is a Muslim country. You may say that this verse meant that all people will be happy with the coming of Jesus. I say: Christianity in Arabia was limited in Najran in Yemen, and in the borders with the Roman country which was mostly a political alliance not a real belief. But as for the overwhelming majority of Arabs, they were not Christians, and Christians were very few. Even before Islam comes, I never heard about a main Christian church in Arabia as that in Antioch, Alexandria, Ephesus or Rome. I never heard of an Arab church father. But when Islam came, all Arabs became Muslims. If the prophecy really meant Christianity it would have mentioned a major Christian city not the center of Islam.

Isa 42:13 Jehovah will go forth as a mighty man; he will stir up *his* zeal like a man of war: he will cry, yea, he will shout aloud; he will do mightily against his enemies.

Then the prophecy tells about fighting God's enemy which is certainly what Muhammad (Peace be upon him) did, while Jesus(Peace be upon him) didn't fight.

Isa 42:17 They shall be turned back, they shall be utterly put to shame, that trust in graven images, that say unto molten images, Ye are our gods.

Then it tells that those who worship the idols would come into shame, Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was sent to a pagan environment, while Jesus (Peace be upon him) was sent to the Jews, and he was never concerned with worshipping images as the Old Testament was, because his conversation with the Jews was mainly to prove that he came from God and that he is the Messiah.

Finally the prophecy says:

Isa 42:18 Hear, ye deaf; and look, ye blind, that ye may see. Isa 42:19 Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I send? who is blind as he that is at peace with me, and blind as Jehovah's servant?

Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was seeking God before being a prophet, as God says in the Quran:

52. And thus have We revealed to thee the Word by Our command. Thou didst not know what the Book was, nor what the faith. But We have made the revelation a light, whereby We guide such of Our servants as WE please. And, truly, thou guidest mankind to the right path, (Holy Quran 42:52)

While Jesus (Peace be upon him) was in an Israelite environment who had God's message, and he went to the temple since he was young, so this can't be applied on him.

3.6.4 Paran

The Old Testament tells an interesting issue about a place called Paran. It says in Deuteronomy:

Deu 33:1 And this is the blessing, wherewith Moses the man of God blessed the children of Israel before his death.

Deu 33:2 And he said, Jehovah came from Sinai, And rose from Seir unto them; **He shined forth from mount Paran, And he came from the ten thousands of holy ones:** At his right hand was a fiery law for them. (ASV)

And in the Septuagaint:

33:2 And he said, The Lord is come from Sina, and has appeared from Seir to us, **and has hasted out of the mount of Pharan, with the ten thousands of Cades;** on his right hand [were] his angels with him.

This prophecy here tells about the three prophets Moses (Peace be upon him) “The LORD came from Sinai”, then Jesus (Peace be upon him) “and rose up from Seir unto them” then finally Muhammad (Peace be upon him) in the bolded words.

Paran is Mecca not Sinai and it is where Ishmael (Peace be upon him) lived in as mentioned in Genesis:

Gen 21:20 And God was with the lad, and he grew. And he dwelt in the wilderness, and became, as he grew up, an archer. Gen 21:21 And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran. And his mother took him a wife out of the land of Egypt.

God was with the lad, etc. — **Paran (that is, Arabia)**, where his posterity has ever dwelt (compare Gen_16:12; also Isa_48:19; 1Pe_1:25). (Jamisson, Fausset and Brown commentary)

<http://bibleapps.com/ifb/genesis/21.htm>

And Strong’s Dictionary tells:

H6290

pâ'rân

From H6286; ornamental; Paran, **a desert of Arabia:** – Paran.

<http://www.abibleconcordance.com/40H-0300.htm>

The descendants of Ishmael (Peace be upon him) were in Arabia not in Sinai:

Gen 25:18 And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur that is before Egypt, as thou goest toward Assyria. He abode over against all his brethren.

Gen 25:18 – And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur,.... That is, the posterity of Ishmael, whose country reached from one place to the other; not from India to Chaluza, as the Targums of Jonathan and Jerusalem; but the extent is that vast desert of Arabia, which eastward was called the wilderness of Havilah, and westward the wilderness of Shur; so that they inhabited it from east to west: (John Gill’s commentary)

<http://www.biblestudytools.com/commentaries/gills-exposition-of-the-bible/genesis-25-18.html>

And Rabbi Rachi tells in his commentary that Paran in Deuteronomy 33 refers to the Ishmaelites:

“from Mount Paran [Why did God then come from Paran?] Because He went there and offered the children of Ishmael [who dwelled in Paran] to accept the Torah, but they [also] did not want [to accept it].”

<http://www.chabad.org/parshah/torahreading.asp?aid=36242&p=1&showrashi=true>

Yes, Paran was mentioned somewhere else in other parts, and doesn’t seem from these scripts that they tell about Arabia, but that doesn’t mean that they is one Paran, for example, there were 2 places called Seir, look at Strong’s dictionary:

H8165

say-eer’

Formed like H8163; rough; Seir, a mountain of Idumaea and its aboriginal occupants, also one in Palestine: – Seir.

<http://www.abibleconcordance.com/40H-8100.htm#h8165>

Also what proves that Paran is not Sinai in that case is that nothing happened in it, even the great nation God promised Ishmael with (Genesis 20:20, 21:18) was certainly in Arabia not Sinai, where in Mecca, the revelation came to Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and from that time, the Arabs became a great nation by God’s religion Islam, that’s why the prophecy was still mentioned in at the end of the OT Habakkuk :

Hab 3:3 God came from Teman, And the Holy One from mount Paran. Selah. His glory covered the heavens, And the earth was full of his praise. Hab 3:4 And his brightness was as the light; He had rays coming forth from his hand; And there was the hiding of his power. Hab 3:5 Before him went the pestilence, And fiery bolts went forth at his feet.

And Teman is the South:

H8486

tay-mawn', tay-mawn'

Denominative from H3225; the south (as being on the right hand of a person facing the east): – south (side, -ward, wind).

<http://www.abibleconcordance.com/40H-8400.htm#h8486>

And that's what Darby's translation gives:

(DRB) God will come from the south, and the holy one from mount Pharan: His glory covered the heavens, and the earth is full of his praise.

Arabia is well-known to be in the South of Palestine.

And this answers the objection that this prophecy is out of context, since the beginning of what God said was in verse 2, it was as an introduction, then He talked about the blessing of Israel throughout the chapter, so this prophecy in Habakkuk proves that it was a prophecy.

Then we come to the second evidence and he came with ten thousands of saints: from his right hand went a fiery law for them. This part is foretelling about the conquest of Mecca, when ten thousands Muslims entered Mecca. See [this](#) as a historical proof even from non-Muslims.

3.6.5 Psalm 45

Psalm 45 is also one of the prophecies foretelling about Muhammad not Jesus (Peace be upon them). To prove this, we can look at the prophecy itself:

Psa 45:3 Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one, Thy glory and thy majesty.

Muhammad (Peace be upon him) fought God's enemies, while Jesus (Peace be upon him) said:

Joh 18:11 Jesus therefore said unto Peter, **Put up the sword into the sheath: the cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it?**

Some may refer this to his second coming, so let's continue on:

Psa 45:8 All thy garments smell of myrrh, and aloes, and cassia; Out of ivory palaces stringed instruments have made thee glad.

Muhammad (Peace be upon him) ruled and received gifts from Egyptian ruler, and from Heraclius, while Jesus (Peace be upon him) didn't rule, nor did he receive gifts.

Psa 45:9 Kings' daughters are among thy honorable women: At thy right hand doth stand the queen in gold of Ophir.

You believe that Jesus (Peace be upon him) didn't marry either kings' daughters or other women, but Muhammad (Peace be upon him) married 2 daughters of Arab leaders, and after his death, his descendent Al Hussein married the daughter of the last Persian king.

Psa 45:10 Hearken, O daughter, and consider, and incline thine ear; Forget also thine own people, and thy father's house: Psa 45:11 So will the king desire thy beauty; For he is thy lord; and reverence thou him.

This daughter is Safiyya daughter of Hoyay ibn Akhtab, this man was one of the Jewish leaders who fought Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him), and then Prophet Muhammad married her.

Saffiyah says, "I was my father's and my uncle's favorite daughter. When the Messenger of Allah came to Madinah and stayed at Quba, my parents went to him at night and when they looked disconcerted and worn out. I received them cheerfully but to my surprise no one of them turned to me. They were so grieved that they did not feel my presence. I heard my uncle, Abu Yasir, saying to my father, 'Is it really him (the final prophet) ?' He said, 'Yes, by Allah'. My uncle said: 'Can you recognize him and confirm this?' He said, 'Yes'. My uncle said, 'How do you feel towards him?' He said, 'By Allah I shall be his enemy as long as I live.'" (Ibn Hisham, As-Sirah an-Nabawiyah)

Then the Prophet defeated Hoyayy in Khaibar's battle, and took Safiyya for himself, "at the beginning she used to hate him because he killed her father and husband, the Prophet kept on apologizing to her and telling: Your father charged the Arabs against me and committed heinous act," he apologized to the extent that made Safiyyah get rid of her bitterness against the Prophet" as mentioned by Al Bayhaqi in Dalael Al Nobowwa, And made her to choose if she would be free from captivation, or that she would marry him, and she chose to marry him as narrated by Ibn Hibban.

You may object saying that this Psalm tells about the Messiah, and give the script:

Psa 45:6 Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: A sceptre of equity is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Psa 45:7 Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated wickedness: Therefore God, thy God, hath anointed thee With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.

Well, when the Psalm says "O God", this wasn't directed to the one being foretold here. It's a praise for God. Then it came in verse 7, and retells about Muhammad (Peace be upon him), and it's very clear when it says ". Therefore God, thy God hath anointed thee With the oil of gladness above thy fellows.", this clearly tells that the Messiah is not God, the word Messiah doesn't necessarily mean Jesus (Peace be upon him), but it means the anointed man as mentioned in 2Sa 1:14 concerning Saul.

2Sa 1:14 And David said unto him, How wast thou not afraid to put forth thy hand to destroy Jehovah's anointed?

This word for anointed is:

H4899

מָשִׁיחַ

mâshîyach maw-shee'-akh

From H4886; anointed; usually a consecrated person (as a king, priest, or saint); specifically the Messiah: – anointed, Messiah.

<http://www.abibleconcordance.com/40H-4800.htm#h4899>

So this doesn't necessarily mean Jesus as a Messiah, but the word anyone who is anointed by God.

3.6.6 A burden upon Arabia

This prophecy also is one of the important prophecies telling about Muhammad (Peace be upon him):

Isa 21:13 The burden upon Arabia. In the forest in Arabia shall ye lodge, O ye caravans of Dedanites. **Isa 21:14** Unto him that was thirsty they brought water; the inhabitants of the land of Tema did meet the fugitives with their bread. **Isa 21:15** For they fled away from the swords, from the drawn sword, and from the bent bow, and from the grievousness of war. **Isa 21:16** For thus hath the Lord said unto me, Within a year, according to the years of a hireling, all the glory of Kedar shall fail; **Isa 21:17** and the residue of the number of the archers, the mighty men of the children of Kedar, shall be few; for Jehovah, the God of Israel, hath spoken it.

This prophecy tells about the migration of Muhammad(Peace be upon him) from Mecca to Medina with his intimate disciple Abu Bakr, Muhammad(Peace be upon him). The Arab pagans tried to kill Muhammad(Peace be upon him) by swords while he is getting out of his house to migrate, but God blinded them and made them all fall asleep while he gets out, and he passed peacefully. (Ibn Hisham). You can read more about the migration even here:

http://www.4muhammed.com/Raheeq_Al-Makhtum-EN/51-Migration-of-the-Prophet

Then the prophecy tells about the Battle of Badr which happened after the migration and Muslims defeated the Arab pagans, and most of their leaders were killed in that battle, this was the beginning of their end. You can read about what happened in Battle of Badr in detail here:

http://www.4muhammed.com/Raheeq_Al-Makhtum-EN/59-The-Battle-of-Badr

3.6.8 The Paraclete

Christians believe that the paraclete or Comforter whom Jesus mentioned is the Holy Spirit. Actually this prophecy tells about Muhammad (Peace be upon him). How come? Let's see what Jesus said:

Joh 14:26 But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.

The word "he shall teach you all things" can't be applied on the Holy Spirit, because Christian scholars misinterpreted many issues. For example if we looked at the Early Church Fathers, we will find that many of them adopted heretic opinions, you can see this in my article [Holy Spirit and Guidance](#). If all these misinterpretations and diversities among Christian sects occurred, then what is the job of the Holy Spirit? Isn't he supposed to teach them all things? Otherwise this means that most of the Early Church Fathers whom Christians mainly depend on as they took their faith from them, and knew the Bible canons from them rejected the Holy Spirit when he told them the truth. This is a blasphemy against the Holy Spirit:

Mat 12:32 And whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of man, it shall be forgiven him; but whosoever shall speak against the Holy Spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come.

This will consequently mean that either Christians took their doctrine and their faith from heretic church fathers, or that we have the first choice that the Holy Spirit will not be the Paraclete mentioned in that prophecy. But in case of Muhammad (Peace be upon him), he told us what to believe, what to do and not to do through what God revealed to him either in the Quran or in the Sunna, if a Muslim misunderstood a verse or had a wrong opinion, then he will be the one who is mistaken, not the Quran or the Sunna since we don't believe that there is a Holy Spirit in us.

Back to John 14:26, it says that the Comforter will be sent in Jesus' name, so all those who believe in Jesus must follow him, and that he will teach all things, which was what Prophet Muhammad did. He shall also remind them of what Jesus said. This was done by Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him), when God said in the Quran concerning Jesus (Peace be upon him):

and giving glad tidings of a Messenger who will come after me, his name being Ahmad. (Sura 61:6)

The word “Holy Spirit” in John 14:26 doesn’t mean that the Comforter is the Holy Spirit the third person in the Trinity, since the word “Spirit”, wasn’t particular with the Holy Spirit, for example see this script:

1Jo 4:1 Beloved, believe not every spirit, but prove the spirits, whether they are of God; because many false prophets are gone out into the world.

This proves that the word spirit is not particular with the third person in Trinity, but it can also mean the prophets. And if Jesus meant the Holy Spirit from the beginning, he would have said “the Holy Spirit whom you know” instead of “the Spirit of the Truth”, especially that the Holy Spirit was present before in other parts as I will show later.

Joh 15:26 But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me: Joh 15:27 and ye also bear witness, because ye have been with me from the beginning.

Muhammad (Peace be upon him) was sent by God (Whom you call the Father), and he testified for Jesus (Peace be upon him), while the Catholics and Protestants believe that the Holy Spirit proceeded from both Father and Son, and all what the Holy Spirit did when he came to the disciples in Acts, all what he had done is that he made them speak with different languages. And disciples at that time already knew Jesus, so this was told to the Christians at the age of Muhammad (Peace be upon him) when they see his testimony concerning Jesus, so they will testify because they already believed in Jesus.

Joh 16:7 Nevertheless I tell you the truth: It is expedient for you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you.

And this can’t be applied on the Holy Spirit, because the Holy Spirit was already present at that time when he came on Mary (Luke 1:35) and Simon (Luke 2:25), and when John the Baptist said concerning Jesus that he shall baptize them with Holy Spirit and fire, and when the Holy Spirit descended on Jesus as a dove (Mat 3:17), and when he breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit: (John 20:22). All this proves that the Holy Spirit was already present, while in case of Muhammad(Peace be upon him), he wasn’t present at that time.

An objection may be raised, how will Jesus send Muhammad (Peace be upon them). Well, the verse may mean that since they are not on the same time, that the coming of Muhammad (Peace be upon him) must be on condition that Jesus (Peace be upon him) is not on Earth, so sending him will be that way which is by raising Jesus (Peace be upon him) being raised to him.

Joh 16:8 And he, when he is come, will convict the world in respect of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment:

This also is a very important proof that the Holy Spirit is not that one foretold, because he is supposed to help the believers not to convict the disbelievers, Christian commentators say that the meaning of this verse is that he shall convince the disbelievers, but actually this is not the case, since many people in the world know nothing about Christianity or Jesus, and if this was the case, there would have been no need for evangelists or apologists to preach Christianity and defend it since the Holy Spirit already does so. But this actually foretells about Muhammad (Peace be upon him), since he rebuked the Jews for disbelieving in Jesus (Peace be upon him), and the Trinitarians for saying that Jesus is God and the Trinity (which is not the proper belief in Jesus (Peace be upon him)), and all pagans for idolatry.

Joh 16:13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come.

This means that the one foretold here is not God, because he is not speaking of himself, but he tells what he hears from God, which is not the case of the Holy Spirit, since it is supposed that it is God. Besides he tells about fore coming events, which Muhammad (Peace be upon him) already did, and this is an example of [things prophesied by Prophet Muhammad](#) (Peace be upon him).

So we can conclude from that the Holy Spirit is not the one foretold by Jesus here, but it was foretelling about a prophet who is Muhammad (Peace be upon him), as for saying in Acts 1:4 that Jesus told them “to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me”, this is not necessary that it was telling about these verse, especially that Luke the one who is supposed to be the writer of Acts didn’t say anything about the Paraclete in his Gospel of Luke.

Finally, I would like to note that there were some heretics in the early stage who claimed to be the paraclete as Montanus for example who claimed to be the promised paraclete, and Tertullian, who is considered one of the most important early Christian apologists, was one of his followers, who believed that he is the paraclete. Mani also claimed that he is the Paraclete. This means that saying that the Holy Spirit is the paraclete wasn’t standing on a solid ground. You can see Philip Schaff’s history Voume 2. 110 to know more about [Montanus and Tertullian.](#), and Volume 2 . 135 to know about [Mani](#). This is a proof that the paraclete was looked at as a prophet not the Holy Spirit whom Christians know.

3.6.9 The Rejected Stone and the Kingdom of God

During his conversation with the Jews, Jesus gave an interesting Parable and reminded them of the rejected stone which became the head of the corner. How could this be a prophecy foretelling about Prophet Muhammad and Islam? Let's look at what Jesus said:

Mat 21:33 Hear another parable: There was a man that was a householder, who planted a vineyard, and set a hedge about it, and digged a winepress in it, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into another country. Mat 21:34 And when the season of the fruits drew near, he sent his servants to the husbandmen, to receive his fruits. Mat 21:35 And the husbandmen took his servants, and beat one, and killed another, and stoned another. Mat 21:36 Again, he sent other servants more than the first: and they did unto them in like manner. Mat 21:37 But afterward he sent unto them his son, saying, They will reverence my son. Mat 21:38 But the husbandmen, when they saw the son, said among themselves, This is the heir; come, let us kill him, and take his inheritance. Mat 21:39 And they took him, and cast him forth out of the vineyard, and killed him. Mat 21:40 When therefore the lord of the vineyard shall come, what will he do unto those husbandmen? Mat 21:41 They say unto him, He will miserably destroy those miserable men, and will let out the vineyard unto other husbandmen, who shall render him the fruits in their seasons.

Here in this parable, the one meant by the householder is God, and the vineyard is the law, the servants are God's prophets, and the son of the householder is Jesus. Of course the word son here means the general Jewish meaning, as there were many people called God's sons as Jacob in Exodus4:22, you can see my article "[Is Jesus the son of God?](#)".

This also doesn't necessarily mean that he will be crucified, for it tells about what the Jews intended to do, and it may be a test from God to Jesus (Peace be upon him) that he thought first that he will be killed, but God saved him at the end.

