

A Christian

looks

at

Islam

# **Table of Contents**

	Page
Muḥammad and His Revelation	1
Muslims "Proof" of Inspiration	10
Scriptural Inspiration and the Qur'ān	20
Scriptural Inspiration and the Bible	32
Islam and Deuteronomy 18	46
An Answer To The Muslims Regarding Pericytyos	58
The Status of Women in Islam	62

## Muḥammad and His Revelation

Muḥammad ibn Abdullah (the son of Abd Allah) was born in 570 A.D. It is reported that he was orphaned at a very young age. This is alluded to in the Qur'ān, in Sūrah 93:6,

“Did he not find Thee an orphan  
and give Thee shelter (and care)?”

His father died before he was born and his mother was in poor health and died when he was six. Amina, his mother gave his care mainly to his nurse Balima until she died. He was then taken in by his aging grandfather 'Abdul Muttalib who died two years later. From that time on his uncle Abū Tālib raised him as his own son.

As a young man Muḥammad worked in the Meccan caravan trade where he eventually became a manager for a wealthy widow named Khadija whom he married when he was 25. She was 40 at this time. They had three sons, all of whom died in infancy, and four daughters, the most famous of whom was Fatima who married Ali, the well loved fourth Caliph of Sunni Islam and first legitimate Imam of Shi'i Islam.

Muḥammad went on to become a successful member of Meccan society gaining great respect for his judgement and his trustworthiness. So much so that he was called al-amin - the “trusted one”. He also possessed a very reflective nature, which led him to seek out periods of solitude and introspective thinking. During these times, he would retreat into a cave on Mount Hira, north of Mecca, where he contemplated his life and looked for the meaning and insight of life and reflected on the ills in his society.

When he was forty, during the month of Ramadan, Muḥammad made the transition from caravan leader to the “prophet of God” in an event Muslims refer to as “the night of power and excellence”. From this point on, over the next twenty years Muḥammad received many more “revelations” from God through an intermediary being, later named as “Jibreel” - or the angel Gabriel.

During his first encounter with Gabriel, the angel grabbed him three times and pressed him almost squeezing the breath out of him. Each time the angel did this he commanded Muḥammad to “Read!” Each time the frightened man said, “I cannot read”. On the third admonition, the words came to him and the “Prophet of Allah” was born.

This episode so upset him, he contemplated suicide but Khadija consoled him. Also, as he set out to commit suicide, thinking he was possessed, he was stopped by a voice, which said,

“O Muhammad you are a messenger  
of God and I am Gabriel”. Khadija  
reinforced this message by reassuring him  
that he was neither mad nor possessed. The  
messenger (she said) was from God and not a  
demon.

There is another Muslim tradition, which states that a “Christian” gave advice to Muḥammad and Khadija. This was Khadijah's cousin, Waraqa ibn Qusayy, who upon hearing of Muḥammad's experience said,

“Surely by Him in whose hand is Waraqa's soul,

thou art the prophet of his people. There hath come unto Thee the greatest Namus (angel) or Gabriel who came unto Moses. Like the Hebrew prophets Thou wilt be called a liar, and they will use thee spitefully and cast thee out and fight against Thee.”

So the “prophet of Allah” and of “Islam” is now assured that he is not mad, but mandated by God through Gabriel. What was revealed in the cave of Hira that first day was Sūrah 96:1-5. Named Iqraa (read! or proclaim!) or Alaq, or the clot of congealed blood. It reads,

- (1) “Proclaim! (or read!). In the name of thy Lord and cherisher, who created –
- (2) Created man out of a (mere) clot of congealed blood.
- (3) Proclaim! and Thy Lord is most bountiful –
- (4) He who taught (the use of) the pen,
- (5) Taught man that which he knew not.”

Yusuf Ali, a respected commentator on the Qur’ān, says of these verses,

“Iqraa, may mean ‘read’ or ‘recite’ or ‘rehearse’ or ‘proclaim aloud’. The object being understood is God’s message. In worldly letters, the holy prophet was unversed (illiterate), but with spiritual knowledge, his mind and soul were filled and now the time had come when he must stand forth to the world and declare his mission.

The declaration or proclamation was to be made in the name of God, the creator. It was not for any personal gain or benefit for the prophet. To him there was to come bitter persecution, sorrow and suffering. This was the call of God for the benefit and erring humanity. God is mentioned by His title of “Thy Lord and Cherisher”, to establish a direct link or connection between the source of the message (God) and the one addressed (Muḥammad). The message was not merely an abstract proposition of philosophy, but “the direct concrete message of a personal God to the creatures whom He loves and cherishes.”

“Thy” – addressed to the prophet, is appropriate in two ways:

- (1) He was in direct contact with the divine messenger (Gabriel) and Him who sent the messenger (i.e., God),
- (2) He represented all humanity in a fuller sense than that in which Jesus Christ is the ‘Son of man’.

The lowly origin of the animal in man is contrasted with the high destiny offered him in his intellectual, moral, and spiritual nature by his most bountiful creator.

NO KNOWLEDGE IS WITHHELD FROM MAN. On the contrary, through the faculties freely given, he acquires it in such measure as outstrips his immediate understanding and leads him to strive for newer and newer meaning.

(The use of) “The Pen” in verse 4 is the symbol of a PERMANENT REVELATION – the mystic pen and the mystic record.

This takes us to Sūrah 68 which is the second revelation given to Muḥammad.

In verse 1 we read,

“Nun. By the pen and by the (record)  
which (men) write.”

Nun here may mean ‘a fish’ or ‘an ink holder’, or it may simply be the Arabic letter N. The mystic pen and record are the SYMBOLICAL FOUNDATIONS OF THE REVELATION TO MAN.

Muḥammad by the abjuration of the pen (through Gabriel) disposes of the flippant charge that he was mad or possessed. For he spoke words of power, which were not incoherent but full of meaning, and through the record of the pen [permanent revelation] that meaning unfolds itself in innumerable aspects to countless generations.

MUḤAMMAD WAS THE LIVING GRACE AND MERCY OF GOD AND HIS VERY NATURE EXALTED HIM ABOVE ABUSE AND PERSECUTION.

This is alluded to in Sūrah 68:2,

“Thou art not, by the grace of Thy Lord,  
mad or possessed.”

To which Ali comments:

“People usually call anyone mad whose standards are different to their own. And, madness is believed by the superstitious to be due to demoniacal possession - an idea distinctly in the minds of the New Testament writers, for Luke writes (8:35) of a man from whom the “devils” were cast out, as being “clothed in his right mind”.

So instead of being out of his right mind, the man of God (Muḥammad) had been raised to great spiritual dignity, a reward that was not like an earthly reward that passes away, but one that was in the very core of his being and would never fail him in any circumstance. He was really granted a nature and character far above the shafts of grief, suffering, slander, or persecution.

The proclaiming or reading of this message implies not only the duty of blazoning forth God’s message as going with the prophetic office, but also the duty of promulgation and wide dissemination of the truth by all who read and understand it (i.e., the Qur’ān).

The comprehensive meaning of aaraa refers not only to a particularly person and occasion but also gives a universal direction. AND THIS KIND OF COMPREHENSIVE MEANING RUNS THROUGHOUT THE QUR’AN - FOR THOSE WHO WILL UNDERSTAND IT.

Given then, this extolling of Muḥammad and his “Recitation” the Qur’ān we must now take note of a few things.

The first thing we note is the fact that Muḥammad's "revelation" is out of time (therefore false) for the following reasons:

[1] God in a previous inspired writing said categorically,

"I felt I had to write and urge you to earnestly contend for the faith that was once for all (time) delivered (entrusted) to the saints [Christians]."  
Jude 3

You see, the problem this presents to Muslims if they are honest. "The Same Pen" said this some 600 years before Muḥammad was even born and since the "Pen" is a symbol of "permanent revelation" one would naturally conclude from Jude 3 that "the faith" is permanent and is to be contended for by "the saints" (Christians).