Anyway, back to the parable, it's very clear that it tells about how people deviated from God's law, and killed his prophets, and made them rule on themselves, when he asked them how will the vineyard will act with these men, they told him that he will destroy them, and give it to other husbandmen, then Jesus says:

Mat 21:42 Jesus saith unto them, Did ye never read in the scriptures, The stone which the builders rejected, The same was made the head of the corner; This was from the Lord, And it is marvelous in our eyes? Mat 21:43 Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof. Mat 21:44 And

he that falleth on this stone shall be broken to pieces: but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust.

He tells them here about those who will take the kingdom of God, the rejected stone is Ishmael's descendants, as the Bible clearly says:

Gen 16:12 And he shall be as a wild ass among men; his hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell over against all his brethren.

As Ishmael's descendants were living in the desert, they were called wild. The verse also tells that he will fight every man, and every man will fight him, which is really true, and this was before Islam as the Bible tells sometimes for example in Jeremiah 49, and after Islam where Muslims fought the non-Muslims, and non-Muslims fought Muslims, since all disbelievers agree on fighting Islam, so the real case is that the situation is altered after Islam, and this really is exactly expressed by Jesus when he says that the rejected stone became the head of the corner, and that the one who falls on it will be broken, and the one whom the stone falls on will scatter into dust.

Then he says:

Mat 21:43 Therefore say I unto you, The kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given to a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof.

Which means the transmission of the covenant from Isaac to Ishmael, and it can't mean the Church, since it says that this nation will bring forth the fruits, which is written in ESV:

(ESV)Therefore I tell you, the kingdom of God will be taken away from you and given to a people producing its fruits.

And in the CEV:

(CEV)I tell you that God's kingdom will be taken from you and given to people who will do what he demands.

Which can't be applied on the Church since they followed Paul who cancelled the law, or at least made it exclusive for the Jews, and made the salvation only in faith:

Gal 2:16 yet knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law but through faith in Jesus Christ, even we believed on Christ Jesus, that we might be justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law: because by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.

Heb 6:1 Wherefore leaving the doctrine of the first principles of Christ, let us press on unto perfection; not laying again a foundation of repentance from dead works, and of faith toward God,

Violating what Jesus (Peace be upon him) clearly said:

Mat 5:17 Think not that I came to destroy the law or the prophets: I came not to destroy, but to fulfil.

Mat 19:17 And he said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good: but if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments.

Mat 23:1 Then spake Jesus to the multitudes and to his disciples, Mat 23:2 saying, The scribes and the Pharisees sit on Moses seat: Mat 23:3 all things therefore whatsoever they bid you, these do and observe: but do not ye after their works; for they say, and do not.

So Jesus (Peace be upon him) is very clear in ordering his disciples to keep the commandments and keep the law, which is what Christians supposed to be, while the Bible clearly threatens those who don't follow the law:

Deu 28:15 But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of Jehovah thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day, that all these curses shall come upon thee, and overtake thee. Deu 28:16 Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Deu 28:17 Cursed shall be thy basket and thy kneading-trough. Deu 28:18 Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy ground, the increase of thy cattle, and the young of thy flock. Deu 28:19 Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. Deu 28:20 Jehovah will send upon thee cursing, discomfiture, and rebuke, in all that thou puttest thy hand unto to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly; because of the evil of thy doings, whereby thou hast forsaken me.

So according to the Bible, what Paul did can't be accepted at all, which means that all those who follow Paul, can't be meant in that prophecy, but this prophecy foretells about the Islamic nation, whom God said concerning it in the Quran:

110. You are the best people raised for the good of mankind; you enjoin good and forbid evil and believe in ALLAH. And if the People of the Book had believed, it would have, surely, been better for them. Some of them are believers, but most of them are transgressors. (Holy Quran 3:110)

4 JESUS

4.1 WHAT DOES ISLAM TELL ABOUT JESUS?

Before explaining the Islamic belief in Jesus, I must first explain what Islam means. Islam means that we only worship God who created us and created the Universe, so He is the Only One that deserves to be worshiped. God sent messengers to tell people about this absolute fact and remind them about it and about its requirements, Jesus (Peace be upon him) was one of the prophets.

We as Muslims believe in Jesus (Peace be upon him), we believe in him being miraculously born from virgin Mary:

91. And remember her who guarded her chastity, so WE breathed into her of Our Word and WE made her and her son a Sign for all peoples. (Holy Koran 21:91).

Not only this we also have a chapter in the Koran called the chapter of Mary. This chapter talked about the birth of Jesus (Peace be upon him).

<http://quran.al-islam.com/Targama/dispTargam.asp?nType=1&t=eng&nSora=19&nAya=1&l=eng>

We believe in the miracles God gave to Jesus (Peace be upon him) that he spoke while he was only a baby, healed those born blind, healed the lepers, revived the dead, breathed life into a bird made of clay, the Koran mentioned all these miracles and we acknowledge it. All Muslims love Jesus (Peace be upon him).

But at the same time we can't say that he is God. God is mightier than being incarnated to a man who comes out of his mother, then grows as a baby, eats, enters the bathroom, gets tired,.....etc. or having a son, all these beliefs were found after Jesus (Peace be upon him) and Jesus (Peace be upon him) is totally innocent from saying this. Jesus never said that even in the Bible as the next articles shall illustrate.

171. O People of the Book ! exceed not the limits in your religion, and say not of ALLAH anything but the truth. Verily, the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, was only a Messenger of ALLAH, and a fulfillment of HIS word which HE has sent down to Mary, and a mercy from HIM. So believe in ALLAH and HIS Messengers, and say not, `They are three.` Desist, it will be better for you. Verily, ALLAH is the only One God. Holy is HE, far above having a son. To HIM belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth. And sufficient is ALLAH as a guardian.

172. Surely, the Messiah disdains not to be a servant of ALLAH, nor do the angels who are near to Him, (Holy Quran 4)

We believe that Jesus wasn't crucified, but that God saved him from crucifixion, and his appearance was put on someone else(most probably Judas), so that they thought that they were crucifying him, but actually they were not, and he was raised to Heaven. Look at what the Quran says:

**156. And for their disbelief(the Jews) and for their uttering against Mary a grievous calumny;
157. And for their saying, `We did slay the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, the Messenger of ALLAH;' whereas they slew him not, nor did they bring about his death upon the cross, but he was made to appear to them like one crucified; and those who differ therein are certainly in a state of doubt about it; they have no certain knowledge thereof, but only pursue conjecture;and they did not arrive at a certainty concerning it(Holy Quran 4:156-157**

The next sections shall discuss these points in detail and prove that there is no solid evidence showing that Jesus is God or Son of God or that he was crucified.

4.2 JESUS SAYS IT “I AM NOT GOD”

A common question that has been a point of dispute among the history is: “Is Jesus God?”. Muslims believe he is not God, but a prophet. Christians say that he is God. Now as there is a dispute, there must be a judge to solve this dispute. The judge here is Jesus himself, what did Jesus say in the Bible?

Jesus (Peace be upon him) never said that he is God, the Quran says:

116. And when ALLAH will say, ‘O Jesus, son of Mary, didst thou say to men, ‘Take me and my mother for two gods beside ALLAH?’ he will answer, ‘Holy art THOU, I could never say that which I had no right. If I had said it, Thou wouldst have surely known it. Thou knowest what is in my mind, and I know not what is in Thy mind. It is Thou alone WHO art the Knower of all hidden things; 117. ‘I said nothing to them except that which Thou didst command me – Worship ALLAH, my Lord and your Lord. And I was a witness over them as long as I remained among them, but since Thou didst cause me to die, Thou, hast been the Watcher over them, and Thou art Witness over all things; 118. ‘If Thou punish them, they are Thy servants; and if Thou forgive them, Thou surely art the Mighty, the Wise. ‘

Note: Taking Mary as a god is what the Catholics do concerning the intercession of Mary, since they pray to her and believe that she can benefit them, we as Muslims consider this as idolatry even if they didn’t say that she is a god.

The Bible itself (despite the [Bible interpolation](#)) testifies that Jesus (Peace be upon him) said that the Father is the only God, and that he is human, in the Old Testament, it says:

Num 23:19 God is not a man, that he should lie, Neither the son of man, that he should repent:

And Jesus (Peace be upon him) says that he is a man and a son of man:

Joh 8:40 But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I heard from God: this did not Abraham.

Jesus repeated on telling that he is the son of man as in Luke 17:22, 7:34, and in many other verses.

Besides Jesus kept on telling that only the Father is God:

Joh 17:1 When Jesus had spoken these words, he lifted up his eyes to heaven, and said, “**Father**, the hour has come; glorify your Son that the Son may glorify you, **Joh 17:2** since you have given him authority over all flesh, to give eternal life to all whom you have given him. **Joh 17:3** And this is eternal life, **that they know you the only true God, and Jesus Christ whom you have sent.**

Jesus says that the Father is the only true God. Actually if he said "God" instead of Father in verse 1 (the bolded word), this wouldn't have been a proof that the Father is the only God, because God could have meant the whole Trinity. By using the word Father, Jesus clearly states the Father only is the only God, thus excluding the son and the holy spirit. And consider Jesus word "this is the eternal life". Jesus didn't say that the eternal life is that he is God who came in flesh or that he is the second person in the Trinity, or that he is the Savior who came to be crucified for the sin of Adam, it is simply that the Father is the only God, and that Jesus was sent by God. Also in other verses, Jesus refers to Father as his God, and this clearly means that he is not God, and can't be interpreted by the human nature because the human nature is supposed to be God also:

Joh 20:16 Jesus said to her, "Mary." She turned and said to him in Aramaic, "Rabboni!" (which means Teacher). Joh 20:17 Jesus said to her, "Do not cling to me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father; but go to my brothers and say to them, 'I am ascending to **my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.**'"

Mar 12:28 And one of the scribes came up and heard them disputing with one another, and seeing that he answered them well, asked him, "Which commandment is the most important of all?" Mar 12:29 Jesus answered, "The most important is, 'Hear, O Israel: **The Lord our God, the Lord is one.**'"

Mat 27:46 And about the ninth hour Jesus cried out with a loud voice, saying, "Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?" that is, "**My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?**"

Jesus even denies to be good and says that there is no good but God:
Mat 19:16 And behold, one came and said to Him, Good Master, what good thing shall I do that I may have eternal life?
Mat 19:17 And He said to him, Why do you call Me good? **There is none good but one, that is, God.** But if you want to enter into life, keep the commandments.

Jesus explicitly says that the Father is greater than him, which means that he is not equal to God:

Joh 14:28 "You heard me say, 'I am going away and I am coming back to you.' If you loved me, you would be glad that I am going to the Father, **for the Father is greater than I.**"

This actually addresses what Paul said in Philippians that Jesus is equal to God, Jesus answers him saying that the Father is greater than him.

Jesus is not more than a teacher, a prophet, he is NOT God:

Mat 23:9 And do not call anyone on earth 'father,' for you have one Father, and he is in heaven.
10 Nor are you to be called 'teacher,' for you have one Teacher, the Messiah.

Jesus doesn't know the hour:

Mar 13:32 "But about that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, **nor the Son, but only the Father.**

God is omniscient, He knows everything, and Jesus acknowledges this to the Father. The Father is the only one who knows the hour neither Jesus nor the angels know about it. If Jesus doesn't know the hour, then he is not omniscient, and since God is omniscient, then Jesus is not God.

Jesus acknowledges that he can do nothing by himself:

Joh 5:30 **By myself I can do nothing;** I judge only as I hear, and my judgment is just, **for I seek not to please myself but him who sent me.**

God is not only omniscient, but also omnipotent. God can do everything. This is God whom both Muslims and Christians believe to be. Jesus here denies his omnipotence, but refers it to the Father, and this is an answer to what Christians say that the signs and works Jesus made prove that he is God, Jesus here answers this claim saying: "By myself I can do nothing".

Luke 22:42 "Father, if you are willing, take this cup from me; **yet not my will, but yours be done.**" Lu 22:43 **An angel from heaven appeared to him and strengthened him.**

This may be a continuation to the above verse about God's omnipotence. God is the Creator, He created everything, including angels. If Jesus is God, and he created everything, why shall he need one of his creatures to strengthen him? Is the creature stronger than the Creator?

You may say that Jesus actually said that he is God, this article shall discuss this, [did Jesus really say "I am God"?](#)

4.3 DID JESUS REALLY SAY “I AM GOD”?

Jesus (Peace be upon him) never said the word “I am God” nor “I am the second person in Trinity”, nor “I am human and divine”, but as I mentioned before, Jesus clearly said that the Father is the only God, and that He is his God, and that he doesn’t know the hour,.....etc. You will tell me that he clearly declared his deity through lots of scriptures, I say actually he didn’t say it clearly, but all these are conclusions made, and by examining them, we find that they are not real, I will try in this section to cover these scriptures as much as I can, and if I forgot something, you can contact me.

“Before Abraham was born, I am!”

This actually is not a proof that Jesus is God because he is eternal, because this language was present in the Bible, it only means that he was in God’s foreknowledge, the same as what said concerning Jeremiah and Paul:

Jer 1:5 Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee, and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee; I have appointed thee a prophet unto the nations.

Eph 1:4 even as he chose us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blemish before him in love:

The context also proves this when he said before:

Joh 8:56 Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; and he saw it, and was glad. Joh 8:57 The Jews therefore said unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham? Joh 8:58 Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was born, I am.

Jesus (Peace be upon him) meant here is that Abraham (Peace be upon him) rejoiced when he knew that Jesus (Peace be upon him) will be from his descendants, and this is clear through the word “my day”, he didn’t say:”when he saw me”, this clearly means that he meant that Abraham knew that he will be raised one day, so he was rejoiced for that day.

The word “I AM” doesn’t claim divinity, anyone can say I am. The word “ego eimi” if it really meant Jehovah, it wouldn’t have been translated but it have been written Jehovah, especially when we see that the same word “ego eimi” was said by others:

Some said, “It is he.” Others said, “No, but he is like him.” He kept saying, “I am the man.” (John 9:9)

Is the beggar God? Of course not, but it actually means “I am the Messiah”, and this is very clear with what he said to the Samaritan woman:

Joh 4:25 The woman saith unto him, I know that Messiah cometh (he that is called Christ): when he is come, he will declare unto us all things. Joh 4:26 Jesus saith unto her, I that speak unto thee am he.

Which was said in other translation:

(MKJV) Jesus said to her, I AM, the One speaking to you.

This is a very clear proof that he didn't mean to Jehovah by this word, and the context can show that as above.

"I and the Father are one":

Well, this word in itself is not a proof that he claims divinity, for the unity can be unity in aim, for example what Jesus said concerning the disciples:

Joh 17:22 And the glory which thou hast given me I have given unto them; that they may be one, even as we are one;

Of course this verse doesn't mean that they are one by body, but by aim and faith, it is the same also concerning John 10:30. Dr. Thomas Constable, a Christian commentator acknowledges this on his notes on John 10:30:

"Jesus did not mean that He and the Father were the same person of the Godhead. If He had meant that, He would have used the masculine form of the word translated "one" (Gr. heis). Instead He used the neuter form of the word (Gr. hen). He meant that He and the Father were one in their action. This explanation also harmonized with the context since Jesus had said that He would keep His sheep safe (v. 28) and His Father would keep them safe (v. 29).....First, Jesus' claim to oneness does not in itself prove the Son's unity in essence with the Father. In 17:22, Jesus prayed that His disciples might be one as He and the Father were one, namely, in their purpose and beliefs.....In short, this verse does not say that Jesus was claiming to be of the same essence as God. Here He claimed to function in union with the Father. However the context and other statements in this Gospel show that His unity with the Father extended beyond a functional unity and did involve essential metaphysical unity."

<http://www.soniclight.com/constable/notes/htm/NT/John/John.htm>

So Dr. Constable is saying here that this verse in itself doesn't mean real unity but figurative one, but the context proves that he was claiming to be God, but actually I don't agree with him on that, because the context disproves his deity, let's look at what the context says:

Joh 10:32 Jesus answered them, Many good works have I showed you from the Father; for which of those works do ye stone me? Joh 10:33 The Jews answered him, For a good work we stone thee not, but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God. Joh 10:34 Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? Joh 10:35 If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken), Joh 10:36 say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God? Joh 10:37 If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not. Joh 10:38 But if I do them, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know and understand that the Father is in me, and I in the Father. Joh 10:39 They sought again to take him: and he went forth out of their hand.

When we look at the context, we find actually that Jesus is actually disproving the claim that he is God not proving it. The Jews misunderstood what he said, and thought that he was saying that he was God. Actually what the Jews said means that they understood from the scriptures that the Messiah is not God, so anyone who is saying that he is God is blaspheming. if they really misunderstood the scriptures, it should have been that Jesus answers their misconception by quoting a verse from the OT telling that the Messiah will be God as Isaiah (9:6 for example, see my post ([Old Testament and Jesus](#)), but the verse he quoted proves the opposite, Jesus referred to Psalms 82:6:

Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods?

So simply Jesus is quoting people who were called gods when they are not actually God. Just a metaphorical godhead, Jesus says that as these judges in Psalm 82:6 are called gods metaphorically, I am called son of God metaphorically. So I am called son of God as these were called gods and sons of Most High, if the Psalm wasn't blasphemed when they called the judges as gods, why do you consider me blaspheming when I am called son of God?

Finally coming to the last point which some may say that Jesus said that he is in the Father and the Father is in him. This is not also a proof, as it only means that he has a good relationship with God since he is a prophet, and this language is very common:

Joh 14:20 In that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.

1Jo 2:24 As for you, let that abide in you which ye heard from the beginning. If that which ye heard from the beginning abide in you, ye also shall abide in the Son, and in the Father.

Forgiving sins:

Jesus (Peace be upon him) said “your sins are forgiven” NOT “ I forgive your sins”, he referred forgiving sins to unknown which is inevitably God, he didn’t refer it to himself. And it’s clear through the context:

Mat 9:8 When the crowds saw it, they were afraid, and they glorified God, who had given such authority to men.

Also in another verse, Jesus asks the Father to forgive those who harmed him, if Jesus really forgives sins, he would have forgiven them immediately without praying to God.

Luk 23:34 And Jesus said, “Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do.” And they cast lots to divide his garments.

Also in many Christian denominations, people go and confess to the priest who says at the end “your sins are foregiven”, no one said that the priest is God.

John 1:1-3:

First of all, these are the words of Gospel John’s writer. Actually there is a doubt in the identity of the writer of Gospel John being John the apostle or an anonymous writer. What is more important is that this verse is mistranslated. The first “God” in “the word was with God” in this verse is “hotheos” in Greek origin which means God (with capital G) and with ho a definite article, while the second which is in “the word was god” is “theos” with no definite article which is supposed to be translated into god (with small g). Of course there is a big difference between both words , since the word “God” means Jehovah of the Old Testament, while the word god, means a god for pagans which is not meant in this verse, or god which means master as told about Moses (Peace be upon him):

Exodus 7:1” And Jehovah said to Moses, See, I have made you a god to Pharaoh. And Aaron your brother shall be your prophet.”

Or Psalms 82:6 “:

“I said, ‘You are “gods”; you are all sons of the Most High.’ (Psalms 82:6)”.

As for John 1:3

Joh 1:3 All things were made through him; and without him was not anything made that hath been made.

These things doesn’t necessarily mean creation, but it is his religion, and saving the people by faith in God and in Jesus as a prophet, since many scripts prove that Jesus (Peace be upon him) is not God.

Anyone who has seen me has seen the Father 4.3.1.1

The Bible clearly tells that no one can see God really:

1Jo 4:12 No one has ever seen God

Exo 33:20 But," he said, "you cannot see my face, for man shall not see me and live."

So the verse here tells that what Jesus (Peace be upon him) says and does is what God really wants so seeing Jesus as a real prophet is like seeing God, some might say that the Greek word used in John 12:45 meant real seeing, well in Thayer's definition to that word (G2334 θεωρέω theōreō), it can mean seeing mentally or discerning, besides this was referred to Jesus when he said to the disciples:

Joh 14:19 Yet a little while, and the world beholdeth me no more; but ye behold me: because I live, ye shall live also.

The Greek word "behold" here is the same one used in John 12:45, and in this verse seeing meant seeing by faith not real seeing, but seeing by faith as Albert Barnes and other commentators said.

Calling Jesus Lord:

First of all, the word "Lord" means Master or Sir, it is a famous title for the Peers, for example "Lord Chancellor, Lord Justice Bingham. In Britain, you address a judge or Peer as my Lord" (Cambridge International Dictionary of English). This was what meant by Paul calling him lord:

1Co 8:6 yet to us there is one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto him; and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and we through him.

So Paul separated between the two words God and Lord because he meant that Father is the only God to be worshiped other than false gods, and Jesus (Peace be upon him) the only master to be followed other than false prophets, this was also meant by saying "through whom are all things, and we through him.", because Jesus is the prophet whom they get their religion through him. Even there are some English translations which sometimes use the word Master instead of Lord. For example in John 5:7, CEV and LITV uses the word lord instead of Sir or Master, in John 13:36 YLT and WNT use the words Master or Sir instead of Lord.

Thomas calling him "My Lord and my God":

Calling him "my Lord" doesn't mean that he is God as mentioned before, and calling him "my God" can't mean that he is God since it clearly contradicts with what Jesus (Peace be upon him) said to the Father:

3 Now this is eternal life: that they know you, the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom you have sent. (John 17:3)

So either the word God mentioned in that script like the one meant for Moses (Peace be upon him):

And the LORD said to Moses, “See, I have made you like God to Pharaoh, and your brother Aaron shall be your prophet. (Exodus 7:1) ESV

Or that Thomas said this here as an exclamation as when one says “O my God”, or that this script was interpolated so that it can be a proof for the divinity of Jesus (Peace be upon him), but actually it clearly contradicts with other Bible verses as we have shown here and through the other article which tells that [Jesus actually tells that the Father is the only true God.](#)

I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me:

This is the case with all prophets, so what? Christians believe in the OT, and believe that Moses, David, Isaiah and others were prophets from God, if someone came and said that he believes in Jesus but believes that Moses or other OT prophets are liars and false prophets, could they come to the Father that way? Surely not, because disbelieving in any of the prophets is disbelieving in OT which was confirmed by Jesus and which you believe it's the word of God, so saying “I am the way, the truth, and the life: no man cometh unto the Father, but by me.” doesn't apply on Jesus only but on all prophets.

4.4 IS THE TRINITY TRUE?

The Trinity is the main Christian belief which is the belief in Father, Son and Holy Spirit one God. In this section, I will try to discuss it, and see if it is really from God or not.

Jesus (Peace be upon him), as he never told that he is God, and as he told that the Father is the only God, as I mentioned before, **Jesus didn't say anything concerning the Trinity**, there are some verses Christians use to prove the Trinity, I will try to discuss it in this section:

The first one is:

Gen 1:26 And God said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness: and let them have dominion over the fish of the sea, and over the birds of the heavens, and over the cattle, and over all the earth, and over every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth.

Actually using the plural is not a proof that God is more than one person, for this is commonly used language for glorifying, and this was used concerning others in the Bible:

Ezr 4:17 Then sent the king an answer unto Rehum the chancellor, and to Shimshai the scribe, and to the rest of their companions that dwell in Samaria, and in the rest of the country beyond the River: Peace, and so forth. Ezr 4:18 The letter which ye sent unto us hath been plainly read before me.

2Ch 10:9 And he said unto them, What counsel give ye, that we may return answer to this people, who have spoken to me, saying, Make the yoke that thy father did put upon us lighter?

Besides, the verse after it refutes the Trinity:

Gen 1:27 And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

This proves that the former verse was used for glorifying, otherwise this will mean that the other two persons went away, and only one person remained which is not the case for the Trinity.

The second verse used to prove the Trinity is:

Mat 3:16 And Jesus when he was baptized, went up straightway from the water: and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending as a dove, and coming upon him;

I actually don't understand where is the point in that verse that proves the Trinity, it doesn't say that the 3 persons are one, all what it says is that they were present with each other for a moment, neither it says that the Son or the Holy Spirit are God.

Also this verse is used as a proof:

Mat 28:19 Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit:

Actually there are some comments on this verse:

- The verse doesn't say that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost are one, all what it said is to baptize people in the name of the 3 of them, saying name not names doesn't mean that the 3 are one. When a leader tells his soldiers: "fight your enemies in the name of the country the people and the king" doesn't mean that the 3 are one, this is the same case for 1 Peter 1:1-2.

Otherwise, if we used the same way, we can have another Trinity from the Bible:

1Ti 5:21 I charge thee in the sight of God, and Christ Jesus, and the elect angels, that thou observe these things without prejudice, doing nothing by partiality.

It is the first time for me to hear that the elect angels became the third person in the Trinity.

- The apostles didn't respond to what Jesus ordered them in this verse, since the baptismal formula was never told that way by the apostles, but they were always baptizing people in the name of Jesus, and they were baptizing the Jews only not the gentiles, only Paul and Baranabas (who were not present when Jesus said the above) baptized the gentiles.
- There is a problem in the canonicity of the verse itself as Eusebius quoted it, "Go ye and make disciples of all the nations in my name."(Church history 3.5.2), Basil said that he knew nothing about it:"Of the rest I say nothing; but of the very confession of our faith in Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, what is the written source? If it be granted that, as we are baptized, so also under

the obligation to believe, we make our confession in like terms as our baptism, in accordance with the tradition of our baptism and in conformity with the principles of true religion, let our opponents grant us too the right to be as consistent in our ascription of glory as in our confession of faith.”

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf208.vii.xxviii.html>

A main fourth evidence is 1 John 5:7 which is commonly known as the Johannine comma:

1Jo 5:7 For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one.

Actually, this verse was omitted from most translations, and most Christians agree on it being added to the Bible, look for example at what Albert Barnes says in his commentary:

“The reasons which seem to me to prove that the passage included in brackets is spurious, and should not be regarded as a part of the inspired writings, are briefly the following:

I. It is missing in all the earlier Greek manuscripts, for it is found in no Greek manuscript written before the 16th century. Indeed, it is found in only two Greek manuscripts of any age – one the Codex Montfortianus, or Britannicus, written in the beginning of the sixteenth century, and the other the Codex Ravianus, which is a mere transcript of the text, taken partly from the third edition of Stephen’s New Testament, and partly from the Complutensian Polyglott. But it is incredible that a genuine passage of the New Testament should be missing in all the early Greek manuscripts.

II. It is missing in the earliest versions, and, indeed, in a large part of the versions of the New Testament which have been made in all former times. It is wanting in both the Syriac versions – one of which was made probably in the first century; in the Coptic, Armenian, Slavonic, Ethiopic, and Arabic.

III. It is never quoted by the Greek fathers in their controversies on the doctrine of the Trinity – a passage which would be so much in point, and which could not have failed to be quoted if it were genuine; and it is not referred to by the Latin fathers until the time of Vigilius, at the end of the 5th century. If the passage were believed to be genuine – nay, if it were known at all to be in existence, and to have any probability in its favor – it is incredible that in all the controversies which occurred in regard to the divine nature, and in all the efforts to define the

doctrine of the Trinity, this passage should never have been referred to. But it never was; for it must be plain to anyone who examines the subject with an unbiassed mind, that the passages which are relied on to prove that it was quoted by Athanasius, Cyprian, Augustin, etc., (Wetstein, II., p. 725) are not taken from this place, and are not such as they would have made if they had been acquainted with this passage, and had designed to quote it. IV. The argument against the passage from the external proof is confirmed by internal evidence, which makes it morally certain that it cannot be genuine.”

<http://www.studylight.org/com/bnb/view.cgi?book=1jo&chapter=005>

Actually his note concerning this is very extensive, and I preferred to quote a part of it, so as not to have a very long article.

What we can conclude is that there was no solid ground for the belief in Trinity, all the verses used are not that serious, and doesn't give the real description for the Trinitarian belief, but they can have many meanings, which doesn't match with a belief that is supposed to be the basic belief, and other scripts were inserted to the Bible to try to get an evidence for that belief, which proves that this was a major problem that faced Christians for centuries.

4.5 IS JESUS THE SON OF GOD?

One of the important issues concerning the Christian belief in Jesus (Peace be upon him) is the belief that he is the only begotten son of God before all ages, which we as Muslims don't accept.

First of all, the word "son of God" in itself is not a proof of that this sonship is literal, as it was used extensively in both the Old and New Testaments in a figurative meaning, i.e. that this sonship means adoption as can be seen here:

Exo 4:22 And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh, Thus saith Jehovah, Israel is my son, my first-born:

Psa 82:6 I said, Ye are gods, And all of you sons of the Most High.

2Sa 7:14 I(God) will be his father, and he(Solomon) shall be my son (I put the words in paranthesis)

Luk 3:38 the son of Enos, the son of Seth, the son of Adam, the son of God.

Mat 5:9 Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God.

Mat 5:16 Even so let your light shine before men; that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.

So as we see here, this expression is used for different people , and doesn't mean real sonship but adoptive sonship as we all agree, now Christians will say that this is not the case of Jesus as he is the son of God by begetting not by adoption:

Joh 3:16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have eternal life.

Actually according to the Bible, if we say that the word beget means literal sonship, this will mean that others are begotten God's sons:

1Jo 3:9 Whosoever is begotten of God doeth no sin, because his seed abideth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is begotten of God.

1Jo 5:18 We know that whosoever is begotten of God sinneth not; but he that was begotten of God keepeth himself, and the evil one toucheth him not.

Also what proves from the Bible that sonship of Christ is not literal is some Bible verses:

Joh 8:38 I speak the things which I have seen with my Father: and ye also do the things which ye heard from your father.

As we see here, he compares his sonship to the father to the sonship of the Jews in which he said in verse 44 that their father is the Satan, which is a metaphorical father, so if he really meant a real sonship, he wouldn't have compared his sonship to God to their sonship to the Satan.

Also another situation when he said to the Jews: "I and the Father are one", and the Jews accused him of blasphemy, as I said before, the script he quoted here tells that he didn't mean a literal divinity or literal sonship, but inferior one, look again at what he said:

Joh 10:34 Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? Joh 10:35 If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken), Joh 10:36 say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?

So he tells again that as the judges meant in Psalms 82:6 are called gods figuratively, why do you consider me blaspheming if I said that I am the son of God? This clearly means that this sonship of God goes with the same logic of the judges being gods, so Jesus used Psalm 82:6 to justify calling him as son of God and to prove to the Jews that he is not blaspheming, which clearly means that this sonship is not literal.

Next, if we really considered that he was really the literally begotten son of God, what does this word mean? Christians will say it is not a real sonship, but they may say that "begotten" means "come from", if this was the case, what is the difference between begetting the Son and proceeding of the Holy Spirit? Another interpretation is made by [Theophilus of Antioch](#), where he says:

"Not as the poets and writers of myths talk of the sons of gods begotten from intercourse [with women], but as truth expounds, the Word, that always exists, residing within the heart of God. For before anything came into being He had Him as a counsellor, being His own mind and thought. But when God wished to make all that He determined on, He begot this Word, uttered, the first-born of all creation, not Himself being emptied of the Word [Reason], but having begotten Reason, and always conversing with His Reason. And hence the holy writings teach us, and all the spirit-bearing [inspired] men, one of whom, John, says, "In the beginning

was the Word, and the Word was with God,” (Joh_1:1) showing that at first God was alone, and the Word in Him. Then he says, “The Word was God; all things came into existence through Him; and apart from Him not one thing came into existence.” The Word, then, being God, and being naturally⁶² produced from God, whenever the Father of the universe wills, He sends Him to any place; and He, coming, is both heard and seen, being sent by Him, and is found in a place.”

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf02.iv.ii.ii.xxii.html>

We as Muslims don't agree with that meaning, as if God needs to beget another person to be an attribute of Him so as to create, or that when he wills something, God doesn't need when he wants to create something to beget a word from his heart, to be a new person whom he takes as a chancellor, or that He needs to beget the word so as to send it anywhere He wants, when God wills, He only says “be”, it becomes as God wills, but we actually look to this as a blasphemy against God. And if God wasn't emptied from reason or word when he begat it, what is the need for begetting the word to be His Son who will be God's chancellor? Does God really need a chancellor? I actually see a discrepancy in that weird belief.

Not only that, but in another position, Theophilus said that the word was in God's bowels:

“God made all things out of nothing; for nothing was coeval with God: but He being His own place, and wanting nothing, and existing before the ages, willed to make man by whom He might be known; for him, therefore, He prepared the world. For he that is created is also needy; but he that is uncreated stands in need of nothing. God, then, having His own Word internal within His own bowels, begat Him, emitting Him along with His own wisdom before all things”

<http://www.earlychristianwritings.com/text/theophilus-book2.html>

We also don't accept what Tertullian says:

” Chap. XIX. – Christ, as to His Divine Nature, as the Word of God, Became Flesh, Not by Carnal Conception, nor by the Will of the Flesh and of Man, but by the Will of God. Christ's Divine Nature, of Its Own Accord, Descended into the Virgin's Womb.”

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf03.v.vii.xix.html>

We actually see this as a blasphemy, how can God descend into a woman's womb? So the embryo will be God, and then the baby is God, who cries, suckles,....etc. How can these acts come from God Almighty? Look also here Tertullian is talking about the divine nature, which means that all this was by the divine nature, and no comment.

1Ki 8:27 But will God in very deed dwell on the earth? behold, heaven and the heaven of heavens cannot contain thee; how much less this house that I have builded!

88. And they say, `The Gracious God has taken unto Himself a son.' 89. Assuredly, you have indeed uttered a most hideous thing. 90. The heavens might well-nigh burst thereat, and the earth cleave asunder, and the mountains fall down in pieces. 91. Because they ascribe a son to the Gracious God. 92. It becomes not the Gracious God that HE should take unto Himself a son. 93. There is none in the heavens and the earth but he shall come to the Gracious God as a bondman. (Holy Quran 19)

4.6 DID JESUS DIE FOR OUR SINS?

The most common belief among Christians is the belief that Jesus died for our sins, but the question is: Do we have a solid account that proves this?

Actually when we look at the verses Christians use to prove this belief, we find that 95% of these verses are from Paul's epistles, and the verses used to prove this belief from the Gospels are very few, which puts a question mark on its source and whether Jesus really told that he would die on the cross for our sins.

As I illustrated in my post :"[Concept of salvation between Islam and Christianity](#)"we as Muslims don't need to believe that God needs to be a man or to be crucified for our sins, because God is mightier than that, we actually believe that this is a blasphemy and an insult against God. For sin to be forgiven by God, mans should repent faithfully to God, and acknowledge his sins, and God is the All Forgiver and All Merciful who will forgive him if He really knew he is really intending to repent and stop the sin:

110. And whoso does evil or wrongs his soul, and then asks forgiveness of ALLAH, will find ALLAH Most Forgiving, Merciful. (Holy Quran 4:110)

No need for all that so that God forgives my sins, and this is what is also said by the Old Testament:

Eze 18:21"But if a wicked person turns away from all his sins that he has committed and keeps all my statutes and does what is just and right, he shall surely live; he shall not die.

Eze 18:22None of the transgressions that he has committed shall be remembered against him; for the righteousness that he has done he shall live.

Jesus (Peace be upon him) wasn't clear in clarifying his supposed main message, something like this must have been very clear so that no one doubts, but even according to the Gospels, it seems that Jesus didn't know about it, look at what he said:

Joh 17:4 I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do.

This was before crucifixion, Jesus tells that he accomplished the work God gave to him. This work is to tell people about God, as all prophets did. If he really knew that he came to die for our sins and the plan of salvation Christians talk about it, he won't have said that he accomplished the work God gave him to do.

Not only that, but when Jesus was asked about the way to eternal life:

Mat 19:16 And behold, one came to him and said, Teacher, what good thing shall I do, that I may have eternal life?

Mat 19:17 And he said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good: **but if thou wouldst enter into life, keep the commandments.**

Jesus' answer was simply to keep the commandments which are the same commandments of the Old Testament, nothing new.

What about Jesus' action before being crossed?

Mat 26:38 Then saith he unto them, **My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: abide ye here, and watch with me.**

Mat 26:39 And he went forward a little, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, **My Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass away from me: nevertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt.**

If this was really the reason why he came, would have he been that sad and sorrowful? Why would he keep on prayer and asks God to take that cup away from him? If Jesus was supposed to be waiting for that moment, why would he ask God to get it away?

Finally look at what he said on the cross:

Mat 27:46 And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice, saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? **that is, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?**

Jesus accuses God that he left him, as if Jesus was surprised by this or that God betrayed him, is that logical? Doesn't he know why he is there? Some might argue that this refers to Psalm 22, which Christians might argue that it foretells about the event on the cross. If this was the case, why didn't Jesus refer to other verses that are strongly used by Christians either in this Psalm or in other verses like in Isaiah 53? This verse actually proves that Jesus didn't know about the plan of salvation except that God has forsaken him.

Now let's come to examine the verses used to prove that Jesus died for us, the first verse used is John 3:16, actually there is a doubt in referring this verse to Jesus, look at the TNIV version, the translators ended the quotation at John 3:15, and said in the footnotes that some interpreters put the quotation at 3:21, also you can see Robertson's Word Picture, this means that there is a diversity concerning referring the most famous verse in the Bible to Jesus (Peace be upon him). This script whom Christians build their belief on. If Jesus was really God, and this was really the reason for his coming, he would have kept on declaring that clearly so that no one doubts in it, but he didn't, only that verse and there is a diversity concerning who said it. And Where are the other Gospels? This critical belief should have agreed on through the

Gospels. besides how would God give His son? And how would he save people? And save them from what? The verse didn't say all that, and Jesus never answered these questions, Paul only did. All these questions are put supposing that Jesus really said so, but he really didn't say so, and a belief must be built on a solid ground, otherwise it falls.

The second script used to prove this belief:

Mat 26:28 For this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.

Actually Jesus was pointing to wine saying this is his blood, and saying that it will be shed for the redemption of sins, but this refers to wine, and it may explain what the Catholic belief concerning saying that wine becomes Jesus' blood and shedding the blood may refer back to the wine as it is what he refers to from the beginning.

Also there is another verse used to prove this is that one used, which is that Jesus predicted to suffer from the Pharisees and that he will be killed and raised from death, actually I don't see a relation between this script and the belief that he'd die for us, it only tells that he'd die, but it didn't say that this will be for our sins.

Something else used as a proof also is that they were giving sacrifices in the Old Testament for forgiving their sins, so Jesus was the sacrifice so that people don't need to do that anymore, actually this is really weird, because if this was the case, then Christians must fulfill the laws of the Old Testament and leave only that law, but actually they neither obey that law nor the other laws, but it appears as if the law is taken selectively when it meets their belief, besides, Jesus forgave the adulterer in John 8 (although there is a doubt in referring this story to Jesus), and he didn't need for example to be stoned so that he abrogates stoning the adulterers, plus, the same question still remains, where did Jesus say "I am the sacrifice of the OT", or anything like that?