[2] Concerning the point that the angel Gabriel is the intermediary being that legitimises the Qur'ān, God gave a clear warning to all men through this "faith once (and once only) delivered (through the Holy Spirit) in Galatians 1:8,

"But even though we (apostles) or AN ANGEL FROM HEAVEN should preach a gospel other than the one we preached to you, LET HIM BE ETERNALLY CONDEMNED."

Then in Galatians 8:9,

"As we have already said, so I say now again: If anybody is preaching to you a gospel other than the one we preached to you, let him be eternally condemned." [anathema].

Here we see how important this issue really is, not only are angels and men "accursed" eternally if they conspire to preach "another gospel" by the Holy Spirit has the apostle SAY IT TWICE. That is how important the issue is to God. It is emphatically emphasised then underlined by "The Pen" – doubly permanent revelation according to Muslim theology yet totally ignored by them all including Muḥammad and "Gabriel".

What is of interest concerning Gabriel (Jibreel) is that, it appears initially Muḥammad did not know who he was. It was (according to tradition) Khadijah's Christian cousin who alerted him to the angel's name.

"There hath come unto Thee the greatest Namus (angel) who came to Moses".

In another tradition (or hadith) of the prophet himself, according to Sahih Muslim, a respected hadith collect (along with Al Bukhari), said this,

"Umar b Khattab, with whom Allah is pleased, reported: While we were sitting with the Prophet of Allah, one day, there appeared to us a man wearing very white clothes. His hair was very black. No signs of travel appeared on him, nor could any of us recognise him. He came in and sat facing the Prophet, with his knees

touching the prophet's knees, and placed his hands on the thighs of the prophet, and said, "O Muḥammad! Tell me, what is Islam?" The prophet answered, "Islam is to testify that there is no true God but Allah, and Muḥammad is the messenger of Allah, to perform the Salah (prayers), to give the Zakat (alms) and to perform the Hajj (pilgrimage to Mecca) if you can afford it." Umar said, "We were amazed about him. He asked him and approved his answer. The man further asked, "Tell me what is the Iman?" The prophet said, "The Iman is to believe in the oneness of Allah, and to believe in his angels, His books, His messengers, and to believe in the final day and in al Qadar and in its good and bad consequences." "You have told the truth", he said. Then he asked, "Tell me, what is the Ishan?" He said, "It is to worship Allah as though you see Him. Although you do not see Him, He sees you." He said, "Tell me, when is the final hour?" The prophet said, "The one who is asked [about it] has no more knowledge about its timing than the one who is asking." He said, "Tell me then about its signs". The prophet said, "When the female slave gives birth to her own mistress, and when you see the poor, naked shepherds compete with one another in erecting tall buildings." Then the man left. The prophet kept thinking for a while then he asked, "Umar, do you know who the messenger was?" "Allah and His messenger knows," I said. "That was Jibreel [Gabriel]. He came to teach you your dīn (religion)", the Messenger of Allah said.

From this, six articles of faith in Islam are predicated.

- (1) Belief in Allah.
- (2) Belief in His angels, especially [Gabriel].
- (3) Belief in His scriptures.
- (4) Belief in His messengers, especially [Muḥammad].
- (5) Belief in the last day.
- (6) Belief in the Qada' and Qudar.

How different this is from Biblical plenary inspiration. Here we have an angel asking a prophet three questions which he answers – and that is how Umar and his companions were taught their religion or (deen) which in Arabic commonly refers to a whole way of life, worship, politics, law and code of conduct, even hygiene and etiquette. Thus in Qur'ān 3:19 "the true (deen) religion with Allah is Islam [surrender]. This plus knowing the articles of Iman or faith, the Muslim must believe in every article of Imam along with the rest of the religious precepts is the true knowledge which Allah and His messenger (Muḥammad) enjoin the believers to seek.

I think we can see why God warned us not to believe an angel or man who deviates from the one faith delivered to all true Christians 500 years before this above encounter.

The second thing we must note is the claim that Muḥammad "represents the whole of humanity IN A FULLER SENSE than that in which Christ is the 'Son of man'. This is at once both a monumental and a monstrous claim, which is cunningly worded. You see, Islam denies categorically that Christ was the 'Son of God.'

In Surah 112:1-4 the Qur'ān states:

- (1) “Say, He is God, the one and only
- (2) God the eternal and absolute
- (3) He begetteth not, nor is He begotten
- (4) And there is none like unto Him.”

Ali says of verse 3, “This is the negative (to negate), the Christian idea of the godhead, “the Father... only begotten son”, etc. This then leaves Christ with the title ‘son of man’. Islam, then in claiming that Muḥammad represents the whole of humanity in a fuller sense than that which Christ is the Son of man, is in fact saying (when you get through the smokescreen of words) that Muḥammad is of higher rank than Christ by making him the representative head of the human race. This is an outlandish and blasphemous claim and it is backed up in a hadith of Al-Bukhari, perhaps the most respected collector and compiler of the hadith or sayings of Muḥammad. In the following hadith, Muḥammad is experiencing a vision of what will occur on the day of resurrection. On that day people will look for an intercessor to help them gain access to paradise. They approach Adam, Noah, Abraham, and Moses – all of these refuse to intercede and what is more, each of them name their own sins. ONLY JESUS DOES NOT CLAIM TO BE A SINNER. This then prompts the people to move toward Christ as their mediator and intercessor, which I would add, is the rational thing to do. Then follows the hadith on this event, narrated by Abu Huraira,

“The apostle [Muḥammad] said: ‘So they will go to Jesus and say, ‘O Jesus! You are Allah’s apostle – and His word, which He sent to Mary, and a SUPERIOR SOUL created by Him, and you talked to the people while still young in the cradle. Please intercede for us with your Lord. Don’t you see in what state we are?’ Jesus will say: ‘My Lord has today become angry as He has never been before, nor will he ever become hereafter.’ Jesus will not mention any sin but will say ‘Myself, Myself, Myself.’ Go to someone else, Go to Muḥammad.”  
(Bukhari 6:200-201; 60:178-236).

Muḥammad attests to the sinlessness of Jesus, here and in another hadith, narrated by Abu Huraira,

“The prophet said, ‘When any human being is born, Satan touches him on both sides of the body with his two fingers. EXCEPT JESUS THE SON OF MARY, whom Satan tried to touch but failed, for he touched the placenta instead.’”  
(Bukhari 6:234; 54.10.506)

Islam teaches the sinlessness of Jesus then. Now compare this with Muhammad himself. As he neared death, these hadith appeared,

Narrated by Aisha (his wife),

“The prophet said: ‘O Allah! Wash away my sins with the water of snow and hail, and cleanse my heart from sins as a white garment is cleansed of filth, and let there be a far distance between and sins of mine as you have set far away the east and the west from each other.’”  
(Bukhari 8:257; 75.45.386).

Narrated by Abu Huraira,

“I heard Allah’s apostle saying: ‘By Allah! I ask for Allah’s forgiveness and turn to Him in repentance more than 70 times a day’ “  
(Bukhari 8:213; 75.3.319).

Narrated by Um-al-Ala,

“The prophet said, ‘By Allah! Though I am an apostle of Allah, yet I do not know what Allah will do to me’ “  
(Bukhari 5:183; 58.45.266).

Here we have a conflict between Muḥammad and his disciples. He expresses his unworthiness to enter heaven while they have no doubt he will go there, i.e., his disciples have no doubt. But it highlights the difference between Muḥammad and Christ, one sinless, the other sinful (by his own admission). But Muḥammad, not Christ, is said to be the representative head of the human race and man’s intercessor on judgement day. Does this not strike you as a retrograde step? Is not something backward here? How will we answer these questions? Well, let us go back to the ‘Book of Christ’, the sinless one – the New Testament.

We find that there are indeed two representative heads of the human race. First there was Adam, and his actions in Eden did indeed have implications for all humanity. We read in Romans 5:12-18. Then from Romans 5:19 we read,

“For just as through the disobedience of one man (Adam) the many (human race) were made sinners [since all have sinned] so through the obedience of ONE MAN [the second representative head of humanity] the many (who obey Him) will be made righteous...”