Besides, there are many questions concerning that point. Now it is supposed that God wants to give people salvation and forgive them without restricting them with the atonement, what is need that He becomes a man and humiliates Himself when He can just send a lamb as He did with Abraham's son when He sent a lamb instead of letting himself die for people? The Old Testament didn't say that the atonement will be God Himself, but in most cases it was a lamb, and He could have easily redeemed people like what He did with Abraham and his son. I see that this is against God's mightiness, God doesn't die and doesn't pain from people who worth compared to His creation. I see this as a blasphemy that shows that God can do nothing except that He Himself dies.

The second thing, who killed Jesus? Were they sinned people who wanted atonement? No, They were the Jews who fought Jesus and killed him as an opposition to his message. So they were not actually giving atonement, they were sinning. How can a sin be an atonement for a sin? An atonement is supposed to be a good deed from a man who repented for his sin not from a man who is sinning by this atonement. So actually I don't see that this is a sacrifice for love, it is an action with no meaning, like if a man thinks that when he loves another, he expresses his love by killing himself with no need to sacrifice his beloved person.

Christians use Isaiah 53 as a proof that Jesus' death was foretold in the Bible. First of all, Jesus never quoted from Isaiah 53, and the quotes of the Gospels doesn't imply that belief, the first quote was in Matthew 8:17, when he was driving the demons out, the second one was in Luke 22:37, when he ordered his disciples to buy swords (this is actually against the prophecy itself, since the prophecy says that he would be as a silent lamb), and the quote was to say that he would be reckoned with transgressors, so in both cases the quotes never mentioned death.

How could Jesus leave the most important things in the prophecy which tell that he would bear their sins which is the main Christian belief, and concentrate on trivial events if he really came for that belief? Actually Jesus (according to the Bible, but we Muslims have nothing to do with this) never thought Isaiah 53 to mean what the Christians understood. Besides, which is more important, is that this prophecy didn't mean Jesus, if it is read in context, it really doesn't, this chapter is an extension to chapters 51, 52 which were talking about Israel, and there are scripts in 53 which prove that it doesn't tell about redemption, see for example this verse:

Isa 53:10 Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see *his* seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand.

Of course you know that Jesus (Peace be upon him) didn't have a seed, you may say it's spiritually speaking, the case is that the Hebrew word is "zerah" which means a real seed other than the word "ben" which can mean spiritual sonship as in Genesis 15:3-4:

Gen 15:3 And Abram said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed(zerah): and, lo, one born(ben) in my house is mine heir. Gen 15:4 And, behold, the word of Jehovah came unto him, saying, This man shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir.

You can see the Hebrew text to make sure, the same thing for prolonging days, this expression in Hebrew, can't mean everlasting life which doesn't match with your belief that Jesus is God,

the same for the word in verse 1, (servant), according to your belief is that only God can make the sacrifice which doesn't match with this verse.

Isaiah 53 was foretelling about Israel, and the deliverance from the Babylonian captivity, the word servant refers to Israel in many scripts, and it was used that way commonly in Isaiah, for example in Isaiah 45:4, 48:1-3,....etc. And this can be proved all over the scripts, but it's very clear that they didn't mean that belief in salvation.

4.7 WAS JESUS REALLY CRUCIFIED?

Crucifixion of Jesus has the one of the oldest debates between Muslims and Christians. Now let's analyse this issue.

Islamic Belief:

God said in the Quran:

157. And for their saying, 'We did slay the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, the Messenger of ALLAH;' whereas they slew him not, nor did they bring about his death upon the cross, but he was made to appear to them like one crucified; and those who differ therein are certainly in a state of doubt about it; they have no certain knowledge thereof, but only pursue a conjecture; and they did not arrive at a certainty concerning it. 158. On the contrary, ALLAH exalted him to Himself. And ALLAH is Mighty, Wise. (Holy Quran 4)

As we clearly see from the verses, the Jews didn't crucify Jesus (Peace be upon him) himself, but the one crucified was made to appear to them as Jesus (Peace be upon him) that they thought he was Jesus, but actually he wasn't, while Jesus (Peace be upon him) was ascended to Heaven alive, and he will come back as a sign for the Hereafter.

Is there a strong historical evidence for Jesus' crucifixion?

First of all, as Muslims, we needn't give historical evidence that Jesus didn't die on the cross, since we believe that the one on the cross had the appearance of Jesus (Peace be upon him), so it may have happened that they were deceived and thought that the one crucified was Jesus (Peace be upon him). Besides, if you want a historical evidence for Jesus not crucified, I think that you need a historical evidence for the huge events happened during crucifixion:

Mat 27:51 And behold, the veil of the temple was rent in two from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake; and the rocks were rent; Mat 27:52 and the tombs were opened; and many bodies of the saints that had fallen asleep were raised; Mat 27:53 and coming forth out of the tombs after his resurrection they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many.

I think that something like that must have been very huge event, especially when it accompanies crucifixion, I want to ask, is there a historical evidence for it? Note also that none of the other Gospels even mentioned it.

Early Christian Writings telling that Jesus wasn't crucified but exchanged:

Not all early Christian sects believed that Jesus (Peace be upon him) was crucified, we find for example that the Basilides who believed that Simon of Cyrene who was crucified; Jesus exchanged forms with him on the way, and, standing unseen opposite in Simon's form, mocked those who crucified him, and then ascended to heaven.<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/hcc2.v.xiii.xiii.html>

Also Gospel Judas which tells that Jesus told Judas:

"Truly [i] say to you, Judas, [those who] offer sacrifices to Saklas [... *exemplify* ...] everything that is evil. But you will exceed all of them. **For you will sacrifice the man that clothes me**. Already your horn has been raised, your wrath has been kindled, your star has shown brightly, and your heart has [*been hardened...*]"http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gospel_of_Judas

So it seems from this that someone will cloth Jesus, which seems to be talking about dying on the cross.

Of course I don't mean by this that we must agree with the Basilides or Gnostics in their beliefs, or that they actually had the right belief, but this is a proof that the belief that the one who was crucified was Jesus didn't have that consensus, the case was that Christians took the Romans' testimony who didn't even believe in Jesus (Peace be upon him).

Evidence adopted by Christians:

The evidence is taken either from the Bible, or from the Jews, or from the Romans, or from Josephus. As for the Bible, when we look at the story of crucifixion in the four gospels, we find [many contradictions in the story of crucifixion between Gospels](#) as the way Judas gave Jesus, the way Judas died, the hour of crucifixion, who went to the tomb after crucifixion, it seems that everyone heard narrations and wrote them without making sure if these were really narrations or not.

As for the Jews, the Quran itself testifies that they said that they killed Jesus, and this was because they hated him, and tried to show that they were victorious over him, but actually they were not since God saved him, and made him rise to Heaven. The same thing for the Roman historians, both of them were born after crucifixion, for example Tacitus was born in 56 AD, and Lucian of Samosta was born in 125 AD, both of them didn't live at that time, and they may have taken this from what people say. Besides, did they give the account confirming the huge events Gospel Matthew tells in Matthew 27:51? I don't think so. As for what Josephus said concerning Jesus, there is a very serious problem in authenticity of this testimony, even the Early Church Fathers didn't know about it till Eusebius, but at the same time, we find Origen -who was familiar with writings of Josephus- saying nothing about that testimony. See that link for more details.http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Josephus_on_Jesus The conclusion is that saying that Jesus was the one crucified were only narrations that were transmitted between people, and it lacks much accurate evidence, as God said in the Quran:

157. And for their saying, `We did slay the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary, the Messenger of ALLAH;' whereas they slew him not, nor did they bring about his death upon the cross, but he was made to appear to them like one crucified; and those who differ therein are certainly in a state of doubt about it; they have no certain knowledge thereof, but only pursue a conjecture; and they did not arrive at a certainty concerning it. 158. On the contrary, ALLAH exalted him to Himself. And ALLAH is Mighty, Wise.

5 QURAN

Actually in that section, I preferred to copy some articles taken from Islam Religion site, since it has an excellent material, and I found no need that I write myself since it won't reach that level. I tried to pick up the most important articles. You can see the other articles [here](#).

[The Authorship of the Quran \(part 1 of 3\): The Words of a Human?](#)

[The Authorship of the Quran \(part 2 of 3\): The Words of a Poet or a Teacher?](#)

[The Authorship of the Quran \(part 3 of 3\): Was it the Words of Satan or God?](#)

[The Prophecies of the Quran](#)

[Scientific miracles of the Quran](#)

Preservation of the Quran:

[1.Memorization](#)

[2.The written Quran](#)

[Before you read the Quran](#)

[Read the Quran](#)

[Download the Quran](#)

6 THE BIBLE

6.1 ISLAMIC VIEW OF THE BIBLE

Our Muslim belief in the Bible is that God sent the Torah to Moses (Peace be upon him), and the Gospel to Jesus (Peace be upon him), but this doesn't mean that the Pentateuch or the four Gospels present now are the real Torah and Gospel sent to Moses and Jesus (Peace be upon them). The case is that the Torah and Gospel and other prophets' books have been subjected to a lot of corruption and interpolations that the true verses are mixed with the false ones, that's why God sent the Quran to Muhammad (Peace be upon him) who is the final prophet, where it was saved from corruption as it is the final book, and contains the absolute truth. So we consider the Quran as a judge on the Bible, we accept the Bible verses which agree with the Quran, and reject the Bible verses which disagree with the Quran, as for the verses the Quran didn't talk about, we neither agree nor disagree.

God said in the Quran in the context of talking about Jews:

79. Woe, therefore, to those who write the Book with their own hands and then say, 'This is from ALLAH,' That they may take it for a paltry price. Woe, then, to them for what their hands have written, and woe to them for what they earn. (Holy Quran 2:79)

Ibn Abbas, the Prophet's disciple said:

"O Muslims! How could you ask the People of the Book about anything, while the Book of Allah (Qur'an) that He revealed to His Prophet is the most recent Book from Him and you still read it fresh and young Allah told you that the People of the Book altered the Book of Allah, changed it and wrote another book with their own hands. They then said, 'This book is from Allah,' so that they acquired a small profit by it. Hasn't the knowledge that came to you prohibited you from asking them By Allah! We have not seen any of them asking you about what was revealed to you."

And Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) said in Bukhari:

Do not believe the People of the Book and do not deny them. Say: "We believe in Allah and what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to you. Our God and your God is One, and to Him we have submitted."

And said in Abu Dawood:

The Apostle of Allah (peace_be_upon_him) said: Whatever the people of the Book tell you, do not verify them, nor falsify them, but say: We believe in Allah and His Apostle. If it is false, do not confirm it, and if it is right, do not falsify it.

Also there was another Hadith in Bukhari that that Humayd bin `Abdur-Rahman heard Mu`awiyah talking to a group of Quraysh in Al-Madinah. He mentioned Ka`b Al-Ahbar, and said: "He was one of the most truthful of those who narrated from the People of the Book, even though we found that some of what he said might be lies.'

This means that Ka`b didn't intend to lie, but he was telling what was interpolated by the People of the book.

Some might object and say: "Isn't God able to protect His Book?" , I say: of course, but the Quran tells us that God left His book to the People of the Book, so as to test them, but they disobeyed God and interpolated in the Book:

44. Surely, WE sent down the Torah wherein was guidance and light. By it did the Prophets, who were obedient to US, judge for the Jews, as did the godly people and those learned in the Law, because they were required to preserve the Book of ALLAH, and because they were guardians over it. . (Holy Quran 5:44)

And this was very clear even in the Bible itself:

Deu 4:1 And now, O Israel, hearken unto the statutes and unto the ordinances, which I teach you, to do them; that ye may live, and go in and possess the land which Jehovah, the God of your fathers, giveth you. Deu 4:2 Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish from it, that ye may keep the commandments of Jehovah your God which I command you.

This verse clearly tells that interpolation in the Bible can happen, and it is not impossible because if it was impossible, there would have been no need that God warns them against it.

6.2 MUSLIM OBJECTIONS ON THE BIBLE

I will give here some of the reasons why Muslims don't accept the Bible. One of the main reasons is the way illustrating God and His prophets, in the Bible, God is described with attributes and analogies that we Muslims condemn describing God that way. And the way of illustrating His prophets in many cases as idolators, adulterers, drunk, we can't accept this for God's prophets who are supposed to be those who guide people to God, as if God can't chose His prophets, this is actually a blasphemy against God and His prophets.

For example when the Bible says that God rested and refreshed as in Exodus 17:31, or when the Bible says that God fought Jacob and Jacob prevailed as in Genesis 32:28, or making analogies for God as a one out of sleep, Like a mighty man that shouts by reason of wine. (Psalm 78:65), or as a lioness and a bear (Hosea 13:8), or as a lamb (Revelation 17:14), or that God puts a sign in the sky so that He remembers His covenant with people that He won't destroy them by flood. We as Muslims don't accept attributing this to God, because we believe that God is Almighty than being attributed that way.

Also when I read in the Bible that Noah got drunk and naked(Genesis 9:21), or that Aaron ordered the Jews to worship the calf (Exodus 32:2), or that Lot made it with his daughters (Genesis 19:31-36), or that Jacob lied and stole the blessing from his father (Genesis 27) or that David did what he did with Uriah and his wife (II Samuel 11), or that Solomon worshipped other gods (I Kings 11:1-11), we as Muslims believe that prophets are the best men, and that's why God chose them to tell His message to people, how could they act that way? Even if you said that they were honest in telling God's revelation, this is not enough, if I directed you to a road, and told you that this is the right road, and then I walked in another road, would you believe me? If the company's policy tell that smoking is in the smoking area only, and then you find your manager smoking inside the building, would anyone take it serious? Actually no one would care about the rules or policies of the company if the manager violates it. Besides, if God's prophets are that way, why didn't God choose better people to be His prophets? This is actually blaspheming God before it is a blasphemy against the prophets, as if God can't chose His prophets.

I only wanted to give this as an example for what we reject in the Bible, these are not the only things we don't agree with the Bible, but I only wanted to give an example.

6.3 DO BIBLE MANUSCRIPTS PROVE ITS AUTHENTICITY?

The main evidence used by Christians to prove the authenticity of the Bible is the extensive number of Bible manuscripts of both the Old and New Testaments, but actually this is not an enough evidence, as the number is not the only factor that tells if it is true or not, what is more important is the time these manuscripts were written, for example in case of the Old Testament, the two major manuscripts are Masoretic text and the Septuagint. The Masoretic text refers back to the ninth century, while the oldest manuscript for Septuagint refers back to the fourth century. As for the New Testament, the oldest manuscripts are the Syriac Peshitta referring to about 200AD, while contains the New Testament except 2 Peter, 2 John, 3 John, Jude and Revelation, also the Greek Vaticanus and Sinaiticus which are considered to be the main manuscripts used, and refer to the fourth century.

These are the oldest manuscripts for both the Old and New Testaments, as we see for the Old Testament, the oldest manuscript refers to the fourth century, and for the New Testament, the oldest manuscript refers to the beginning of the third century, and doesn't contain some epistles, which puts a question mark concerning them, were they added to the Bible? This makes a gap between the time of the Prophets including Jesus (Peace be upon him), and the time of writing these manuscripts, and makes the claim that the Bible was fully preserved not very accurate, because it could have happened that the writers of these manuscripts were anonymous.

Some might say that there were earlier fragments that prove that the books of the Bible were present at that time as the fragments of John Rayland for example which refers to about 125 AD, and has some words in the Gospel of John, but actually this is not a proof even for the existence of Gospel John at that time, all that it can prove is that these words were present at that time, but it could have been taken from another source, and it may have been that the writer of Gospel John copied it from that source,...etc., many possibilities exist, but this is not an evidence in itself.

This is also the same case for the Dead Sea Scrolls, all what was found in Qumran were mostly fragments, the only book which was found to be nearly complete is Isaiah, but all other Old Testament books were fragments that doesn't prove that the Bible was present the same as it is now, especially that a lot of Apocrypha were found in Qumran, which puts another question mark concerning the books which used to be canonical at that time, and on what base were the books of the Bible taken as canonical and others were not?especially that a lot of these apocrypha were present with the canonical books in the same manuscript as

1-4 Maccabees and the Prayer of Manasseh which are present in the Vaticanus with other canonical books.

More sources:

[Main New Testament manuscripts](#)

[Dead Sea Scrolls](#)

6.4 DO CHURCH FATHER QUOTES PROVE BIBLE AUTHENTICITY?

A common evidence used to prove that the Bible was preserved is the quotes of the Early Church Fathers, but actually the first Early Church Fathers who extensively quotes from the Bible lived at the end of the second century as Irenaeus and Tertullian, those who were before them as Ignatius, Polycarp, Barnabas and Justin Martyr quoted very few verses from the Bible especially the New Testament, may be Justin Martyr quoted a lot from the Old Testament, but his quotes from the New Testament were very few, besides, a large portion of these few quotes were not really quotes, but they were only narrations by meaning, what I mean is that it could have been that a common source from where the Gospels copied, and there is already a theory telling that there was a common source for the Synoptic Gospels called the Q source, and many theologians adopt this theory. You can make sure of what I am saying concerning the quotes of the Church Fathers by downloading E-sword program from e-sword.net and installing the book of Ante-Nicene Fathers on the program, it will be highlighting the scripts, and you can easily distinguish them with no need to read all these books.

Besides, many Early Church Fathers had heretical opinions, let's see the opinions adopted by early church fathers:

1. Theophilus of Antioch:(c. 183 AD)

In his book "To Autolycus", Theophilus of Antioch said in [Chapter 15](#) that the Trinity is "God, His word and His Wisdom", and in [Chapter 10](#) that the Word is the Spirit of God which is against what the Trinity teaches that it is God, His word and His spirit. And for sure the word is NOT the spirit as this will lead to the [Monarchian heresy](#) which tells that the Father is the Son is the Holy Spirit not that they are three different persons.

2. Papias of Hierapolis: (c. 155 AD)

[Papias](#) tells about Judas' death saying " Judas walked about in this world a sad example of impiety; for his body having swollen to such an extent that he could not pass where a chariot could pass easily, he was crushed by the chariot, so that his bowels gushed out. "

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.vii.ii.iii.html>

which doesn't match at all with what the Gospels say:

Mat 27:5 And he cast down the pieces of silver into the sanctuary, and departed; and he went away and hanged himself.

Note: Papias is commonly used as an evidence by Christian scholars to prove the authenticity of Gospel of Matthew, it seems that he really knew it well 😊

3. Irenaeus (c. 202AD)

Ireneous who said that Jesus was more than 50 yrs when he died

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.ix.iii.xxiii.html>

Which is also against Christian teachings that Jesus died at 33.

4. Tertullian (c.225 AD)

Tertullian was actually following the heretical Montanus who claimed to be the Paraclete as recorded by Philip Schaff:

He (Montanus) fell into somnambulistic ecstasies, and considered himself the inspired organ of the promised Paraclete or Advocate, the Helper and Comforter in these last times of distress. His adversaries wrongly inferred from the use of the first person for the Holy Spirit in his oracles, that he made himself directly the Paraclete,

This link talks about Tertullian and his relationship with Montanus:

In Africa there was a lot of interest in the new prophecy, and Tertullian came to believe that it was genuine, accordingly mentioning it and defending it strongly in his later works. Unfortunately his work in defence of it, *De ecstasi*, in 7 books is lost. Tertullian fiercely attacks those who condemned the new prophecy, and in attacking the church authorities as more interested in their own political power in the church than in listening to the Spirit, he foreshadows the protestant reaction to papal claims.

<http://www.tertullian.org/montanism.htm>

5. Origen: (c.253 AD)

Although being a main source for Christians as an early church father, Origen actually adopted many heretical opinions, Philip Schaff tells concerning him: "For — and in this too he is like Schleiermacher — he can by no means be called orthodox, either in the Catholic or in the Protestant sense. His leaning to idealism, his predilection for Plato, and his noble effort to reconcile Christianity with reason, and to commend it even to educated heathens and Gnostics, led him into many grand and fascinating errors."

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/hcc2.v.xv.xxix.html>

All this proves that the Christian belief wasn't settled at that time, which gives the conclusion that the real Gospels were not that genuine, and that a lot of theological problems happened at that critical time even among early church fathers whom are supposed to be a main evidence for the Bible through their quotes, how could they be an evidence to the Gospels and

epistles and Christian belief when they are actually adopting opinions that are obviously against what the Gospels tell and what Christians believed? Aren't these church fathers orthodox Christians who were filled with the Holy Spirit and were actually quoted by Christians as the conquerors of heresy? How could they be conquerors of heresy when they adopted heresies?

6.5 JEWISH CORRUPTION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

This section shall highlight some of the corruptions made by the Jews in the Old Testament and how early Christians accused the Jews of corruption.

The first example is Justin Martyr (an early church father who died at about 150 AD) says in his dialogue with Trypho, a Jew:

Chap. LXXII. — **Passages Have Been Removed by the Jews from Esdras and Jeremiah.**

And I said, "I shall do as you please. From the statements, then, which Esdras made in reference to the law of the passover, they **have taken away the following**: 'And Esdras said to the people, This passover is our Saviour and our refuge. And if you have understood, and your heart has taken it in, that we shall humble Him on a standard, and..... thereafter hope in Him, then this place shall not be forsaken for ever, says the God of hosts. But if you will not believe Him, and will not listen to His declaration, you shall be a laughing-stock to the nations.'..... And again, **from the sayings of the same Jeremiah these have been cut out**: 'The Lord God remembered His dead people of Israel who lay in the graves; and He descended to preach to them His own salvation.'

So Justin Martyr here is explicitly accusing the Jews of corrupting the Old Testament by hiding some verses talking about salvation. But is it that easy that verses are removed from the Bible? Let's see what John Chrysostom (church father who lived in the fourth century) says in his Homilies on Gospel Matthew when he came to the verse quoting the Old Testament" which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene.":

And what manner of prophet said this? Be not curious, nor overbusy. **For many of the prophetic writings have been lost**; and this one may see from the history of the Chronicles. For being negligent, and continually falling into ungodliness, some they suffered to perish, others they themselves burnt up and cut to pieces. The latter fact Jeremiah relates; the former, he who composed the fourth book of Kings, saying, that after a long time the book of Deuteronomy was hardly found, buried somewhere and lost. But if, when there was no barbarian there, they so betrayed their books, much 56 more when the barbarians had overrun them. For as to the fact, that the prophet had foretold it, the apostles themselves in many places call Him a Nazarene. "

So simply John Chrysostom is not just accusing the Jews of being negligent who are not caring for their books, but also of destroying their own books. If these are accusations made by Christians, who are supposed to share the Jews their belief in the Old Testament, how could

Muslims trust the Jews and consider that they were really honest and followed God's commandment to keep His books, not to add or remove or replace?

Not only that, we can see another interesting account by Adam Clarke, a Christian commentator where he shows another intentional corruption made by the Jews against the Samaritans. He said in his commentary on Deu 27:4 -

“Set up these stones – in Mount Ebal – So the present Hebrew text , but the Samaritan has Mount Gerizim. Dr. Kennicott has largely defended the reading of the Samaritan in his second dissertation on the present state of the Hebrew text , and Dr. Parry has defended the Hebrew against the Samaritan. Many still think Dr. Kennicott's arguments unanswerable, **and have no doubt that the Jews have here corrupted the text through their enmity to the Samaritans.** “

So here again Adam Clarke didn't just accuse the Jews for corrupting the manuscripts due to their hostility with Christians only, but also they did the same with Samaritans, and with Muslims when they changed the name of [Abraham's offered son to Isaac](#).

These may be just some examples of what I have seen from Christian writings, and for sure if we dug more through various books, we may find more issues showing other issues. Actually if we went through early and medieval Muslim writings, we may find many quotes from Jewish and Christian writings talking about Prophet Muhammad in a very explicit way which are not present in the Bible. But if the Jews are actually proven to behave the way described above, then I tend to believe Muslim scholars, especially that this is against both Christian and Jewish beliefs.

6.6 WERE THE BIBLE WRITERS REALLY INSPIRED BY GOD?

Christians usually argue that the Bible was written by writers who were inspired by the Holy Spirit. If this is true, then we shouldn't find any fault within the Bible. Is this really the case? This article gives some citations by Adam Clarke, the Christian commentator where he shows that Ezra fell in some faults when he wrote the Chronicles This can be highlighted in his commentary.

Adam Clarke tells in his commentary on 1Chronicles 7:6:

“The sons of Benjamin; Bela, and Becher and Jediel – In Gen_46:21, ten sons of Benjamin are reckoned; In Num_26:38, etc ., five sons only of Benjamin are mentioned, Bela, Ashbel, Ahiram, Shupham, and Hupham: and Ard and Naaman are there said to be the sons of Bela; The rabbins say that Ezra, who wrote this book, did not know whether some of these were sons or grandsons; **and they intimate also that the tables from which he copied were often defective**, and here we must leave all such matters.”

<http://www.studylight.org/com/acc/view.cgi?bk=12&ch=7>

We can see here that Adam Clarke admits that there were some defective tables from which he copied. The question now is: If the Bible writers were inspired by the Holy Spirit, why were they misled by copying from a defective copy?

Then Adam Clarke continues in 1Chronicles 8:29 saying:

“And at Gibeon – This passage to the end of the 38th verse is found with a little variety in the names, 1Ch_9:35- 44.

The rabbins say that Ezra, having found two books that had these passages with a variety in the names, as they agreed in general, **he thought best to insert them both, not being able to discern which was the best.** “

<http://www.studylight.org/com/acc/view.cgi?bk=12&ch=8>

How can we say that Ezra or any Bible writer were really inspired? If the one who rewrote the Torah was a prophet who took the revelation from God, he wouldn't have fell in that problem, and he would have been able to distinguish the defective copies.

6.7 BIBLE DIFFICULTIES

6.7.1 Bible Corruption of Abraham's Offered Son to Isaac

Who was the offered son of Abraham? Is it Ishmael or Isaac? This has been a point of controversy between Muslims from one side, and from Jews and Christians from the other side. This article is not just showing a Bible difficulty that yielded in an inconsistency, but it can also give a hint on how the Jews intentionally changed the name of the offered son from Ishmael to Isaac. The question to the Bible is: how old was Ishmael when he went to Agar?

The Bible tells that Ishmael was about 16 years old when he went with Agar:

Gen 17:24 And Abraham was ninety years old and nine, when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin. Gen 17:25 And Ishmael his son was thirteen years old, when he was circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin.

Then when Abraham begat Isaac, he was 100 yrs old (Genesis 21:5), then Isaac grew and weaned (Genesis 21:9), this will take about 2 yrs, this means that Ishmael was about 16 yrs old when he went with Agar as Genesis 21 tells, my question is that how could Agar go all that way carrying a 16 yr old lad, as you can see from the rest of the chapter:

Gen 21:14 And Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and gave her the child, and sent her away. And she departed, and wandered in the wilderness of Beer-sheba. Gen 21:15 And the water in the bottle was spent, and she cast the child under one of the shrubs. Gen 21:16 And she went, and sat her down over against him a good way off, as it were a bowshot. For she said, Let me not look upon the death of the child. And she sat over against him, and lifted up her voice, and wept. Gen 21:17 And God heard the voice of the lad. And the angel of God called to Hagar out of heaven, and said unto her, What aileth thee, Hagar? Fear not. For God hath heard the voice of the lad where he is. Gen 21:18 Arise, lift up the lad, and hold him in thy hand. For I will make him a great nation. Gen 21:19 And God opened her eyes, and she saw a well of water. And she went, and filled the bottle with water, and gave the lad drink. Gen 21:20 And God was with the lad, and he grew. And he dwelt in the wilderness, and became, as he grew up, an archer.

The chapter goes as if Ishmael was a baby whom his mother lifts then puts, and he is silent, which doesn't match with a 16 yr old lad, it may be said that in Genesis 21:14, it says " putting it

on her shoulder, and gave her the child”, so it doesn’t mean that she really lifted him up, the case is that the Septuagint tells it very clearly:

21:14 And Abraam rose up in the morning and took loaves and a skin of water, and gave [them] to Agar, and he put the child on her shoulder, and sent her away, and she having departed wandered in the wilderness near the well of the oath.

<http://ecclesia.org/truth/septuagint-hyperlinked.html>

I think that the reason for this is what is said in the next chapter:

Gen 22:1 And it came to pass after these things, that God did prove Abraham, and said unto him, Abraham. And he said, Here am I. Gen 22:2 And he said, Take now thy son, thine only son, whom thou lovest, even Isaac, and get thee into the land of Moriah. And offer him there for a burnt-offering upon one of the mountains which I will tell thee of.

We as Muslims believe that Ishmael was the one offered, and we believe that the Jews altered the word Ishmael to Isaac, and the above difficulty is the evidence, since the scripture tells “after these things”, which are supposed to be happened when Ishmael was a baby, and since it is supposed that Ishmael was the firstborn son of Abraham, then it will mean that the only son here means him not Isaac, who haven’t been born yet if Ishmael was a baby, so for the Jews to get rid of this problem, they rearranged the chapters, and put the event of Isaac birth before that chapter, but it yielded that difficulty.

Actually the Jews were accused of corruption in other issues, and this article is talking about Christian [early church fathers accusing the Jews of Bible intentional corruption](#). This can be added to the accusations list.

6.7.2 When did Abraham leave Haran?

When did Abraham leave Haran? Was it before or after his father's death? This is a Bible difficulty showing an inconsistency between Old Testament and New Testament.

In the Old Testament it says that Terah lived 70 years then he begat Abraham:

Gen 11:26 And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran.

And then it tells that Abraham left Haran when he was 75:

Gen 12:4 So Abram went, as Jehovah had spoken unto him; and Lot went with him: and Abram was seventy and five years old when he departed out of Haran.

And that Terah was 205 years when he died:

Gen 11:32 And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years: and Terah died in Haran.

This means that Terah was $70+75=145$ years when Abraham left Haran, i.e., he was still alive when Abraham left Haran.

But actually the writer of Acts had another opinion:

Act 7:4 Then he went out from the land of the Chaldeans and lived in Haran. And after his father died, God removed him from there into this land in which you are now living. (ESV)

So the writer of Acts says what Genesis didn't say, Christian commentators tried to solve this problem, Adam Clarke for example writes:

“And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran – Haran was certainly the eldest son of Terah, and he appears to have been born when Terah was about seventy years of age, and his birth was followed in successive periods with those of Nahor his second, and Abram his youngest son. Many have been greatly puzzled with the account here, supposing because Abram is mentioned first, that therefore he was the eldest son of Terah: but he is only put first by way of dignity. An in stance of this we have already seen, [Gen 5:32](#), where Noah is represented as having Shem, Ham, and Japheth in this order of succession; whereas it is evident from other scriptures that Shem was the youngest son, who for dignity is named first, as Abram is here; and Japheth the eldest, named last, as Haran is here. Terah died two hundred and five years old, [Gen 11:32](#); then Abram departed from Haran when seventy-five years old, [Gen 12:4](#); therefore Abram was born, not when his father Terah was seventy, but when he was one hundred and thirty.

When any case of dignity or pre-eminence is to be marked, then even the youngest son is set before all the rest, though contrary to the usage of the Scriptures in other cases. Hence we find

Shem, the youngest son of Noah, always mentioned first; Moses is mentioned before his elder brother Aaron; and Abram before his two elder brethren Haran and Nahor. These observations are sufficient to remove all difficulty from this place.”

This would have been a good solution to this difficulty, if this wasn't mentioned:

Gen 17:17 Then Abraham fell upon his face, and laughed, and said in his heart, Shall a child be born unto him that is a hundred years old? and shall Sarah, that is ninety years old, bear?

This clearly means that when Abraham was told by God to have a child when he was 100 is a miracle, how come that Terah begat Abraham at 130?

Besides, a very important fragment was discovered within Dead Sea Scrolls that doesn't match with this claim, it is fragment 4Q252, which says:

He gave the land to Abraham His beloved.~Terah was~one hundred~and forty years old when he left 9Ur of the Chaldees and went to Haran and Ab[ram was s]eventy. And he dwet five years in Haran. **Then [Terah died] six[ty years after Abram] went out [to] the land of Ganaan. “**

<http://www.moellerhaus.com/Dead%20Sea%20Scrs/dsscomsGen.htm>

So as we see, saying that Terah begat Abraham at 130 doesn't match with the Bible, and DSS doesn't agree with it. This means that there is still a difficulty concerning what the writer of the Acts wrote.

6.7.3 How old was Perez when he married?

What was the age of Perez when he married? In Genesis 37:2, it says that Joseph was 17 when he dreamt and his brothers envied him:

Gen 37:2 These are the generations of Jacob. **Joseph, being seventeen years old**, was feeding the flock with his brethren; and he was a lad with the sons of Bilhah, and with the sons of Zilpah, his father's wives: and Joseph brought the evil report of them unto their father.

Then it says that when he stood before the Pharaoh he was 30:

Gen 41:46 And Joseph was thirty years old when he stood before Pharaoh king of Egypt.

Then the 7 years of plenty ended:

Gen 41:53 And the seven years of plenty, that was in the land of Egypt, came to an end.

Then 2 years from the famine passed when he invited his brothers to Egypt:

Gen 45:6 For these two years hath the famine been in the land: and there are yet five years, in which there shall be neither plowing nor harvest.

From the above, we can conclude that the time between when Joseph's brothers envied him, and when he invited them to Egypt will be= $2+7+30-17=22$ years

Let's see what happened in Jacob's family within that time:

Judah married and begat Er and Onan (Genesis 38:3-4), this happens at least in 2 years for marrying and conceiving twice, then Er married Tamar, then he died, which nearly happens within 12 years till Er marries and let's assume that he died immediately after he married, so we can have now about 13 years, then Onan married her and then died, and let's assume that all this didn't take one day, then in verse 11 Tamar waited for Shelah to grow up, so that she marries him, but he grew up and didn't marry her as in verse 14, so let's assume that all this took two years, so we now have 15 years, then Judah sinned with her, and she begat Perez, this would take about one year. So we can now conclude that Perez was about 6 years old when he went to Joseph in Egypt. The Bible tells that when Perez went to Joseph, he had 2 sons:

Gen 46:12 And the sons of Judah: Er, and Onan, and Shelah, and Perez, and Zerah; but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan. **And the sons of Perez were Hezron and Hamul.**

How come that a boy at 6 years old not only that he marries, but he also has 2 sons?

6.7.4 Genealogy of Jesus

This was one of the major difficulties that faced the Bible scholars for a long time, that the genealogy of Jesus in Matthew is totally different than that in Luke, For example in Robertson's Word Picture:

“Being Son (as was supposed) of Joseph, the son of Heli (ōn huios hōs enomizeto Iōsēph tou Helei). For the discussion of the genealogy of Jesus, see notes on Matthew 1:1-17. The two genealogies differ very widely and many theories have been proposed about them. At once one notices that Luke begins with Jesus and goes back to Adam, the Son of God, while Matthew begins with Abraham and comes to “Joseph the husband of Mary of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ” (Mat_1:16). Matthew employs the word “begot” each time, while Luke has the article tou repeating huiou (Son) except before Joseph. They agree in the mention of Joseph, but Matthew says that “Jacob begat Joseph” while Luke calls “Joseph the son of Heli.” There are other differences, but this one makes one pause. Joseph, of course, did not have two fathers. If we understand Luke to be giving the real genealogy of Jesus through Mary, the matter is simple enough. The two genealogies differ from Joseph to David except in the cases of Zorobabel and Salathiel. Luke evidently means to suggest something unusual in his genealogy by the use of the phrase “as was supposed” (hōs enomizeto). His own narrative in Luk_1:26-38 has shown that Joseph was not the actual father of Jesus. Plummer objects that, if Luke is giving the genealogy of Jesus through Mary, huios must be used in two senses here (son as was supposed of Joseph, and grandson through Mary of Heli). But that is not an unheard of thing. In neither list does Matthew or Luke give a complete genealogy. Just as Matthew uses “begat” for descent, so does Luke employ “son” in the same way for descendant. It was natural for Matthew, writing for Jews, to give the legal genealogy through Joseph, though he took pains to show in Mat_1:16, Mat_1:18-25 that Joseph was not the actual father of Jesus. It was equally natural for Luke, a Greek himself and writing for the whole world, to give the actual genealogy of Jesus through Mary. It is in harmony with Pauline universality (Plummer) that Luke carries the genealogy back to Adam and does not stop with Abraham.”

This was how Robertson shows the difficulty and how he tried to solve it. Actually this may have been right, but there are still other difficulties that must be put into consideration, the first thing is that if the genealogy in Matthew is the genealogy of Joseph, which means that it is not that of the Christ, which means that he won't be the Messiah since the Messiah should be from Solomon's genealogy. It may be said that Joseph was considered his father even if he wasn't the biological father, so Jesus still has the right to be the Messiah according to this genealogy, but actually I didn't find an evidence in the Bible where it treats a biological father as a father by

adoption, but even I found what tells that heir should be from the biological father not from a father by adoption:

And Abram said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed: and, lo, one born in my **Gen 15:3** house is mine heir. Gen 15:4 And, behold, the word of Jehovah came unto him, saying, This **but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be** ;man shall not be thine heir **.thine heir**

Also there are some other difficulties in the genealogy of Matthew, the first difficulty is that when we refer back to the genealogy in I Chronicles 3, we find that 3 names were dropped in Matthew who are Ahaziah, Joash and Azariah, and each of them is supposed to be a king who ruled, these are 3 continuous generations which were omitted. It may be said that they used to omit some names in the genealogy, which is really right, but not in this case, because it is supposed that the writer of Matthew is writing 42 generations during 3 periods each period should contain 14 generations, which is not actually the case here since the second period will contain 18 generations not 14 that way. It may be said that they were omitted because of their sins, so they can't be considered from the generation of the Messiah, but actually this is not an excuse, because the genealogy already other sinners, for example it contains Judah, who sinned with Tamar and begat Perez(Genesis 38), it contains Solomon, whom the Bible claims that he worshiped the idols and died that way (and we Muslims reject this blasphemy against God's prophets), and Jehoram who also worshiped the idols as in Easton's Bible Dictionary, what I see is that when Muslims object on omitting names from the genealogy Christians answer and say that this was due to their sins, and when we say how can the highest genealogy from where the Messiah is supposed to get from contains 4 cases of adultery (Tamar, Rahab, Ruth and Batheshba), they will say that God so loved the sinners that he put 4 adulterers in his genealogy!

The fourth one omitted here was Jehoiakim (see 1 Chronicles 3:15), and it seems that the reason for this is this verse:

Jer 36:30 Therefore thus saith Jehovah concerning Jehoiakim king of Judah: **He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David;** and his dead body shall be cast out in the day to the heat, and in the night to the frost

According to that verse in Jeremiah, no one from Jehoiakim's descendants shall sit on David's, which means that the Messiah can't be from his descendants. It may be said that this was the genealogy of Joseph not Jesus, so he could have been omitted, of course first this is not an appropriate justification, since if this was the case, then this genealogy has nothing to do with

Jesus, we either take all the genealogy for Jesus and consider that since he was the son adopted by Jesus, then all the genealogy refers to him, or that we say that this genealogy has nothing to do with Jesus, but we shouldn't take it selectively, besides, it seems that the writer of Gospel Matthew didn't understand it that way, otherwise he wouldn't have omitted his name.