Here we see there are indeed two representative heads of the human race, one was Adam who represented the race as sinful [literally law breakers]. But who is the second? Whoever he is, he is to put this state of affairs right. Who then is qualified? The sinless Christ, or (by his own admission) the sinful Muḥammad?

Romans 5:20-21 continues,

“...But where sin increased, grace increased all the more, so that just as sin reigned in death so also grace might reign through righteousness [there is the balancing of the books so to speak. But how and through whom?] TO BRING ETERNAL LIFE THROUGH JESUS CHRIST.”

There is the second representative of the human race, Christ, not Muḥammad. Christ was tempted in every way that we are YET WAS WITHOUT SIN, (Hebrews 4:15). It was this fact that made Him the only one worthy to represent mankind. He was the only one who resisted temptation to its ultimate degree and He suffered its ultimate torment. This gave Him that right.

Muḥammad NEVER DID THIS. HE ADMITS HE NEVER DID THIS. THUS HE DOES NOT HAVE THE RIGHT TO REPRESENT HUMANITY AND IT IS BLASPHEMOUS TO SAY THAT HE REPRESENTS HUMANITY IN A FULLER SENSE BECAUSE HE IS GREATER THAN CHRIST. And, that is the claim being made by the Qur’ān according to one of its most respected commentators.

Further, when we add Acts 4:12 to the above evidence,

“Salvation is found in NO-ONE ELSE (but Christ)  
for there is no other name under heaven  
given to men by which we  
MUST BE SAVED.”

These words underline the fact that Christ alone speaks as the representative head for the human race in religious matters and matters pertaining to salvation.

From this it is clear that all mankind is given a choice between two only representative heads – Adam, who is a symbol of sin and death, and Christ, the symbol of eternal life and righteousness. Mankind must choose which side he is on. Muḥammad has no kingdom and therefore no authority to act as a representative head for mankind.

It is interesting that Jibreel (Gabriel) was the one who came to Mary and informed her of what God had done in choosing her to carry Christ and bring Him into the world. He said to her, (Luke 1:33),

“And He [Jesus] shall reign over the house  
of Jacob forever [aiōnas] unto the ages  
and of His kingdom - There shall be no end.”

Paul, after the ascension of Christ back into heaven says in Colossians 1:17,

“He is before all things, and by Him  
all things consist (or hold together).”

This is saying He is the head of everything, a claim He made Himself in Matthew 28:18;

“All power (authority)  
IN HEAVEN AND ON EARTH  
has been (or was) given to Me”.

In the Greek “All” *πασα* (*pasa*) means in this verse ‘the highest degree’, the maximum of the thing, which the noun *ἐξουσια* (*exousia*) ‘authority’ denotes. Thus Christ has the absolute maximum, the highest degree of authority in heaven, AND ON EARTH.

Islam now tries to negate all this evidence by blindly asserting that Gabriel came to Muḥammad and simply retracted all of this by putting him into direct contact with God, making him a third representative head of humanity in a fuller sense than Christ who has the maximum authority in both heaven and earth and had this authority 600 years before Muḥammad was even born. He also stated “NO MAN can get to God except THROUGH HIM”. This underlines the absolute authority He has over ALL MEN – INCLUDING MUHAMMAD.

Islam has Gabriel as either an ignorant or lying angel of God. They certainly compromise his veracity on the issues of knowledge and inspiration. It is indeed a strange thing that Muḥammad and the angel do not consider this. The prophet Isaiah knew of this 700 years before Christ was even born. He says in Isaiah 9:6,

“For unto us a child is born (given)

and, the government will  
be on his shoulders. (i.e., authority)  
 And He will be called Wonderful Counsellor,  
 Mighty God, Prince of peace, everlasting Father.”

Then in Isaiah 9:7,

“THE INCREASE OF HIS GOVERNMENT  
and peace, THERE WILL BE NO END  
 (confirmed by Gabriel in Luke 1:33).  
 He will reign on David’s throne and over  
 his kingdom establishing and upholding  
 it with justice and righteousness  
 FROM THAT TIME ON [His ascension]  
 AND FOREVER. The zeal of the Lord  
 Almighty shall accomplish this”.

Christ confirmed His absolute sovereignty in Matthew 28:18, just before He ascended back into heaven. Gabriel knew all this to be true, so why would he go to Muḥammad and negate it?

Could it be that Iblis [Satan] transformed himself into an angel of light (Gabriel), which he can do, and that is why we are not to listen to any angel who comes with a different message!

Ali comments that

“No knowledge is withheld from man.” Yet Muḥammad had no knowledge of who Christ really was at the time of that first encounter in the cave of Hira. We are left with the problem that God either withheld the true knowledge from Muḥammad, or He allowed Gabriel to lie by abrogating what he had said previously to Mary. If the latter is the case then it does not come as any surprise that he gets Muḥammad to add in Sūrah 68:2,

“Thou art not mad or possessed.”

For he can see the dilemma this poses and moves to cover it. Thus preserving his integrity – if he really did speak to Muḥammad in this vein.

This leaves the possibility open that Muḥammad was either mistaken on this issue or he overtly lied.

Another thing of note is the Islamic “proof” of inspiration here. Much is made of Muḥammad’s illiteracy. From this, Muslims argue ‘a fortiori’ that this, illiteracy proves the Qur’ān’s inspiration. That is arguing from the lesser to the great – “an illiterate man could not possibly narrate the Qur’ān by himself. But that is a flimsy web on which to build so great a case as plenary inspiration.

## Muslims “Proof” of Inspiration

When we deal with the faith we have as Christians in regard to the truthfulness of the scriptures and their inspiration by God, i.e., the Bible and especially the New Testament as the full and final revelation by God to man, it is not our duty to “prove” the truth of them to unbelievers. This is because the “faith once for all delivered to Christians” [Jude 3], is in fact already proven. It is proven by, God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, the Apostles, internal and external evidence, history, archaeology and certain scientific data. We are not explicitly commanded to prove anything. What we are enjoined to do is, “Defend that body of truth by earnestly contending for its (proven) veracity”.

From this it follows that any burden of proof falls in the opposite court, i.e., those who wish to deny the truthfulness of God’s revealed word must prove it false. In order to do this of course one must then say that God, Christ, the Holy Spirit, evidences both internal and external, history, archaeology and science have misrepresented and falsified the case.

In logic there is a fallacy of irrelevance called *Ignoratio Elenchi*, which occurs so often that special names have been given to the ways it is committed. Three main types of this type of fallacious reasoning are:

- (1) *Argumentum ad hominem* - This consists in proving something about a person who puts forward a doctrine or proposal rather than about the merits of the doctrine or proposal.
- (2) *Argumentum ad verecundiam* - This consists in appealing to authority instead of establishing our contention on its merits.
- (3) *Argumentum ad populum* - This consists in appealing to one’s passions and prejudices rather than to their intelligence.

Christians fall into these errors of reasoning just as frequently in some cases as everyone else.

There is another fallacy called *Petitio Principii* or arguing in a circle, sometimes called begging the question because we beg for the conclusion rather than prove it to be true. An example of this that fits our study is - ‘The Qur’ān is inspired by God because Muḥammad says so, and he is inspired by God’. To say that is not to prove that the Qur’ān is inspired at all, it simply argues in a circle begging the question.

However, Christians often fall into the same thing they accuse Muslims of. Consider this: ‘The Bible is inspired because Paul said so and he was an inspired apostle of God.’ Here we have exactly the same argument with exactly the same result. This does not in and of itself prove the Bibles inspiration at all. Sadly, arguments such as these are often the extent of people “contending for” or “defending” the faith, a defence bound to fail. Even worse is ‘the Qur’ān (or Bible) is inspired because the Qur’ān (or Bible) says that it is’. This is an even smaller circle, which proves nothing. So let us not fall into such spurious contentions when we are defending the faith.

All arguments however do proceed from certain premises that may or may not be granted and evidence for or against those premises. There is however one thing that is common to every argument from the outset and that is every argument begins with a presupposition, i.e., something is supposed or assumed to be true in and of itself. The

argument then proceeds to either defend the presupposition as true or proves that it is false. There is no middle ground here at all as all precisely stated presuppositions are either true or false. The evidence called forth proves the case either way - there can be no draw in this contest.