6.7.5 The Story of Crucifixion

Here we shall discuss some of the contradictions in the crucifixion story between the Gospels. When there is a trial in a court, to accept what the witnesses say, there must be no variation between what they are saying, but if there was a wide variation between what the witnesses say, we reject both narrations since there is no proof to overwhelm a witness over another, these variations between the writers of the Gospels prove that they didn't witness what happened, these were stories present at their time, and everyone wrote what he heard, and these variations are a proof that the story of crucifixion in the Bible can't be accepted.

Betrayal by Judas and Seizing Jesus:

Gospel Matthew says:

Mat 26:47 And while he yet spake, lo, Judas, one of the twelve, came, and with him a great multitude with swords and staves, from the chief priest and elders of the people. Mat 26:48 Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that is he: take him. Mat 26:49 And straightway he came to Jesus, and said, Hail, Rabbi; and kissed him. Mat 26:50 And Jesus said unto him, Friend, *do* that for which thou art come. Then they came and laid hands on Jesus, and took him. Mat 26:51 And behold, one of them that were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and smote the servant of the high priest, and struck off his ear.

While Gospel John says:

Joh 18:3 Judas then, having received the band *of soldiers*, and officers from the chief priests and the Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons. Joh 18:4 Jesus therefore, knowing all the things that were coming upon him, went forth, and saith unto them, Whom seek ye? Joh 18:5 They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am *he*. And Judas also, who betrayed him, was standing with them. Joh 18:6 When therefore he said unto them, I am *he*, they went backward, and fell to the ground. Joh 18:7 Again therefore he asked them, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth. Joh 18:8 Jesus answered, I told you that I am *he*; if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way: Joh 18:9 that the word might be fulfilled which he spake, Of those whom thou hast given me I lost not one. Joh 18:10 Simon Peter therefore having a sword drew it, and struck the high priest's servant, and cut off his right ear. Now the servant's name was Malchus. Joh 18:11 Jesus therefore said unto Peter, Put up the sword into the sheath: the cup which the Father hath given me, shall I not drink it? Joh 18:12 So the band and the chief captain, and the officers of the Jews, seized Jesus and bound him,

We can see that there is a large difference between the two stories, in Matthew, it says that once Judas came, he went and kissed Jesus, while in John, it says that Jesus asked them "whom you seek?", and they answered him: "Jesus", and when he said "I am he", all this happened and Judas was only standing with them, and it couldn't have happened that kissing him was in between because the script in Matthew is very clear that Judas went straightway to kiss Jesus. And it's clear in Matthew that the sign to know Jesus was the kiss, while in John, Jesus identified himself, and only what Judas did is that he guided them, and where is the event that they fell when they heard Jesus saying "I am he"? Where did Matthew tell that? Another difference between the two stories is that in Matthew, Peter cut the high priest's servant's ear after they seized Jesus, while in John, Peter did that before they seize him.

Peter Denying him

Mat 26:69 Now Peter was sitting without in the court: and a maid came unto him, saying, Thou also wast with Jesus the Galilaeen. Mat 26:70 But he denied before them all, saying, I know not what thou sayest. Mat 26:71 And when he was gone out into the porch, another *maid* saw him, and saith unto them that were there, This man also was with Jesus of Nazareth. Mat 26:72 And again he denied with an oath, I know not the man. Mat 26:73 And after a little while they that stood by came and said to Peter, Of a truth thou also art *one* of them; for thy speech maketh thee known. Mat 26:74 Then began he to curse and to swear, I know not the man. And straightway the cock crew. Mat 26:75 And Peter remembered the word which Jesus had said, Before the cock crew, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bitterly.

Mar 14:66 And as Peter was beneath in the court, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest; Mar 14:67 and seeing Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and saith, Thou also wast with the Nazarene, *even* Jesus. Mar 14:68 But he denied, saying, I neither know, nor understand what thou sayest: and he went out into the porch; and the cock crew. Mar 14:69 And the maid saw him, and began again to say to them that stood by, This is *one* of them. Mar 14:70 But he again denied it. And after a little while again they that stood by said to Peter, of a truth thou art *one* of them; for thou art a Galilaeen. Mar 14:71 But he began to curse, and to swear, I know not this man of whom ye speak. Mar 14:72 And straightway the second time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word, how that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crew twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept.

We can here see some differences between the 2 Gospels, in Matthew, it tells that Jesus told Peter that he will deny him 3 times after the cock crows, while in Mark, it tells that Jesus told Peter that the cock will crow twice before Peter denies him thrice, and there is no place that

Jesus tells both statements since the situation happened quickly (See Matthew 26:31-35, Mark 14:27-31), and in Luke, the statement was much clearer that the cock will not crow before Peter denies him thrice (Luke 22:34 and Matthew 26:34), unlike Mark which tells that the cock crew before he denies him thrice (Mark 14:68). Also in Matthew it says that a maid and then another maid asked him, while in Mark, it says that the same maid asked him twice.

The hour of crucifixion:

Mar 15:25 And it was the third hour, and they crucified him.

Joh 19:14 Now it was the Preparation of the passover: it was about the sixth hour. And he saith unto the Jews, Behold, your King!

So according to Mark, he was crucified at the third hour, while according to John, he was still at the Pilate at the sixth hour, the Christian commentators answer this by telling that what is told in Mark is in Jewish time at 9 am, while in case of John, this was by Roman time at six am, and so crucifixion was also at 9 am, but there are some problems with that conclusion, the first problem is that it is supposed that the writer of John according to Christians is the disciple John, who is Jewish, so it is not logical that he uses the Roman timing, especially that he was talking about the preparation of the Passover, and what is the need that the Holy Spirit reveals to Mark in Hebrew timing and to John in Roman timing? Besides, it is really a difficult possibility, otherwise how could it be that denying of Peter, the trial, then crucifixion happened only in 3 hours?

6.7.6 How did Judas die?

How did Judas die? Actually the Bible tells us 2 stories. In Matthew, it says that he hanged himself:

Mat 27:5 And he cast down the pieces of silver into the sanctuary, and departed; and he went away and hanged himself.

While in Acts, it says that he fell on the ground his bowels gushed out:

Act 1:18 (Now this man obtained a field with the reward of his iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out

So which one was the real story? It might be said that he first hanged himself, and when he fell on the ground his bowels gushed out. Actually this is so weird, and I don't know how could this happen. Anyway this is not the only problem since it seems that every writer is trying to fulfill a prophecy in the Old Testament, and builds his story on the verse he chose, so we find that in case of Matthew, the chief priest took the money and bought the field, so that what happens in Jeremiah (Zechariah) is fulfilled:

Mat 27:6 And the chief priests took the pieces of silver, and said, It is not lawful to put them into the treasury, since it is the price of blood. Mat 27:7 And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter's field, to bury strangers in.

And in case of Acts, Judas is the one who bought the field and he died in it, so that what is written in Psalms be fulfilled:

Act 1:18 (Now this man obtained a field with the reward of his iniquity;

So if Judas obtained the field by the reward he took, from whom did the chief priest buy the field?

Actually if we examined the writings of early church fathers, we find that Papias actually mentioned a new story of how Judas died:

Judas walked about in this world a sad example of impiety; for his body having swollen to such an extent that he could not pass where a chariot could pass easily, he was crushed by the chariot, so that his bowels gushed out. "

<http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/anf01.vii.ii.iii.html>

So Papias says that Judas' bowels were gushed out, not because he fell on the ground after hanging himself, but because his body was swollen and he was crushed by a chariot. This may match with the account of Acts, but for sure it doesn't match with Matthew's. It's worth saying

that Papias is considered a main evidence by Christians to prove that Matthew the disciple of Jesus is the one who wrote the Gospel of Matthew, when we find that actually he didn't match with his account.

6.8 ANONYMOUS BIBLE WRITERS

When examining the identity of the Bible writers, you can see from the commentaries that many Bible books are written by anonymous people. This is what is admitted by the Bible scholars themselves, I will give some examples of these books, you can get back to the NIV commentary and to the Catholic encyclopedia:

<http://www.newadvent.org/bible/>

I would really like to ask a question, how could be there all that dispute in the book whom you claim to be fully divine?

Genesis: “Historically, Jews and Christians alike have held that Moses was the author/compiler of the first five books of the OT. These books, known also as the Pentateuch (meaning “five-volumed book”), were referred to in Jewish tradition as the five fifths of the law (of Moses). The Bible itself suggests Mosaic authorship of Genesis, since Ac 15:1 refers to circumcision as “the custom taught by Moses,” an allusion of Ge 17. **However, a certain amount of later editorial updating does appear to be indicated (see, e.g., notes on 14:14; 36:31; 47:11).** (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 2)”

Joshua: “It seems safe to conclude that the book, at least in its early form, dates from the beginning of the monarchy. Some think that Samuel may have had a hand in shaping or compiling the materials of the book, **but in fact we are unsure who the final author or editor was.** (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 286)”

Judges”Although, according to tradition, Samuel wrote the book,**authorship is actually uncertain.**” (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 322).

I,II Samuel: This redactor, according to Hummelauer, is the prophet Nathan; the work, however, can hardly be placed so early. Others attribute it to Isaias, Jeremias, Ezechias, or Esdras. **None of these opinions rests on any solid ground, and we can only say that the author is unknown.** (Catholic Encyclopedia)

I,II Kings: According to the Babylonian Talmud (Baba bathra, fol. 15, 1), the Prophet Jeremias is the author. Not a few among both older and more recent exegetes consider this probable. **It is indeed remarkable that Jeremias’s activity is not alluded to—his name not even being mentioned—**although he stood in close relation to the events of the last few years, while everything other prophets (e.g. Elias, Eliseus, Isaias) did for kings and people is carefully noted. **In case** Jeremias was the author, we have to accept the explanation that he did not consider it suitable to relate here what he had set forth at length in his prophecy. (Catholic Encyclopedia)

I,II Chronicles: “According to ancient Jewish tradition, Ezra wrote Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah (see Introduction to Ezra: Literary Form and Authorship), **but this cannot be established with certainty.** (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 569)”

Psalms: (1) Jewish tradition is uncertain as to the authors of the Psalms. Baba Bathra (14 f) mentions ten; Pesachim (10) attributes all the Psalms to David. (2) Christian tradition is alike uncertain (Catholic Encyclopedia)

Isaiah: The canonical Book of Isaias is made up of two distinct collections of discourses, the one (chapters 1-35) called sometimes the “First Isaias”; the other (chapters 40-66) styled by many modern critics the “Deutero- (or Second) Isaias”; between these two comes a stretch of historical narrative; some authors, as Michaelis and Hengstenberg, holding with St. Jerome that the prophecies are placed in chronological order; others, like Vitringa and Jahn, in a logical order; others finally, like Gesenius, Delitzsch, Keil, think the actual order is partly logical and partly chronological. **No less disagreement prevails on the question of the collector.** Those who believe that Isaias is the author of all the prophecies contained in the book generally fix upon the Prophet himself. But for the critics who question the genuineness of some of the parts, the compilation is by a late and unknown collector. (Catholic Encyclopedia)

Ruth: The Book of Ruth is anonymous, for the name which it bears as its title has never been regarded otherwise than that of the chief actor in the events recorded. (Catholic Encyclopedia)

I Machabees: No data can be found either in the book itself or in later writers which would give us a clue as to the person of the author. (Catholic Encyclopedia)

II Machabees: II Mach. is, as has been said, an epitome of a larger work by a certain Jason of Cyrene. Nothing further is known of this Jason except that, judging from his exact geographical knowledge, he must have lived for some time in Palestine. **The author of the epitome is unknown.** (Catholic Encyclopedia)

Job: “Although most of the book consists of the words of Job and his counselors, **Job himself was not the author.**” (Catholic Encyclopedia)

“**The unknown author** probably had access to oral and/or written sources....”(From the NIV Bible commentary, page 722).

Song of Songs: “Verse 1 appears to ascribe authorship to Solomon. Solomon is referred to seven times, and several verses speak of the ‘king’, **but whether he was the author remains an open question.** (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 997)”

Ecclesiastes (Qoheleth): Most modern commentators are of the opinion that Qoheleth's style points not to Solomon, but to a later writer. (Catholic Encyclopedia)

Habakkuk: Owing chiefly to the lack of reliable external evidence, there has been in the past, and there is even now, a great diversity of opinions concerning the date to which the prophecy of Habakkuk should be ascribed. (Catholic Encyclopedia)

Malachi: A large number of modern authors likewise refuse to see in Malachi the proper name of the author.According to them, it is from this passage that the name Malachi was borrowed by a more recent author, who added the inscription to the book (Catholic Encyclopedia)

Matthew:The passing years do not make it any plainer who actually wrote our Greek Matthew. Papias records, as quoted by Eusebius, that Matthew wrote the *Logia* of Jesus in Hebrew (Aramaic). **Is our present Matthew a translation of the Aramaic Logia along with Mark and other sources as most modern scholars think? If so, was the writer the Apostle Matthew or some other disciple?** **There is at present no way to reach a clear decision in the light of the known facts.** There is no real reason why the Apostle Matthew could not have written both the Aramaic *Logia* and our Greek Matthew, unless one is unwilling to believe that he would make use of Mark's work on a par with his own. But Mark's book rests primarily on the preaching of Simon Peter. Scholfield has recently (1927) published *An Old Hebrew Text of St. Matthew's Gospel*. We know quite too little of the origin of the Synoptic Gospels to say dogmatically that the Apostle Matthew was not in any real sense the author. (Robertson's Word Picture, Introduction to Matthew)

Mark: "Although there is no direct internal evidence of authorship, it was the unanimous testimony of the early church that this Gospel was written by John Mark. (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 1488)"

Hebrews: "The writer of this letter does not identify himself, but he was obviously well known to the original recipients. (From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 1856)"

1 John: "...Unlike most NT letters, 1 John does not tell us who its author is. The earliest identification of him comes from the church fathers...(From the NIV Bible Commentary, page 1904)"

Revelation (Apocalypse): Perhaps no single book in the New Testament presents so many and so formidable problems as the Apocalypse of John. These difficulties concern the authorship, the date, the apocalyptic method, the relation to the other Johannine books, the purpose, the historical environment, the reception of the book in the New Testament canon, the use and

misuse of the book through the ages, etc. In the eastern churches the recognition of the Apocalypse of John was slower than in the west, since it was not in the Peshitta Syriac Version. Caius of Rome attributed the book to Cerinthus the Gnostic, but he was ably answered by Hippolytus, who attributed it to the Apostle John. The Council of Laodicea (about a.d. 360) omitted it, but the third Council of Carthage (a.d. 397) accepted it. The dispute about millenarianism led Dionysius of Alexandria (middle of the third century, a.d.) to deny the authorship to the Apostle John, though he accepted it as canonical. Eusebius suggested a second John as the author. But finally the book was accepted in the east as Hebrews was in the west after a period of doubt.(Robertson's Word Picture, Introduction to Revelation)

Robertson says concerning 2 Peter, Revelation, Hebrews:

Probably no book in the New Testament presents more unsettled problems than does the Epistle to the Hebrews. On that score it ranks with the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse of John, and Second Peter. But, in spite of these unsolved matters, the book takes high rank for its intellectual grasp, spiritual power, and its masterful portrayal of Christ as High Priest. It is much briefer than the Fourth Gospel, but in a sense it carries on further the exalted picture of the Risen Christ as the King-Priest who reigns and pleads for us now.(Robertson's Word Picture, Introduction to Hebrews)

6.9 TEXTUAL VARIANTS

This section shall cover some of the variations between Bible manuscripts either in both Old and New Testaments.

6.9.1.1 *Old Testament manuscripts:*

Old Testament manuscripts vary widely between each other, from the main points of variation is the genealogies, Albert Barnes made a table comparing between the genealogies in Genesis 5 and 11, comparing between the Hebrew, the Septuagint, the Samaritan and the writings of Josephus, the four sources are widely varied, Hebrew refers the time between Adam and Abraham as 2078 years, the Septuagint as 3564, the Samaritan as 2379 and Josephus as 2678 years. This is a wide variety between manuscripts, and proves that a lot of interpolation happened.

<http://www.gotothebible.com/Barnes/Genesis/5.html>

Albert Barnes of course prefers the Hebrew, but actually I see that the Hebrew is the most far one from the truth, since this means that the age of humanity will be 2078 years+ age between Abraham and Jesus (about 2400 years maximum)+2007 years= 6485 years, the age of humanity, which is scientifically untrue where many sources tell that life existed on Earth before that time:

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/8th_millennium_BC

6.9.1.2 *In the New Testament manuscripts:*

Textual variants are widely present in NT manuscripts, for example, [Herman Hoskier](#) says:

The Differences Between Sinaiticus and Vaticanus in the Four Gospels:

Matthew 656+ Mark 567+ Luke 791+ John 1022+ Total 3036+

in the Gospels alone.” Hoskier. Codex B., Vol. 2, P.1

And this is widely known, Christians say that these differences are considered to be trivial and has no effect on Christian faith, actually this may be the case with most of these variations, but there are still present very critical variations that were intentional due to theological purposes, let's see some here, you can see this [site](#) as a source for textual variants:

Matthew 24:36:

TEXT: “no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, nor the Son, but the Father only.”
EVIDENCE: S^{*,b} B D Theta f13 28 1195 1230* most lat syr(pal) some cop
TRANSLATIONS: ASV RSV NASV NIV NEB TEV
RANK: C

NOTES: “no one knows, not even the angels of heaven, but the Father only.” **EVIDENCE:** S^aK L W
Delta Pi f1 33 565 700 892 1010 1241 Byz Lect two lat vg syr(s,p,h) most cop
TRANSLATIONS: KJV ASVn RSVn NIVn TEVn

COMMENTS: It is possible that the words were added here by copyists to make the text read like the parallel passage in Mark 13:32. **On the other hand, it is possible that they were omitted to avoid the theological problem of the Son of God not knowing something.** The same thing happened with a few manuscripts in Mark 13:32 (including manuscripts X and 983). They are included here since they are found in early manuscripts of several kinds of ancient text.

Matthew 19:17

(ASV) And he said unto him, Why askest thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good: but if thou wouldest enter into life, keep the commandments.

(MKJV) And He said to him, Why do you call Me good? *There is none good but one, that is, God. But if you want to enter into life, keep the commandments.*

John Gill says on this verse:

“Some copies read, “why dost thou ask me concerning good”. And so the Vulgate Latin, and the Ethiopic versions, and Munster’s Hebrew Gospel read; but the Syriac, Arabic, and Persic versions, read as we do, and this the answer of Christ requires. “

This textual variant seems to happen because some copyists found that Jesus is denying his deity that way, so they changed it to the other reading.

1 Timothy 3:16

TEXT: “He was made apparent in the flesh” **EVIDENCE:** S* A* C* G 33 syr(pal) syr(p,h)? cop?
TRANSLATIONS: ASV RSV NASV NIV NEB TEV
RANK: B

NOTES: “God was made apparent in the flesh” **EVIDENCE:** S^e A² C² D^c K L P Psi 81 104 614 630
1241 1739 1881 2495 Byz Lect
TRANSLATIONS: KJV ASVn RSVn NASVn NIVn

NOTES: “Which was made apparent in the flesh” **EVIDENCE:** D* lat vg syr(p,h)? cop?
TRANSLATIONS: ASVn RSVn

COMMENTS: The word “who” was changed to “which” by some copyists to refer to “mystery.” In an older manuscript that does not have accents and breathing marks, all that is required to change the Greek word for “who” (OS) to the abbreviation for “God” (ΘS) is to add two marks. This happened to several manuscripts, apparently to give a definite subject to the following verbs.

It seems also that this verse was interpolated to be a theological evidence for the deity of the Christ.

We can also see the story of the adulterer in Gospel John 7:53-8:11, and the end of Gospel Mark 16:9-20, which both have much importance, as the first is used as an evidence for the Christians so that they are not restricted by the law, and the other which talks about the resurrection of Jesus and his sitting on the right of the Father, and many scholars admit that these two stories are not present in the early manuscripts. not only that, but Augustine of Hippo mentioned an interesting reason for omitting the story of the adulterer:

“Certain persons of little faith, or rather enemies of the true faith, fearing, I suppose, lest their wives should be given impunity in sinning, removed from their manuscripts the Lord’s act of forgiveness toward the adulteress, as if he who had said, Sin no more, had granted permission to sin.”^[14]

<http://www-user.uni-bremen.de/~wie/TCG/TC-John-PA.pdf>

So is it easy that people omit stories from manuscripts to that extent that led to a dispute among Christians?

7 MISCELLANEOUS TOPICS

7.1 WHO IS ALLAH?

This is a common question among many Christians. Who is Allah? Is He the same as Yahweh? Do we worship the same God?

Well, we believe that Allah is the God whom Muslims worship, and He is the God who revealed to all prophets, and on that base He is the God whom Jews and Christians are supposed to worship:

46. And argue not with the people of the Book except with what is best as an argument, but argue not at all with such of them as are unjust. And say, `We believe in that which has been revealed to us and that which has been revealed to you; and our God and your God is One, and to HIM we submit.’ (Holy Quran 29:46)

And Prophet Muhammad(Peace be upon him) said in Bukhari:

Do not believe the People of the Book and do not deny them. Say: “We believe in Allah and what has been revealed to us and what has been revealed to you. Our God and your God is One, and to Him we have submitted.”

So we believe that Our God is one, the One who sent the Torah, the Gospel and the Quran, as for the name Jehovah or Yahweh, I didn’t find an Islamic scripture telling it, but there are biblical scriptures, see for example in Daniel:

Dan 2:20 Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the name of **God** for ever and ever; for wisdom and might are his.

The word used for God here as BDB Dictionary description is: **H426**

אלה (Aramaic)

‘ēlāhh

BDB Definition:

1) god, God

1a) god, heathen deity

1b) God (of Israel)

Part of Speech: noun masculine

A Related Word by BDB/Strong’s Number: corresponding to H433

Same Word by TWOT Number: 2576

Allah (as most Muslim scholars say) is derived from Al-ilah which means The God, and when we look at the Aramaic word for God, we find it Alaahaa, you can see [this site](#):

<http://learnassyrian.com/aramaic/church/church.html>

You can hear how the word Alaahaa is pronounced. It is almost the same pronunciation as Allah. Not only that, but the word (Alaaha) was mentioned in the movie (Passion of the Christ). See video [here](#):

http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Z87z_W6gHa4

Arab Christians also use the word Allah, and anyone can make sure through the Arabic Bible.

As for those who say that Allah is the name of the pagan moon god, they'd better look at what their own sources say about the name "Allah", and they should say that the Arab Christians are pagans also. Islam has nothing to do with that pagan god, and there is a very clear proof from the Quran concerning this:

37. And of HIS Signs are the night and the day and the sun and the moon. Prostrate not yourselves before the sun, nor before the moon, but prostrate yourselves before ALLAH, Who created them, if it is HIM Whom you really worship. (Holy Quran 41:37)

This verse clearly disproves that claim, and re-asserts that the moon is not God, and that it is not to be worshipped, but only Allah is the One to be worshipped.

7.2 IS JIHAD TERRORISM?

Jihad is the main misconception people have about Islam, thinking that the main aim for Islam is to kill people and take their money, and this is really untrue. Jihad was sanctioned to protect people and let them leave peacefully by fighting the heads of infidelity who stand as an obstacle preventing Islam to reach people, for example, if there was a village infected by a virus, and some people came to this village with the medicine that will heal it, but some of the people in the village came out and prevented them from entering with that medicine, wouldn't it be a must that these people must be prevented by force so that the medicine enters the village? There is no other solution, otherwise the people in the village will die. This is simply the Jihad, it's not a terrorism, it's a war against terrorism, a war so that people can live under the piece of Islam, God said in the Quran:

193. And fight them until there is no persecution, and religion is professed only for ALLAH. But if they desist, then remember that no hostility is allowed except against the wrongdoers.(Holy Quran 2:193)

In Jihad, unlike the wars in the Old Testament, Muhammad(Peace be upon him) ordered Muslims when fighting not to kill women, children or an old man or a monk,see for example this hadith:

It has been reported from Sulaiman b. Buraid through his father that when the Messenger of Allah (may peace be upon him) appointed anyone as leader of an army or detachment he would especially exhort him to fear Allah and to be good to the Muslims who were with him. He would say: Fight in the name of Allah and in the way of Allah. Fight against those who disbelieve in Allah. Make a holy war, do not embezzle the spoils; do not break your pledge; and do not mutilate (the dead) bodies; do not kill the children. (Narrated by Muslim)

Killing women, old men and monks was forbidden in another hadith in Muwatta' concerning Abu Bakr the intimate disciple of Muhammad (Peace be upon him), and the first Muslim Caliph : Yahya related to me from Malik from Yahya ibn Said that Abu Bakr as-Siddiq was sending armies to ash-Sham.(Syria) He went for a walk with Yazid ibn Abi Sufyan who was the commander of one of the battalions. It is claimed that Yazid said to Abu Bakr, "Will you ride or shall I get down?" Abu Bakr said, "I will not ride and you will not get down. I intend these steps of mine to be in the way of Allah." Then Abu Bakr advised Yazid, "You will find a people who claim to have totally given themselves to Allah. Leave them to what they claim to have given themselves. You will find a people who have shaved the middle of their heads, strike what they have shaved with the sword. "I advise you ten things: Do not kill women or children or an aged,

infirm person. Do not cut down fruit-bearing trees. Do not destroy an inhabited place. Do not slaughter sheep or camels except for food. Do not burn bees and do not scatter them. Do not steal from the booty, and do not be cowardly.” (Muwatta’)

When Muslims enter a city, before they fight they must first invite people to Islam, and let them know about Islam, if they accepted, then fighting them is forbidden, if they didn’t then the Jizya (tax), if they accepted, then fighting them is forbidden, if they rejected, then it’s the war:

“When you meet your enemies who are polytheists, invite them to three courses of action. If they respond to any one of these, you also accept it and withhold yourself from doing them any harm. Invite them to (accept) Islam; if they respond to you, accept it from them and desist from fighting against them. Then invite them to migrate from their lands to the land of Muhairs and inform them that, if they do so, they shall have all the privileges and obligations of the Muhajirs. If they refuse to migrate, tell them that they will have the status of Bedouin Muslims and will be subjected to the Commands of Allah like other Muslims, but they will not get any share from the spoils of war or Fai’ except when they actually fight with the Muslims (against the disbelievers). If they refuse to accept Islam, demand from them the Jizya. If they agree to pay, accept it from them and hold off your hands. If they refuse to pay the tax, seek Allah’s help and fight them. ” (Muslim, the rest of the first hadith) If man accepts to pay Jizya, Muslims are ordered to treat him well, and be fair with him, as God says:

8. ALLAH forbids you not respecting those who have not fought against you on account of your religion, and who have not driven you out from your homes, that you be kind to them and deal equitably with them; surely, ALLAH loves those who are equitable. 9. ALLAH only forbids you respecting those who have fought against you on account of your religion and have driven you out of your homes, and have helped others in driving you out, that you make friends with them, and whosoever makes friends with them – it is these that are transgressors.(Holy Quran 60:8-9)

And killing them is forbidden, Muhammad (Peace be upon him) said:

“Whoever has killed a person having a treaty with the Muslims shall not smell the fragrance of Paradise, though its fragrance is found for a span of forty years.” (Bukhari and Ibn Majah)

As for Jizya, it’s value is very low, and women, children, monks and old men are exempted from it, and Muslims should protect them, and if they had any problem with a Muslim, they have the right to go to the judge, and if they had the right, they would take it.

And as long as Islam didn't reach the city where Muslims will enter, it's forbidden to attack them suddenly, it happened once that a Muslim army did that and entered a city without inviting them first, so people of the city complained to the caliph after one year (when they knew that Muslims should invite them first), when the caliph knew that, he ordered the army to get out of the city, and re-invite them.

Finally I must say that Jihad is done when the Muslim nation is strong enough to perform it, and it must be under the caliph, it is not a mess that anyone goes and blows himself up within non-Muslims, this is not considered a Jihad, it's a misunderstanding of Jihad, and this is actually the result of ignorance.

7.3 WAR IN THE BIBLE

There are lots of verses in the Old Testament telling about war and how Israel fought their enemies, and how they treated them, I will give here only 2 verses:

Deu 20:10 When thou drawest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. Deu 20:11 And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be, that all the people that are found therein shall become tributary unto thee, and shall serve thee. Deu 20:12 And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it: Deu 20:13 and when Jehovah thy God delivereth it into thy hand, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword: Deu 20:14 but the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take for a prey unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which Jehovah thy God hath given thee. Deu 20:15 Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations. Deu 20:16 But of the cities of these peoples, that Jehovah thy God giveth thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth; Deu 20:17 but thou shalt utterly destroy them: the Hittite, and the Amorite, the Canaanite, and the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite; as Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee;

And it says in 1 Samuel:

1Sa 15:1 And Samuel said unto Saul, Jehovah sent me to anoint thee to be king over his people, over Israel: now therefore hearken thou unto the voice of the words of Jehovah. **1Sa 15:2** Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, I have marked that which Amalek did to Israel, how he set himself against him in the way, when he came up out of Egypt. **1Sa 15:3** Now go and smite Amalek, and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep, camel and ass. **1Sa 15:4** And Saul summoned the people, and numbered them in Telaim, two hundred thousand footmen, and ten thousand men of Judah. **1Sa 15:5** And Saul came to the city of Amalek, and laid wait in the valley. **1Sa 15:6** And Saul said unto the Kenites, Go, depart, get you down from among the Amalekites, lest I destroy you with them; for ye showed kindness to all the children of Israel, when they came up out of Egypt. So the Kenites departed from among the Amalekites. **1Sa 15:7** And Saul smote the Amalekites, from Havilah as thou goest to Shur, that is before Egypt. **1Sa 15:8** And he took Agag the king of the Amalekites alive, and utterly destroyed all the people with the edge of the sword. **1Sa 15:9** But Saul and the people spared Agag, and the best of the sheep, and of the oxen, and of the fatlings, and the lambs, and all that was good, and would not utterly destroy them: but everything that was vile and refuse, that they destroyed utterly. **1Sa 15:10** Then came the word of Jehovah unto Samuel, saying, **1Sa 15:11** It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king; for

he is turned back from following me, and hath not performed my commandments. And Samuel was wroth; and he cried unto Jehovah all night.

Some Christians try to justify this as they were tribe wars, and it was only a defensive case, I really wonder how, the verses are very clear, according to the Christian perspective, why does the law tell Israelites to come and fight cities, and if they accepted peace, they are all taken as slaves? And why does God orders Israelites to take a part of land (the holy land) from those who were living in it? Where is the freedom of choice which Christians always condemn Islam with? Yes, we believe that God gave Palestine to Israelites (at their time only, but when they broke God's covenant, they have no more right in it), but I am talking from a Christian perspective to those who are treating with double standards, and why did God order to kill women, children, even the suckling? Then they come and accuse Islam with barbarism. Monstrous is the word that comes out of their mouths. They speak naught but a lie.

7.4 POLYGAMY IN THE BIBLE

Actually, there is no place in the Bible , where it tells men not to marry more than one wife, on the contrary, we find that it was told in the Bible that some prophets had more than one wife, for example Abraham had Sarah and Hajar, then after Sarah died, he had Keturah and other concubines as mentioned in Genesis 25:1-6, Jacob had 2 wives 2 handmaids:

Gen 32:22 And he rose up that night, and took his two wives, and his two handmaids, and his eleven children, and passed over the ford of the Jabbok.

David had 9 wives, 6 mentioned in that script:

2Sa 3:2 And unto David were sons born in Hebron: and his first-born was Amnon, of Ahinoam the Jezreelitess; 2Sa 3:3 and his second, Chileab, of Abigail the wife of Nabal the Carmelite; and the third, Absalom the son of Maacah the daughter of Talmai king of Geshur; 2Sa 3:4 and the fourth, Adonijah the son of Haggith; and the fifth, Shephatiah the son of Abital; 2Sa 3:5 and the sixth, Ithream, of Eglah, David's wife. These were born to David in Hebron.

Other than Michal (2 Sa 6:23), Batheshba (2 Sa 11:26) and Abishag the Shunammite (1Ki 1:3) plus more than 10 concubines:

2Sa 15:16 And the king went forth, and all his household after him. And the king left ten women, that were concubines, to keep the house.

Also Solomon had 1000 women 700 concubines and 300 wives, as in 1Ki 11:1-11, and what the Bible condemned wasn't having women, but that these women were disbelievers so they drove him (We Muslims totally reject that blasphemy that Solomon worshipped idols, he is innocent from this)

The Old Testament clearly sanctions it:

Deu 21:15 If a man have two wives, the one beloved, and the other hated, and they have borne him children, both the beloved and the hated; and if the first-born son be hers that was hated;

So it tells that if a man had two wives, and didn't say that it is forbidden.

And after the Bible tells what David made with Batheshba (Which we also consider as a blasphemy against God's prophet David), it tells that God said to him:

2Sa 12:8 and I gave thee thy master's house, and thy master's wives into thy bosom, and gave thee the house of Israel and of Judah; and if that had been too little, I would have added unto thee such and such things.

So the Bible tells that if David needed more (which includes women), and not to commit adultery, God would have gave him, and let him do it.

7.5 DOES ISLAM GIVE A GUARANTEE FOR HEAVEN?

A common question asked by Christians to Muslims is:

We have a guarantee to enter Heaven as Jesus has taken our sins away on the cross so that no one who believes in him shall perish, what is your guarantee as Muslims?

Simple answer is from the Holy Quran:

Allah has promised those who believe and do righteous deeds [that] for them there is forgiveness and great reward. (Holy Quran 5:9)

Is that a guarantee? It may be a guarantee that the one who has the right faith and his faith is compiled into good deeds is promised by Heaven, but who guarantees that he is believing in Allah as He asked him to? And if he has the right faith and knows he has the right faith, how can he guarantee that he shall die on the right faith? How can he guarantee that he is intending by his good deeds only Allah not anyone or anything else so that Allah accepts it? That's actually what Allah shows in the Quran in the story of Abel and Cain:

And recite to them the story of Adam's two sons, in truth, when they both offered a sacrifice [to Allah], and it was accepted from one of them but was not accepted from the other. Said [the latter], "I will surely kill you." Said [the former], "**Indeed, Allah only accepts from the righteous [who fear Him].**" (Holy Quran 5:28)

If we have a guarantee that we shall enter Heaven, what is the need to work and do good deeds? We can steal, kill, fornicate, do anything we like as long as we guarantee that our faith shall let us go to Heaven. Christians will say, this is not the meaning definitely, so where is the guarantee you actually have?

7.6 HOLY SPIRIT AND GUIDANCE

Christians always say that they believe in the Holy Spirit as the guider to the truth as Jesus said:

Joh 14:26 But the Comforter, *even* the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, **he shall teach you all things**, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.

As it is written about the function of the Holy Spirit:

In Christian theology Holy Spirit is believed to perform specific divine functions in the life of the Christian or the church. The action of the Holy Spirit is seen as an essential part of the bringing of the person to the Christian faith.^[48] The new believer is “born again of the Spirit”.^[49] The Holy Spirit enables Christian life by dwelling in the individual believers and enables them to live a righteous and faithful life.^[48] The Holy Spirit also acts as comforter or **Paraclete**, one who intercedes, or supports or acts as an advocate, particularly in times of trial. And it acts to convince the unredeemed person both of the sinfulness of their actions, and of their moral standing as sinners before God.^[50] **Another faculty of the Holy Spirit is the inspiration and interpretation of scripture. The Holy Spirit both *inspires* the writing of the scriptures and *interprets* them to the Christian and/or church.**^[51]

[http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holy_Spirit_\(Christianity\)](http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Holy_Spirit_(Christianity))

So if all Christians believe that the Holy Spirit teaches the inspiration and interpretation of scriptures, why do Christians have that vast diversity among them in both aspects?

Let’s talk first about inspiration, till now there is a diversity between Catholics and Protestants about the number of books of the Bible, as the Catholics have 73 books, Protestants have 66 only and believe that others are apocrypha. Ethiopian and Coptic churches have even more books.

If we looked at the New Testament, although its canon has been settled now, but actually this wasn’t the case among early church fathers. There have been some books as epistle of Barnabas, Shepherd of Hermas that were accepted by many fathers, now they are not in the NT canon. On the other hand, some of the books accepted now as second epistle of Peter, book of Hebrews and book of Revelations, this link can be a nice list made telling about the disputed books:

<http://www.bible-researcher.com/canon5.html>

If we are talking about Bible interpretations then we can see the diversity in faith among Christian churches, some of them are like having statues and images of saints, belief in Mary whether it is the mother of the Lord or not, immaculate conception, Holy Spirit himself who is

supposed to guide Christians, Christians have diversity whether he is proceeded from the Father only or the Father and the Son, and here we go.

Even among early church fathers as well, there have been many misinterpretations and opinions that are against Christian theology although Christians consider them as orthodox church fathers who fought heresy, and believe they had a role in proving the NT true by quoting verses in their books. Actually these orthodox fathers adopted non orthodox opinions, and this can be shown more in my article concerning church fathers and Bible preservation:

<http://jesus-is-muslim.net/church-fathers-bible/>

The question now is; if the Holy Spirit actually guides Christians, Why didn't he guide the early fathers? Either he guided them and they rejected, this means that they are no more orthodox as they reject the Holy Spirit. Or that he didn't guide them, which negates what Christians believe in the Holy Spirit guidance. If the Holy Spirit guides all Christians, why do we see many Christian sects? Yes many Christians among different sects believe their sect is the only true one, this question may not apply to them, but the first question still applies. Other Christians who believe the diversity among sects is not something major or believe to be non-denominational may need to have an answer to this question as well as the first question.

So when Christians say that they are guided with the Holy Spirit, the answer shall be: which one?

7.7 OLD TESTAMENT AND JESUS

A common verse used by Christians to prove from the Old Testament that Jesus is God is Isaiah 9:6, which says:

For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

First of all, the word God here doesn't necessarily tell that the one foretold here is God Himself, but the word "el" can be used for God and for any other deity, as can be shown in Strong's Bible dictionary:

H410

לַא

'êl

ale

Shortened from H352; strength; as adjective mighty; especially the Almighty (**but used also of any deity**): – God (god), X goodly, X great, idol, might (-y one), power, strong. Compare names in "-el."