With these preliminary brief thoughts we will now look at the evidence for Qur'ānic and/or Biblical inspiration. Which of them is inspired? It is clear that only one of them can be, but not both. Also, at the very outset we can say that the presupposition God is the inspirer (ultimate author), is held by both parties (Christians and Muslims). Thus, there is in fact, initial agreement about the author of the inspiration. However, we Christians defend the Biblical account and Muslims, the Qur'ānic account. So how do we decide the issue on the evidence given in the two accounts? To that issue we will now turn.

The Bible claims for itself,

“Every scripture is ‘God breathed’...” [2 Timothy 3:16]

In Greek, *πασα γραφή θεόπνευστος* (*pasa graphē theopneustos*). ‘Pasa’ here means the whole, all (*latin totus*), totality of scripture, both old and new testaments. The writing (*graphē*) is “God breathed or inspired by God”. *Theo* (God), *pneustos* (breathed).

Also in 1 Corinthians 2:13,

“The things which we (apostles) teach (or speak) are not taught in words of human wisdom, but in words taught by the Holy Spirit “– comparing spiritual things with spiritual (words).”

Among other things, this verse argues for plenary (word by word) inspiration. But the thing to note is the word *διδασκτός* (*didaktos*), taught or instructed, by the Holy Spirit *πνευματικός* (*pneumatikos*). This is saying that the whole body of New Testament teaching is taught in the words of the Spirit of God. This is the presupposition of the Bible regarding its inspiration.

Added to this are the words of the Apostle Peter in 2 Peter 1:20-21,

“Know this first, that no prophecy of scripture is of any private interpretation. For the prophecy came not in any time by the will

of men, but holy men of God spoke as they were moved by the Spirit of God.”

The word used here is *προφήτεία* (*prophēteia*) which means discourse (teaching) emanating from divine inspiration declaring the purposes of God, whether by reproof and admonishing the wicked, or comforting the afflicted... This again refers to the entire body of teaching to be found in the New Testament as being underwritten (guaranteed) by the Spirit of God and not the will of man. This strengthens the claim of the presupposition that the Bible is God breathed - every letter attested to by the Spirit of God - not men, not angels, but the Holy Spirit.

The Qur'ān also says that it is its own proof by presupposing Divine revelation, Sūrah 96:1-5,

“Read! In the name of Thy Lord  
and cherisher who created – created man out  
of a clot of congealed blood. Read!  
And Thy Lord is most bountiful He who  
taught the use of the pen, taught man which  
he knew not.”

Then, the Qur’ān bolsters its proof in Sūrah 2:23-25,

“And if you are in doubt about what we have  
revealed to our worshipper [Muḥammad] then  
[produce a chapter like it and call your witnesses  
besides God if you are truthful. And if you cannot  
do it, and you can never do it,  
then fear the fire  
of hell whose fuel is men and stones.”

In Sūrah 96:1-5, referred to as the Night of Power, we have the first revelation given to Muḥammad. To substantiate this, the Qur’ān says in Sūrah 97:1-5,

“We have indeed revealed this in the night  
of power. And what will explain to thee what  
the night of power is? The night of power  
is better than a thousand months. Therein  
come down the angels and the Spirit  
by God’s permission, on every errand.  
Peace! ... This until the rise of man.”

This proof of the Qur’ānic presupposition of Divine inspiration speaks of “the spirit” in witness, however this is NOT the Holy Spirit. Yusuf Ali, the Qur’ānic commentator says of this, “The Spirit is usually understood to be the angel Gabriel, the spirit of inspiration”. However, in an earlier Sūrah (70:4), Ali says,

“The Spirit is understood by some commentators as the angel Gabriel, but I think a more general meaning is possible, and fits the context better. Man is gifted with the Spirit of God (Sūrah 15:29). In the spiritual kingdom we are all raised to the light of the face of God and His glory transforms us.”

Further proof of inspiration is offered in Sūrah 68:2,

“Thou [Muḥammad] are not by the grace of  
thy Lord, mad or possessed”.

In Sūrah 84:20-24, we have written,

“What then is the matter with them that  
they believe not? And when the Qur’ān  
is read to them they fall not prostrate, but  
on the contrary reject it (i.e., the unbelievers).  
But God has full knowledge of what they hide  
in their hearts. So, announce to them a  
grievous penalty.”

Then in Sūrah 98:1-3,

“Those who reject [truth], Among the people of the book and among the polytheists, were not going to depart (from their ways) until there should come to them clear evidence –

An apostle of God [Muhammad] rehearsing scriptures kept pure and holy: wherein are laws (or decrees) Right and Straight.”

Yusuf Ali says of this,

“The clear evidence was the prophet himself, his life, his personality, and his teaching. His teachings were to be definite and permanent. The people of the Book are in the first instance Jews and Christians. The polytheists in the first instance were the idol worshipping Arab tribes, in the second instance Christians who worship a “Triune godhead as Deity”.

Sūrah 40:2,4,5-6,

“The revelation of the book is from God... None can dispute this book (about the signs of God) but the unbelievers. Let not then their strutting about through the land deceive Thee!  
But, (there were people) before them, who denied (the signs) - the people of Noah and the confederates (of evil) after them; and every people plotted against their prophet to seize him and disputed by means of vanities therewith to condemn the truth: But it was I that seized them! And how (terrible) was my requital!  
Thus was the Decree of thy Lord proved true against the unbelievers that truly they are companions of the fire.”

Sūrah 41:1-2,

“A revelation from God Most Gracious Most Merciful - a book whereof the verses are explained in detail; - A Qur’ān in Arabic, for people who understand.”

Ali says of this,

“In Sūrah 40:2-3, the revelation was described mainly with reference to some of the qualities of God from whom it came. Here (above), it is described mainly with reference to its subject matter.

- (1) It brings a message of grace and mercy.
- (2) It is not merely a book of dark sayings, but everything is explained clearly and from various points of view.
- (3) It is in Arabic, the language of the people among whom it was first promulgated, and therefore easily intelligible to them if they take the trouble to understand.
- (4) It opens the way to forgiveness through repentance and gives warning of all spiritual dangers.

Sūrah 46:9,

“Say: I am no bringer of new-fangled doctrine among the apostles, nor do I know what will be done with me or with you. I follow that which is revealed to me by inspiration; I am but a warner open and clear.”

“what is there to forge? All prophets have taught the unity of God and our duty to mankind. I bring no new-fangled doctrine but eternal truths that have been known to good men through the ages. It is to reclaim you I have come. I know I am preaching truth and righteousness as inspired by God”.

Sūrah 45:1,

“The revelation of the Book (Qur’ān) is from God.”

Sūrah 42:13,

“The same religion has He established for you as that which He enjoined on Noah that which we have sent by inspiration to Thee [Muḥammad]...

Sūrah 33:36,

“It is not fitting for a believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by God and [Muḥammad] His apostle to have any option about their decision.”

Ali comments on this,

“We must not put our own wisdom in competition with God’s wisdom. God’s decree is often known to us by the logic of facts. We must accept it loyally, and do the best we can to help in our own way to carry it out. We must make our will consonant to the Universal will.

However, it is also very clear from this verse that once the matter has been decided by God through Gabriel to Muḥammad, there is no option about whatever the issue happens to be. It is also a very good way to silence any criticism or (God forbid) rebellion against this plain revealed teaching.

Now I have laboured the point very simply to make the point that while the Bible has the same presupposition as the Qur'ān as regards its origin and inspiration, the Qur'ān with these and other words and verses, stresses almost *ad nauseum*, that it is inspired by God through the Angel Gabriel, given to an illiterate Muḥammad. Shakespeare once said, "Me thinks the lady doth protest too much" - and that is the sense given in the Qur'ān. It appears so clearly that the main stress is: "you must believe this is the way I really got the Qur'ān. It is interspersed throughout. This is not the way God worked in the Bible. In the Qur'ān one gets the sense that it is Muḥammad's integrity, rather than God's, that is paramount.

"You must believe that what I [Muḥammad] am telling you is true – I have told you 10, 20, 30 times that this is what God has told me – you must believe me." It is, in essence, an *argumentum ad populum*, appealing to one's passion and prejudice. It is also an *argumentum ad verecundiam* as it is always in these many verses appealing to authority but not going further, by contending on its merits that it is a superior revelation or a more truthful revelation than the New Testament. Beyond these many contentions of Muḥammad there is no proof. And if anyone dares to contend there is a simple, God and I have decided that this is the case (as in Sūrah 33:36) and you had better believe it or else. "Do not argue with me!" seems to be the tenor of these verses.

This is strengthened by remarks made in Sūrah 67:1-4,

"Those who reject God and hinder men from the path of God (in the Qur'ān) their deeds will God render astray (from their mark).  
But those who believe and work the deeds of righteousness and believe in the Revelation (Qur'ān) sent down to Muḥammad for it is the truth from their Lord - He will remove from them their ills and improve their conditions. This because those who reject God (and Muḥammad) follow vanities while those who believe (the revelation) follow the truth from their Lord: Thus does God set forth for men their lessons by similitudes. Therefore when you meet the unbelievers in fight (jihad) smite at their necks [behead them]; at length when ye have thoroughly subdued them, bind a bond firmly on them..."

Ali comments,

"When once the fight [jihad] is entered upon carry it out with the utmost vigour, and strike home your blows at the most vital points (smite at their necks), both literally and figuratively. You cannot wage war with kid gloves. In the first onset there must be necessarily great loss of life; but when the enemy is fairly subdued and beaten – which means in a jihad that he is not likely to seek again the persecution of truth,

i.e., [Muḥammad and the Qur'ān] then firm arrangements should be made to bring him under control. Others have construed (binding the bond) to mean after the enemy numbers are fairly thinned down, prisoners may be taken. After all of this, in Sūrah 67:5-6 we are told that God will guide and improve their condition (i.e., Muslim warriors) and then,

“Admit them to the Garden which He has announced or them.”

Ali further comments that,

If we read, “those who are slain” - guide would mean guide them in their spiritual journey after death. “Improve their condition” - whether external or internal, or of the heart and mind. Both meanings apply. The more the wicked rage, the better the position of the righteous will be and God will make it easier and easier for the righteous to love and follow the truth (Qur'ān). If after death their minds and hearts will be more and more settled and at rest, and their spiritual satisfaction greater.

The “garden which He has announced for them” – the state of bliss which is declared in Revelation (i.e., paradise), destined for those who serve God.

That passage makes it crystal clear that those who do not believe in the revelation sent down to Muhammad (because it is the truth from God as revealed by Gabriel in the Qur'ān), and those who would hinder people from believing in this revelation (for example preaching Christianity), are to be met in jihad, killed and made prisoners when brought under control. But implicitly, at least in this passage, they are made to recant their Christian faith, upon which, after embracing Islam, they are to be set free.

This then is how Qur'ānic revelation is to be enforced – or proven by force. Thus jihad somehow, will disprove the claim that the New Testament was the full and final revelation to man. The progression is frightening – after many verses claiming the truth of the Qur'ān, it then underlines the truth by telling the Muslims to kill and enslave those who will not believe that this is in fact the case. So from the presupposition – “The Qur'ān is inspired by God”, we have a line of defence of many verses simply stating it is true, to believe it because I [Muhammad] say it is true, to finally, if you do not believe what I say you shall be killed. This surely calls forth the question – where does the New Testament ever defend its presupposition of divine inspiration in such a way? Rather the tenor of the New Testament is “Love your enemy”, “Do good to them that hate you”, “Count it all joy when men persecute you for Jesus' sake for great is your reward in heaven”, or “Do not retaliate” when you are persecuted for believing in Christ and His revelation – the New Testament.

It appears to be a very severe wrench in the way the presupposition of divine inspiration is to be defended. This is all the more alarming when one realises that God is said to have given the Qur'ān to Muhammad to “confirm (and correct) previous revelation.” This leaves us with the awful realization that if the Qur'ān is indeed true, then Christ's teachings were utterly false in this regard. Yet, the Qur'ān gives Christ a very prominent place and the Hadith tells us Christ was sinless. This logically raises the question of how can one defend a faith which is divinely inspired yet so divergent in its application, and yet endorses a key figure (Christ) as a fair representative of both? It would seem that in defending a faith of this type, its defenders are implicitly calling into question the veracity, not of man, but of God Himself. Any defence that does this must of necessity be a flawed and false defence given the nature of God as revealed in both documents. Not once in the New Testament

does “Earnestly contend for the faith,” mean ‘kill those who dissent’, as Sūrah 67 of the Qur’ān enjoins on Muslim ‘defenders of the faith’. This is a retrograde step and denies the very essence of true love (see 1 Corinthians 13).

When dealing with logic that is not the way we are to defend any presupposition or premise of any argument. When dealing scripturally, this is even more the case. We are to defend the presuppositions and premises both logically and truthfully. Why is this the case? Simply because the battle is for peoples minds - not by force - but by presenting the case for truth in a sensible, logical manner which in no way uses force, physical or otherwise. The only “coercion” is the truth itself, not us as people.

Consider the following passage from 2 Corinthians 10:3-5 from the Bible,

“For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war according to the flesh. For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal (fleshly) but (they are) powerful to God to the pulling down of strongholds. To overthrow the strongholds of reasoning against the knowledge of God (Theo) taking captive every thought (design) to the obedience of Christ.”

The Greek words used here are λογισμύς- (logismous - logic), νόημα (noēma - mental perception or thought) in this passage. To cause whoever is devising evil against Christ to desist from his purpose and submit himself to Christ (as Paul here sets him forth by inspiration of the Holy Spirit).

The word logismous means here a reasoning that is hostile to the Christian faith. These tell us that our defence is based on thoughtful reasonings which capture and put right those thoughts and reasonings that are contrary to the faith once for all delivered (Jude 3). It is a dialogue, a reasoned logical debate – not jihad, which is the very point the Apostle Paul is making.“ The weapons of this war are not carnal (physical). They are mental. Compare this with Romans 12:2,

“And be not conformed to this world, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind, that you may prove what is that good, and acceptable and perfect word of God.”

The word νοῦς (nous - mind, reason) - the capacity for perceiving divine things - recognizing good and hating evil, the power of judging soberly, calmly and impartially, considering, a particular mode of thinking and judging. The sense is that thoughts and emotions are under control.

Philippians 4:8,

“Finally brethren, whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are honest, whatsoever things are just, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are of good report, if there be any virtue and if there be any praise, THINK on these things.”

The word 'think' here is λογίζεσθαι (logizesthe). Consider these things. Again, logical calm reasoning is enjoined.

Colossians 4:4-6,

“That I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak walk in wisdom, σοφία (Sophia), toward them who are outside (watch the way you act toward outsiders) redeeming the time. Let your speech be always with grace, seasoned with salt, that you may know how you ought to ANSWER every man.”

Again it is telling us that we are to be mild, graceful, and not act in any way that would denigrate an outsider. We are to know how to answer every man. We need to know how to rationally defend the faith.

I submit these scriptures in defence of Christianity. These scriptures certainly run counter to the Muslim defence of inspiration by force if you don't believe in the Qur'ān. The above scriptures enjoin all true believers to present a rational defence of the faith in a calm manner. We are told to set Christ forth to people in the manner the Holy Spirit has set Him forth in the scriptures. Hebrews 7:25-27 tells us Christ is:

“Able to save to the utmost those who come to God through Christ, seeing He ever lives to make intercession for them. For such a high priest is HOLY, HARMLESS, UNDEFILED, SEPARATE FROM SINNERS, HIGHER THAN THE HEAVENS. WHO DOES NOT NEED TO OFFER SACRIFICES FIRST FOR HIS OWN SINS – HE IS SINLESS, HE OFFERED HIMSELF FOR ALL SINS.”