We can see examples of some Bible verses used the word "el" for other than God, these can be elaborated through the Strong's Bible concordance site and look at the verses below, check the word number 410:

<http://www.blueletterbible.org/lang/lexicon/lexicon.cfm?strongs=H410&t=KJV&page=1>

Pro 3:27 Withhold 4513 not good 2896 from them to whom it is due 1167, when it is in **the power 410 of thine hand** 3027 to do 6213 [it].

Mic 2:1 Woe 1945 to them that devise 2803 iniquity 205, and work 6466 evil 7451 upon their beds 4904! when the morning 1242 is light 216, they practise 6213 it, because it is 3426 in the **power 410 of their hand** 3027.

Psa 36:6 Thy righteousness 6666 [is] like the **great 410 mountains** 2042; thy judgments 4941 [are] a great 7227 deep 8415: O LORD 3068, thou preservest 3467 man 120 and beast 929.

Dan 11:36 And the king 4428 shall do 6213 according to his will 7522; and he shall exalt 7311 himself, and magnify 1431 himself above every **god 410**, and shall speak 1696 marvellous things 6381 against the God 410 of **gods 410**, and shall prosper 6743 till the indignation 2195 be accomplished 3615 : for that that is determined 2782 shall be done 6213 .

The second thing, which is more important is that Jesus never quoted this verse to prove himself being God, although he quoted the Old Testament a lot, the Jews accused him of blasphemy more than one time, and he never quoted this verse to prove his position (if we assumed it really does), but actually when he was accused of blasphemy, he quoted another verse which totally disproves that he is God; Psalm 82:6 :

“I said, ‘You are “gods”; *you are all sons of the Most High.*’

Jesus quotes it saying:

Joh 10:34 Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, ye are gods? Joh 10:35 If he called them gods, unto whom the word of God came (and the scripture cannot be broken), Joh 10:36 say ye of him, whom the Father sanctified and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am *the* Son of God?

Jesus is simply saying, these judges in the OT were called gods, although for sure they are not God, so what’s wrong that I am also called son of God as I am sanctified by God? I am called the son of God as these judges were called gods, are these judges really God? The same thing applies to me being called son of God. It’s just a metaphor.

If Jesus really believed that he is God, why didn’t he quote Isaiah 9:6 which Christians always quoted to prove that he is God instead of comparing himself with some people who are called gods? Simply because he didn’t believe that he is God and he was denying the Jewish accusation.

7.8 KAABA IN BIBLICAL SCRIPTURES

This shall be a brief account on what the Bible said about the Islamic Kaaba in Mecca.

Allah in the Quran telling about the Kaaba says:

96. The first House (of worship) appointed for men was that at **Bakka**: Full of blessing and of guidance for all kinds of beings: (Quran 2:96)

In Psalm 84 it says:

4 Blessed are those who dwell in your house;
they are ever praising you. Selah

5 Blessed are those whose strength is in you,
who have set their hearts on pilgrimage.

6 As they pass through the **Valley of Baca**,
they make it a place of springs;
the autumn rains also cover it with pools.

7 They go from strength to strength,
till each appears before God in Zion.

8 Hear my prayer, O LORD God Almighty;
listen to me, O God of Jacob.

So the word Valley of Baca is clearly mentioned here, and mentioned as a noun not translated to weeping as some other Biblical versions translate. Meaning it's a real place not just a metaphorical one.

Then it comes to something else:

they make it a place of **springs**;
the autumn rains also cover it with pools.

Don't you know that Mecca has the spring of Zamzam which is a huge spring that has been producing water continuously for more than 1400 years and the pipelines transporting Zamzam water to Al Madina (about 400 km north) which is even an independent miracle in that blessed place.

Zion doesn't necessarily mean Jerusalem, it has been used figuratively for the church and for Israel in the Babylonian captivity, so it seems like it has been used for any group or mass of people worshiping God, which can be applied on Kaaba here. This can even be seen among Christian sites:

"The word *Zion* has various meanings in the scriptures. The most general definition of the word is "the pure in heart" (**D&C 97:21**). *Zion* is often used in this way to refer to the **Lord's people or**

to the Church and its stakes (see [D&C 82:14](#)). It has also been used to refer to specific geographical locations."

http://www.lds.org/ldsorg/v/index.jsp?locale=0&sourceId=8b93f73c28d98010VgnVCM1000004d82620a____&vgnnextoid=bbd508f54922d010VgnVCM1000004d82620aRCRD

Also another source telling about the meaning of Zion:

"Meaning of Zion:

1. (n) an imaginary place considered to be perfect or ideal
2. (n) Jewish republic in southwestern Asia at eastern end of Mediterranean; formerly part of Palestine
3. (n) originally a stronghold captured by David (the 2nd king of the Israelites); above it was built a temple and later the name extended to the whole hill; finally it became a synonym for the city of Jerusalem; "the inhabitants of Jerusalem are personified as."

<http://wordhut.com/definitions/Zion.htm>

What can even prove that the Bible talked about the house of God is in Genesis 22 in Targum Onkelos. **Targum Onkelos** (or **Unkelus**), is the official eastern (**Babylonian**) **targum** (Aramaic translation) to the **Torah**. However, its early origins may have been western, in **Israel**. Its authorship is attributed to **Onkelos**, אונקלוס, a famous convert to Judaism in Tannaic times (c.35–120 a.d). According to Jewish tradition, the content of Targum Onkelos was originally conveyed by God to Moses at **Mount Sinai**. However, it was later forgotten by the masses, and rerecorded by Onkelos.^[1]http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Targum_Onkelos

Targum Onkelos when telling Genesis 22, gave some interesting issues:

And Abraham lifted up his eyes after these (words), and saw, and behold, one ram, holden in the bush by his horns. And Abraham went and took the ram, and offered him for a burnt offering instead of his son. **And Abraham worshipped and prayed there in that place, and said before the Lord, Here shall generations worship: wherefore it shall be paid in that day, In this mountain Abraham worshipped before the Lord.**[26]

http://targum.info/onk/Gen18_22.htm

This part in bold is not included in other Bible translations, it's between verses 14 and 15. Here it talks about a place where Abraham offered his son, and this place was a place that generations shall worship God in. According to my knowledge, I don't know a place Jews or Christians celebrate Abraham's sacrifice and worship God in. But actually in Islam, we have a major feast which is Eid al Adha which can be translated to feast of sacrifice, where we believe that this place is in Mecca. Not only that, but Muslims go to Kaaba for pilgrimage in Eid al Adha.

7.9 CONCEPT OF GOD IN ISLAM

A common misconception Christians have about Islam is that they think Muslims have nothing to do with God except fearing Him. They think that God in Islam is just distant God and the way of worship Muslims should do is just through different works and rites God ordered Muslims to do without any spiritual relationship between a Muslim and God.

To answer this misconception we must first talk about what the Quran tells about Allah. We can first give what some verses tell about attributes of God. These verses tell about the Mightiness and Mercy of God:

22. Allah is He, than whom there is no other god –

- **Who knows (all things) both secret and open;**
- **He, Most Gracious, Most Merciful.**

23. Allah is He, than whom there is no other god –

- **the sovereign,**
- **the Holy One,**
- **the Source of Peace (and Perfection).**
- **The Guardian of Faith,**
- **the Preserver of Safety,**
- **the Exalted in Might,**
- **the Irresistible,**
- **the Supreme:**

Glory to Allah! (high is He) above the partners they attribute to Him.

24. He is Allah,

- **the Creator,**
- **the Evolver,**
- **the Bestower of Forms (or colors).**

To Him belong the Most Beautiful Names:

Whatever is in the heavens and on earth, doth declare His Praises and Glory:

and He is the exalted in Might, the Wise. (Holy Quran 59:22-24)

Now is God really distant from us? The Quran answers no:

186. When my servants ask thee concerning Me, I am indeed close (to them); I listen to the prayer of every suppliant when he calleth on Me;

let them also, with a will, listen to My call, and believe in Me; that they may walk in the right way. (Quran 2:186)

Now, do Muslims love God? Or is it just about fear?

Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) says in Al Bukhari:

Narrated Anas: The Prophet said, "Whoever possesses the following three qualities will have the sweetness (delight) of faith: 1. The one to whom Allah and His Apostle becomes dearer than anything else. 2. Who loves a person and he loves him only for Allah's sake. 3. Who hates to revert to Atheism (disbelief) as he hates to be thrown into the fire."

Does Allah love Muslims?

31. Say (O Muhammad):

"If ye do love Allah, follow me: Allah will love you, and forgive you your sins, for Allah is Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful."

76. Nay. Those that keep their plighted faith and act aright, verily Allah loves those who act aright.

134. Those who spend (freely), whether in prosperity, or in adversity; who restrain anger, and pardon (all) men; for Allah loves those who do good.

(Holy Quran 3:31,76,134)

Does Allah love the unbelievers?

32. Say: "Obey Allah and His Messenger;"

but if they turn back, Allah loveth not those who reject Faith.

57. "As to those who believe and work righteousness, Allah will pay them (in full) their reward; but Allah loveth not those who do wrong." (Holy Quran 3:32,57)

Christians may come and say, "This is the difference between God in Christianity and God in Islam, as God in Christianity loves disbelievers as well". Actually I find it misleading when Christians say so, as Christians keep on saying that if we don't believe in Jesus as our saviour we will go to the Hell and the lake of fire and sulphur. So God in Christianity loves me but he will punish me eternally in Hell. Does these really match? I doubt.

7.10 CONCEPT OF SALVATION BETWEEN ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY

In Islam, it is neither work alone nor faith alone get man to Paradise. It's both actually, Allah says in the Quran:

But as for those who believe and do good works, for them are the Gardens of Retreat – a welcome (in reward) for what they used to do.(Sura 32:19)

See, belief is mentioned before good works, because actually good works alone do nothing if they were without belief, and belief without good works is not a serious belief. So actually good works are an indication of belief and that's why in Islam we are accounted on our good and bad deeds, where bad deeds negate good deeds and the rank of every man in Paradise is dependent on his score of good and bad deeds, so actually good and bad deeds distinguish between believers in Paradise rather than meaning that man shall enter Paradise because of his deeds:

47. And We shall set up balances of justice on the Day of Resurrection, then none will be dealt with unjustly in anything. And if there be the weight of a mustard seed, We will bring it. And Sufficient are We as Reckoners.(Sura 21:47)

Associate this verse with this hadith:

Jabir reported that the Prophet of Islam said: "No good works of yours can ever secure heaven for you, nor can they save you from hell – not even me, without the grace of God."

God promised us that if we believed and obeyed Him, we shall go to Paradise:

9. Allah has promised those who believe (in the Oneness of Allah – Islamic Monotheism) and do deeds of righteousness, that for them there is forgiveness and a great reward (i.e. Paradise). (Sura 5)

Now concerning sins, what if a man is a sinner? If he repented, God shall forgive him:

110. And whoever does evil or wrongs himself but afterwards seeks Allah's Forgiveness, he will find Allah Oft-Forgiving, Most Merciful. (Sura 4)

If the sin was against God, then God has the right to forgive him, if the sin was against someone else as murder or insult for example, God won't forgive it unless the one whom was sinned against forgives the sinner, otherwise, he shall take from his good deeds, if the sinner has no good deeds, he will receive the sins of the one whom he sinned against.

What if the sinner didn't repent and doesn't have good works that outweigh these sins?

116. Verily! Allah forgives not (the sin of) setting up partners in worship with Him, but He forgives whom he pleases sins other than that, and whoever sets up partners in worship with Allah, has indeed strayed far away. (Sura 4)

The only sin that shall let someone be eternally in Hell is Shirk which is associating partners with Allah and not believing Islam is the right religion. Other sins are either forgiven by God's mercy or by going to Hell for some time till they are cleaned from the sins and enter Heaven afterwards.

So if they are Muslims even if they are sinners, they shall enter Paradise, but after being cleansed of their sins in Hell.

So simply salvation in Islam is first through faith, so that actually all Muslims shall go to Paradise, based on their deeds, they shall distinguish, some will be in the higher ranks of Heaven, some will be in lower ranks, some shall go to Hell first till he is cleansed out of his sins, then he shall go to Paradise. Deeds doesn't mean that man can fulfill God's blessings by his good deeds, but they are a sign of loyalty to God as long as they are associated with real faith, so that he gains God's mercy that shall let him go to Paradise. But good deeds without faith shall not be accepted by God:

27. And (O Muhammad) recite to them (the Jews) the story of the two sons of Adam [Habil (Abel) and Qabil (Cain)] in truth; when each offered a sacrifice (to Allah), it was accepted from the one but not from the other. The latter said to the former: "I will surely kill you." The former said: "Verily, Allah accepts only from the pious"

When I ask Christians, what is the need that God becomes a man and dies for our sins? The answer I always receive is: because God is just, He made an atonement for people to repent in the OT so forgiving people's sins without an atonement is against His justice.

God has the right to forgive those who sinned against him as I have the right forgive anyone who insulted me, that has nothing with me being just or not, but actually people consider this as something good I do, so it has nothing to do with God's justice, but it actually poses a couple of questions.

Christians cite this point of Jesus' death with the atonements in the OT. According to Christian belief, who put the rule that there must be an atonement for blood so that the sins are forgiven, who put this rule? Isn't He God? So how can this be a sacrifice? What Jesus did is not a sacrifice, but he just gave a solution to the problem God of Christianity caused? He is the one who put the rule and it was found to be impractical, he did what he did to solve the problem. So either God of Christianity didn't know the consequences of this rule, so he found a problem

and solved it, which is against God's omniscience, or that he actually knew and did what he did to make a show that he loves you.

The second thing, what I know is that people are accounted for their intention, if you do something and this deed gives consequences other than who you intended it to be, then you are actually accounted for your intention not for the consequences, for example if I robbed a guy walking in the street and gave what I stole as a present to a friend of mine, then I discovered that the guy I robbed actually stole this stuff from my friend, am I a thief or a noble guy who wanted to help my friend? For sure a thief, as my intention was just to rob a guy and I didn't know the other part of the story. That's exactly what the death of Jesus was about, it wasn't intended by the Jews to make a sacrifice or atonement so that Jesus takes away their sins, they were just looking to him as someone who shall destroy their leadership and positions and they wanted to get rid of him. So the whole action can be accounted as an atonement, but as murder crime, and this has nothing with what Jesus himself intended, because he is not the one who implemented the action, otherwise he would kill himself.

7.11 THE TRINITY AND LOGIC

A common question Muslims ask Christians about, how do you believe that the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit each is God but they are not three Gods but one God? How can $1+1+1=1$? Is it logical?

In the beginning, we need first to understand what is the Trinity? The Athanasian creed may be a reference:

<http://www.ccel.org/creeds/athanasian.creed.html>

Christians have various answers and analogies to try to explain the Trinity to Muslims and non Christians in general. So let's go and see whether these explanations really prove the Trinity as logical or not.

At the beginning a Christian may say: "Well, it is not $1 \times 1 \times 1=1$ ". Actually this is a weird example, as it actually has no meaning. What is the meaning of saying " Father X Son X Holy Spirit = God"? How could they be multiplied by each other? Actually I am not sure how.

Then we may come to a next analogy, which is Sun has body, light and heat. But they are not considered three suns but one sun. Well, we may need to look at the Athanasian creed explaining the Trinity here where it says:

15. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Spirit is God;
16. And yet they are not three Gods, but one God.
17. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Spirit Lord;
18. And yet they are not three Lords but one Lord.

So we understand from what the creed says here that each person in the Trinity is fully God in nature, i.e. doesn't depend on other persons. This is not the case with the Sun as actually its light is dependent on its heat, and its heat is dependent on the nuclear explosions occurring on its surface. Besides, we don't call the light of the sun or its heat as sun because actually they are light and heat emerging from the sun not the sun itself.

A next analogy may be the human being, where he is body, mind and spirit. Actually this analogy doesn't match with the Trinity as well as the sun analogy as both the mind and spirit refer to the body. An insane man is a body and a soul but has no mind, and dead man is a body with no mind or soul. We don't say that mind is a full man or that spirit are full man, because they cannot exist without a body, but a body can exist without mind or soul even temporarily as the case with a corpse.

Then another analogy may be used, which is the analogy of the atom. An atom contains protons, neutrons and electrons. Actually this is not the case as well as the three subatomic particles are added with each other to make an atom, where the protons with positive charges must be equal to neutrons with negative charges to make the atom neutral, and the case that the atomic weight depends on the weight of each particle. This is not the case with the Trinity, as the Trinity is that God is divided into parts.

Moving to the next analogy of water. Water has 3 phases, an ice which is a solid, heat it to become water (liquid), heat it more to become steam (vapor). This is modalism, meaning that Father is the Son is the Holy Spirit i.e. one person in three different states, this is a heresy used to be adopted by a Christian sect called Monarchians and Church Fathers as Tertullian clearly stated that they are not Orthodoxy Christians in his book Against Praxeas:

<http://christiandefense.org/Tertullian.Prax.htm>

Actually all the analogies shall either end up with any of the three, either concluding that the Trinity doesn't say that each person is a full God as it depends on other persons, or that God is divided into parts or that they are not actually three persons but one person with three different states, and the three are considered a heresy according to Christian belief.

At the end a Christian might say, it's a secret of God and we as humans cannot get it. Actually there is nothing wrong with saying so if the Trinity really had an authentic source from God proving that it is true, but even according to the Bible, neither there is a solid evidence proving the [Trinity in the Bible](#) nor the [Bible could be really proven as a reliable source from God](#), and these points were covered previously in detail.

7.12 DOES ISAIAH 53 POINT TO THE DEATH OF JESUS?

Christians use Isaiah 53 as a proof that Jesus' death was foretold in the Bible. First of all, Jesus never quoted from Isaiah 53, and the quotes of the Gospels doesn't imply that belief, the first quote was in Matthew 8:17, when he was driving the demons out, the second one was in Luke 22:37, when he ordered his disciples to buy swords (this is actually against the prophecy itself, since the prophecy says that he would be as a silent lamb), and the quote was to say that he would be reckoned with transgressors, so in both cases the quotes never mentioned death.

How could Jesus leave the most important things in the prophecy which tell that he would bear their sins which is the main Christian belief, and concentrate on trivial events if he really came for that belief? Actually Jesus (according to the Bible, but we Muslims have nothing to do with this) never thought Isaiah 53 to mean what the Christians understood. Besides, which is more important, is that this prophecy didn't mean Jesus, if it is read in context, it really doesn't, this chapter is an extension to chapters 51, 52 which were talking about Israel, and there are scripts in 53 which prove that it doesn't tell about redemption, see for example this verse:

Isa 53:10 Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see *his* seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand.

Of course you know that Jesus (Peace be upon him) didn't have a seed, you may say it's spiritually speaking, the case is that the Hebrew word is "zerah" which means a real seed other than the word "ben" which can mean spiritual sonship as in Genesis 15:3-4:

Gen 15:3 And Abram said, Behold, to me thou hast given no seed(zerah): and, lo, one born(ben) in my house is mine heir. Gen 15:4 And, behold, the word of Jehovah came unto him, saying, This man shall not be thine heir; but he that shall come forth out of thine own bowels shall be thine heir.

You can see the Hebrew text to make sure, the same thing for prolonging days, this expression in Hebrew, can't mean everlasting life which doesn't match with your belief that Jesus is God, the same for the word in verse 1, (servant), according to your belief is that only God can make the sacrifice which doesn't match with this verse.

Isaiah 53 was foretelling about Israel, and the deliverance from the Babylonian captivity, the word servant refers to Israel in many scripts, and it was used that way commonly in Isaiah, for example in Isaiah 45:4, 48:1-3,....etc. And this can be proved all over the scripts, but it's very clear that they didn't mean that belief in salvation.