John 3:17,

“HE DID NOT COME TO CONDEMN BUT TO SAVE AND HE SAVES ALL THOSE WHO OBEY HIM.”

Hebrews 5:9,

“AND BEING MADE PERFECT, HE BECAME THE AUTHOR OF ETERNAL SALVATION TO ALL THEM WHO OBEY HIM.”

This is how we are to set Christ forth in our defence of the faith. Every person is free to choose his or her own response and nowhere are we commanded to enforce obedience to Christianity on any person outside the faith. Each one must be persuaded in their own mind once they have had the evidence placed before them.

How is it then that, according to the Qur'ān, God has replaced this into a “Be Muslim or die” mentality? Sūrah 67:1-4 by inspiring a “counter inspiration?” Surely this portrays God as capricious at worst and confused at best. How could one defend any inspiration from such a God? We could not rationally defend such a God. The question becomes which body of scripture more truly reflects a loving, merciful, patient and forgiving God since both

explicitly tell us that He is all these things. I leave the reader to assess that for themselves.

Finally let us consider this point: The Qur'ān explicitly claims many times that it was the angel Gabriel and not the Holy Spirit (For the Qur'ān denies the Holy Spirit's existence) who inspired Muḥammad to recite the Qur'ān. Whereas the Bible explicitly says it was the Holy Spirit that inspired some 40 writers over 1600 years from diverse times, places and backgrounds (against one man, in one place, over 20 years), stated 600 years before Muḥammad's birth. Through the inspired apostle Paul wrote,

“But though we (apostles of God) or  
AN ANGEL FROM HEAVEN (e.g. Gabriel)  
preach any other gospel than that which we  
(inspired New Testament messengers)  
have preached to you let him be,  
anathema (cursed by God).  
[Galatians 1:8]

Then underline it by repeating it in Galatians 1:9.

Why would God be so explicitly strong in His condemnation here just to arbitrarily change it through the very medium (angel) He Himself curses? No fair minded honest person could embrace such a glaring contradiction. No rational person could defend this position either. Muḥammed and his followers must prove beyond all doubt that God has authorized what He initially prohibited regarding scriptural inspiration. The fact is they cannot do it on rational grounds. Their usual rejoinder is that the Bible has been corrupted. But they only have the Qur'ān and it's railings as a defence of that position. It is therefore the committing of the other fallacy we alluded to, '*petitio principii*, or arguing in a circle. They assume true what needs to be proven. We ask, 'where is the evidence that God changed His mind?' 'Where is it external to the Qur'ān, in prophecy, in history and such like?'

It is true the Bible has some variations in the text but:

- (a) This is freely admitted, and
- (b) Not one of the variations change the gospel message or the plan of salvation

The Qur'ān on the other hand, abrogates in total the whole plan of salvation even to the point of changing: the day of worship assembly from Sunday to Friday, denying the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ, denying Christ's role as mediator of a 'better covenant' and many other aspects of New Testament teaching by simply stating that it is so because the angel Gabriel told Muḥammad that God told him to. I will let you be the judge in this matter as to which account is the real one, or if you like more likely to be rationally - logically more reasonable.

## Scriptural Inspiration and the Qur'ān

The subject of scriptural inspiration is one that is of paramount importance when it comes to the matters of truth and authority in religion. It is especially important as regards the Bible and the Qur'ān. Both these documents claim that they are “inspired by God” yet both cannot be as witnessed by their divergent and contradictory teaching. How then do we ascertain the truth of this most important issue? Our soul's salvation depends on a correct understanding of this vital subject.

To begin with let us look at some statements found in the Qur'ān, in **Sūrah 97 (the Night of Power)**. The subject is the mystic ‘Night of Power,’ in which revelation comes down to the world. This is through the agency of the angelic host, which evidently represent the spiritual powers of God's mercy.

Verse 1,

“We have indeed revealed this [message] in the night of power”.

Of this verse the commentator Yusuf Ali says,

“It is best to take this in the mystic sense which also agrees with verse 3 which says that the night of power is better than a thousand months. It transcends time for it is God's power dispelling the darkness of ignorance by His revelation in every kind of affair.”

In verse 4 we read this,

“Therein came down the angels AND THE SPIRIT by God's permission, on every errand.”

This statement is very interesting, as we have been told that revelation came through the angelic host representing the spiritual powers of God's mercy. Verse 4 here echoes and agrees with that sentiment. However, the phrase, “and the Spirit” would seem to imply that there was another agency involved in the inspiration and revelation of the Qur'ānic scriptures. Christians would naturally associate that “spirit” with the eternal Holy Spirit (Hebrews 9:14), that is, “His [God's] eternal spirit, Divine by implication. In Muslim thinking, however, this is not the case. Ali comments that, “the spirit is usually understood to be the ANGEL GABRIEL - the ‘Spirit of inspiration’.

If we go back to Sūrah 70:4, we have another citing of these two entities, the angels and the spirit. We read in Sūrah 70:4,

“The angels AND THE SPIRIT ascend unto Him (God) in a day the measure whereof is (as) fifty thousand years.”

Ali says here,

“The spirit and the angels, *cf.* Sūrah 78:38 which states, ‘the day that the spirit and the angels will stand forth in ranks...’ Then in Sūrah 97:4, ‘the angels and the spirit’ - reverse order. In Sūrah 16:2, the word Rūḥ is translated ‘Inspiration’. This is the

angel Gabriel as he is charged especially with bringing the message to human apostles (plural), Sūrah 21:193. Perhaps therefore, he can be considered the chief of angels.”

Ali surely cannot get away with ‘perhaps’. The whole thrust of the ‘spirit’ places Gabriel in that position. It makes him almost equal with God. In fact, if we consider Biblical inspiration, he has made Gabriel equal with God as the “spirit of inspiration”.

Now let us look at Sūrah 58:22 which states this,

“Thou wilt not find any people who believe in God on the last day loving those who resist God and His apostle, even though they were their fathers or their sons, or their brothers, or their kindred. For such He has written faith in their hearts, and STRENGTHENED THEM WITH A SPIRIT FROM HIMSELF...”

Here Ali says,

“Where it is said (Sūrah 2:87) that God strengthened the prophet Jesus with the Holy Spirit. We learn here that all good and righteous men are strengthened by God with the holy spirit. If anything, the phrase used here is stronger, “a spirit from Himself”. Whenever anyone offers his heart in faith and purity to God, God accepts it, engraves that faith on the seekers heart, and further fortifies him with the DIVINE SPIRIT, which we can no more define [accurately] or adequately than we can define in human language the nature and attributes of God.”

The word Rūḥ “the spirit”, is also translated “inspiration”. In Sūrah 16:2, applied to the angel Gabriel as the “spirit (rūḥ) of inspiration. In Sūrah 70:4, Ali says it has a more general meaning as the spirit gifted to man. Then in Sūrah 58:22, men are strengthened by the holy spirit, a spirit from Himself, therefore divine, which is stronger than the holy spirit God strengthened Christ with in Sūrah 2:87.

The problem here is clear - Muslims deny the real Holy Spirit of the Godhead. They do this because they deny outright the divinity of both Christ and the Holy Spirit. This in turn presents them with a great problem, the problem of the inspiration of their scriptures hence all this equivocation around the “spirit”, which is given four meanings by this Qur’ānic commentator, viz,

- (1) The spirit of inspiration (Gabriel).
- (2) A spirit gifted to mankind in a general sense.
- (3) The holy spirit, which God strengthened Jesus with.
- (4) The divine spirit given to the faithful at the last day.

We are left really with the task of trying to figure out exactly what this “spirit” in actuality happens to be.

The Bible on the other hand (Hebrews 9:14) states categorically that the blood of Christ cleanses our conscience from dead works to serve the living God. This was done through the ETERNAL SPIRIT. The word used here is αἰώνιος (aiōnios), “without beginning or end, that which always has been and always will be”. It is applied to the πνεύματος (pneumatōs - spirit) so whatever this spirit is, it is eternal and changeless. These are divine attributes, and if, as in the margin of the NASB, we were to read by His (Christ’s) eternal spirit, which is a legitimate reading, these divine attributes belong to Him. The point is: there is no equivocation around the word “Spirit” in context. It is the Divine Eternal Spirit, the Holy Spirit of all scripture, both Old and New Testaments.

Muslims on the other hand, even though they try to cancel out the Holy Spirit, are faced with the fact that they, in truth, cannot. So, at the last, after their smoke screen of prevarication and equivocation, they finally admit He exists but will be given to believers in the last day. They infer Him in Sūrah 2:87, by saying the prophet Jesus was strengthened with the “holy spirit”, then they deny Him by saying that Gabriel (an angel) is the “spirit of inspiration”. Thus, elevating an angel to the status of the “Holy Spirit” of inspiration, he must be the holy spirit since the Qur’ān is considered holy and Gabriel was its spokesman. It is this type of convoluted circular reasoning and question begging “illogic” that pervades Muslim reasoning on points such as this, for you simply cannot prove that the Holy Spirit does not exist by invoking Him on the very last day of human existence. Are we to really believe that something non-existent to Muslim theology will suddenly appear just before we are admitted to paradise, as in Sūrah 58:22? Of course one could always fall back on to “mystical meanings”.

Let us look at Revelation in some Qur’ānic passages. In Sūrah 26:192-199, we read this statement,

“Verily this is a revelation from the Lord of the worlds.  
With it came down the Spirit of faith and truth – to Thy  
heart and mind that Thou mayest admonish in the  
perspicuous Arabic tongue. Without doubt it is  
(announced) in the mystic books of former peoples.  
Is it not a sign to them that the learned of the  
children of Israel knew it (as true)? Had we  
revealed it to any of the non Arabs, and had we  
recited it to them, they would not have believed it.”

This mentions the “special characteristics” of the Qur’ān. It is to show, as Ali comments, “that:

- (1) It is true.
- (2) Its rejection by the Meccan pagans was of a piece with previous experience in the history of man: vested interests resist truth, but it conquers”.

Ali then comments on Sūrah 26:193,

“With it came down the spirit of faith and truth”, Rūḥ-ul-amīn, the epithet of Gabriel who came with the inspired messages to the holy prophet (Muhammad). Back in Sūrah 26:107 Ali comments on Amīn,

“One to whom a trust has been given, with several shades of meaning implied, e.g.,

- (1) Worthy of trust.

- (2) Bound to deliver his trust, as a prophet is bound to deliver his message.
- (3) Bound to act entirely as directed by the trust, as a prophet is bound to give only the message of God, and not to add anything of his own.
- (4) Not seeking any interest of his own.”

Ali goes on to say,

“A further signification as attached to the spirit of inspiration (Gabriel D.B.) is that it is the very quintessence of faith and truth, unlike the lying spirits which delude men with falsehood. On the whole I think ‘the spirit of faith and truth’ will represent the original best here”.

Here then we have a clear statement Gabriel is the spirit of inspiration, the spirit of faith and truth. Further, we are to simply accept this without any proof whatsoever other than Muḥammad’s say so.

Ali continues on Sūrah 26:194, “to thy heart and mind”.

“Qalb (heart) signifies not only the seat of affections, but also the seat of memory and understanding. The process of inspiration is indicated by the IMPRESSION OF THE DIVINE MESSAGE ON THE INSPIRED ONES HEART, MEMORY AND UNDERSTANDING FROM WHICH IT WAS PROMULGATED IN HUMAN SPEECH TO THE WORLD. In this case the human speech was THE PERSPICUOUS ARAB TONGUE WHICH WOULD BE PLAINLY INTELLIGIBLE TO THE AUDIENCE WHO WOULD IMMEDIATELY HEAR IT AND BE THROUGH THEM TRANSMITTED TO THE WORLD.”

From this, Ali offers as ‘proof’ the following comments,

“Many Jewish doctors recognised the holy prophets” message as a message from God, e.g. ‘Abdullah ibn Salâm and Mukhairīq. The latter was a man of property, which he left for Islam. (There were also Christian monks and learned men who recognised the prophet’s mission). The turn of the Arabs having come for receiving God’s revelation as was foretold in previous revelations, it was inevitable that it should be in the Arab tongue through the mouth of an Arab. OTHERWISE IT WOULD HAVE BEEN UNINTELLIGIBLE, AND THE ARABS COULD NOT HAVE RECEIVED THE FAITH AND BECOME THE VEHICLES FOR ITS PROMULGATION AS ACTUALLY HAPPENED IN HISTORY.”

Now let us look at Sūrah 81:15-21,

“So verily I call to witness the planets that recede,  
Go straight or hide; and the night as it dissipates;  
and the dawn as it breathes away the darkness  
verily this is the word of a most honourable  
messenger, Endued with Power, with Rank before  
the Lord of the throne, with authority there (and)  
faithful to his trust.”

This is an adjuration, which in the Qur'ān is an oath in human speech called in evidence, something that is sacred to the human heart. In God's message (the Qur'ān), also when delivered in human language, solemn emphasis is indicated by an appeal to something striking among the signs of God which will go straight to the human heart which is addressed. In each case the symbol of the appeal has reference to the particular point enforced in the argument. In Sūrah 70:15, Muḥammad calls to witness the heavenly bodies because they show, in a symbolic form, the beauty of goodness of God in sending His revelation through Gabriel. The appeal is made to three things: the planets, the night, and the dawn. Ali comments here:

- (1) The planets have a retrograde and a forward motion, and, during occultation hide or disappear behind the sun or moon or are otherwise invisible or appear stationary. They behave differently from the millions of stars around them. Yet they are not mere erratic bodies, but obey different laws, and evidence the power and wisdom of God.
- (2) How the night gradually declines after its height at midnight! It seems gradually to steal away, and as dawn approaches, to merge into day. So a soul in spiritual darkness gradually awakes to its spiritual dawn through revelation.
- (3) The slow "breathing out" of the darkness by the dawn, shows us by beautiful imagery, that these mysterious operations of which people in their ignorance are frightened if they have to do with darkness are really beneficent operations of God. They have nothing to do with evil spirits, witches or magic.

For three questions were actually raised about the holy prophet's ministry by the ignorant:

- (1) Did his wonderful works come from himself and not from God?
- (2) Was he possessed of an evil spirit, in other words, was he mad?
- (3) Was he a soothsayer, necromancer or magician? For he had virtues, powers, and eloquence so extraordinary that they could not understand him?

The answer comes in Sūrah 70:19,

"Verily this is the word of a  
most honourable messenger".

Ali comments,

"They are told here that their three theories are foolish. The revelation was really from God. Their wonder should cease if they observe the daily miracles worked round them in nature. The bringer of God's message was the angel Gabriel, and not an evil spirit."

Then we read in Sūrah 70:20 that Gabriel was,

"Endued with power, with rank before the Lord  
of the throne."

Ali continues,

“Not only was the bringer of the revelation Gabriel, an honourable messenger INCAPABLE OF DECEIT, but he had in the angelic kingdom rank and authority before God’s throne, and he could convey an authoritative divine message. HE WAS LIKE THE HOLY APOSTLE FAITHFUL TO HIS TRUST. THEREFORE THERE COULD BE NO QUESTION OF THE MESSAGE BEING DELIVERED IN ANY OTHER WAY THAN EXACTLY ACCORDING TO THE DIVINE WILL AND PURPOSE.”

Ali then goes further in his comparison of Muḥammad to the archangel Gabriel by saying,

“THESE EPITHETS COULD APPLY TO THE PROPHET HIMSELF, BUT IN VIEW OF SŪRAH 70:23, IT IS BEST TO UNDERSTAND THEM OF GABRIEL.”

Sūrah 70:23 says,

“And without doubt he (Muḥammad) saw him  
(Gabriel) in the clear horizon.”

So, after describing the credentials of the archangel Gabriel the text now appeals to the people to consider their own companion (Muḥammad).

Sūrah 70:22, which says,

“And (O people!), your companion is not possessed”

This prophet (companion) who had been born among them and had lived with them, and was known to be honourable, truthful and trustworthy. If Gabriel was the one who brought the message to him, then there was no question of demoniacal possession. And (Sūrah 70:23) the prophet had seen him in his inspired vision ‘in the clear horizon’.

Back in Sūrah 53:18 we read this statement in support,

“For truly did he see of the signs of His Lord  
the Greatest!”

In fact, Sūrah 53:1-18, speaks of “True Revelation”. Sūrah 53:10-12 says this,

“So did God convey the inspiration to His servant  
conveyed what He meant to convey. The prophet’s mind  
and heart in no way falsified what he saw,  
WILL YE THEN DISPUTE WITH HIM  
CONCERNING WHAT HE SAW?”

Sūrah 53:13,

“For indeed he saw him at a second descent.”

Ali says of this,

“The first occasion when Gabriel appeared in a visible form was at the mountain of light when he brought his first revelation beginning with Iqraa. The second was at the prophet’s Mi`rāj or ascension. These are the only two occasions when Gabriel appeared in visible form. The Mi`rāj appearance was near the Lote tree in the highest heaven, above which (figuratively) is the Throne of God. The mansion or throne (figuratively) or special presence – if the throne or presence could ever be

localised in our thoughts: for God's "throne doth extend over the heavens and the earth" (Sūrah 2:255). The point was reached when the spiritual knowledge of man could reach no higher. The Sūfis interpret the Lote tree in Islam to be what the burning bush was to Moses. Only, in the case of Moses it was only a prefigurement of the divine effulgence on this earth. In the case of Muḥammad it was the Divine Glory in heaven itself, and it was shrouded in unspeakable mystery. This was indeed 'The greatest of the signs of the Lord', Sūrah 53:18.

Then, if we return to Sūrah 81:24-27,

"Neither does he withhold grudgingly a knowledge of the unseen. Nor is it a word of an evil spirit accursed. Then whither go ye? Verily this is no less than a message to (all) the worlds".

If Muḥammad had have grudgingly withheld a knowledge of the unseen then he would have had nothing but the words of a soothsayer - guarded, ambiguous, and misleading. Here everything was clear, sane, true and under divine inspiration.

It is not the word of an evil accursed spirit such as evil suggestions of envy, spite, greed, selfishness or other vices. On the contrary, the teaching of the Qur'an is beneficent, pointing to the right way, the way of God. Thus we have been shown as Ali says,

"That this is not word of a mortal, but it is full of Divine wisdom, its teaching is not that of a madman, but sane to the core and in accordance with human needs; it freely and clearly directs you to the right path and forbids you the path of evil. Why then hesitate? Accept the Divine grace, repent of your sins, and come to a higher life. The Qur'ān is not meant for one class or race; it is universal, and is addressed to all the worlds. "

Sūrah 27:6 puts it this way,

"As to Thee, the Qur'ān is bestowed upon Thee. From the presence of One who is wise and all knowing."

Sūrah 28:2,

"These are the verses of the book that make things clear."

Revelation is presented here in three aspects:

- (1) It explains the nature of God, our own position, and the spiritual world around us.
- (2) It directs us to right behaviour and keeps us from evil.
- (3) To those who have faith and accept its guidance it gives the good news of forgiveness, purification, and achievement of salvation.

Sūrah 36:69-70,

“We have not instructed the (prophet) in poetry, nor is it meet for him: This is no less than a message and a Qur’ān making things clear”.

Here poetry is connoting fairy tales, imaginary descriptions, things futile, false, or obscure such as decadent poetry is. Whereas the Qur’ān is a practical guide - pure, true and clear.

Sūrah 25:32,

“Those who reject faith say: ‘Why is not the Qur’ān revealed to him all at once? Thus (is it revealed), that we may strengthen Thy heart thereby, and we have rehearsed it to Thee in show well arranged stages, gradually”.

Three reasons are given for the gradual revelation of the Qur’ān:

- (1) To strengthen Muḥammad’s heart. The tremendous task of winning the Arab nation, and through them the whole world, to Islam, required superhuman patience, constancy and firmness, and these qualities were strengthened by the gradual promulgation of solutions to each difficulty as it arose.
- (2) “Slow well arranged stages” – though the stages were gradual, as the occasion demanded from time to time, in the course of 23 years, the whole (Qur’ān) emerged, when completed, as a well arranged scheme of spiritual instruction even in the arrangement of the Sūrahs.
- (3) Questions put and answers given. Divine knowledge is a fathomless ocean. But glimpses of it can be obtained by any individual sincerely searching for truth. Their progress will be in grades. If they ask questions and answers are then furnished to them they are more likely to apprehend the truth, as they have already explored the part of the territory in which they are interested. In the same way, when concrete questions arise by the logic of events and they are answered not only for the occasion but also from a general standpoint, the teaching has a far greater chance of penetrating the human intelligence and taking shape in practical behaviour. And, THIS IS THE USUAL WAY OF INSTRUCTION IN THE QUR’ĀN.

Sūrah 41:42,

“No falsehood can approach it (Qur’ān) from before it or behind it: It is sent down by One full of wisdom, worthy of all praise.”

God’s truth (Qur’ān) is fully guarded on all sides. No one can get the better of it by attacking it from before or behind it, openly or in secret, or in any way whatsoever.

Sūrah 55:1-2,

“God most gracious! It is He that  
taught the Qur’ān”

The revelation comes from God most gracious and it is one of the greatest signs of His grace and favour.

Sūrah 75:16-18,

“Move not Thy tongue concerning the (Qur’ān)  
to make haste therewith. It is for us to  
collect it and to promulgate it:  
But when we have promulgated it: follow  
Thou its recital (as promulgated).”

Be not in haste with the Qur’ān before its revelation to thee (Muḥammad) is completed. The immediate meaning here according to Ali is,

“That the holy prophet was to allow the revelation conveyed to him to SINK INTO HIS MIND AND HEART AND NOT TO BE IMPATIENT ABOUT IT. God would certainly complete it according to His plan and see that it was COLLECTED AND PRESERVED FOR MEN AND NOT LOST. THAT THE INSPIRED ONE WAS TO FOLLOW IT AND RECITE IT AS THE INSPIRATION WAS CONVEYED TO HIM. AND THAT IT CARRIES ITS OWN EXPLANATION ACCORDING TO THE FACULTIES BESTOWED BY GOD ON MAN.

The general meaning follows the same lines. We must not be impatient about the inspired word. We must follow it as made clear to us by the faculties given to us by God.”

This then is the Qur’ānic idea of revelation and inspiration, but we will now try to encapsulate this idea.

**First**, we have the “spirit of inspiration”, Rūḥ-ul-amīn. The epithet given to the angel Gabriel who to Muslims is the “spirit” of the inspiration of the Qur’ān. Thus, God inspired Gabriel, who in turn, by delivering the message, inspired Muḥammad. This appears to be the case since Gabriel was the intermediary between God and the “prophet” Muḥammad.

**Second**, we have seen the equivocation involved in the Muslim explanation of “spirit”.

- (A) This places Gabriel above the angels and makes him ‘spirit’. This only makes sense when we realise that Muslims deny the existence of the Holy [eternal] Spirit (Hebrews 9:14).
- (B) There are four meanings assigned to “spirit” by Yusuf Ali - the respected Qur’ānic commentator, viz,
  - (i) The Spirit of inspiration – Gabriel.
  - (ii) A spirit gifted to men in a general sense.
  - (iii) The holy spirit that God strengthened Jesus with.

- (iv) The Divine spirit given to the faithful at the last day.
- (v) The souls of men.
- (C) We must also note that the Divine Spirit of (4) above is meant in a stronger sense than the holy spirit given to Christ as a strengthening in (3).
- (D) However, we now have the existence of a Divine Spirit revealed at the end of time, yet is denied existence categorically in Muslim theology, for to admit its existence is to “ascribe partners to God” – a form of polytheism which in Islam is almost the ‘unforgivable sin.’
- (E) It surely provokes the question, “what then was the ‘holy spirit’ God gave to Christ since Gabriel is the ‘spirit’ of inspiration and therefore consolation?”
- (F) Muslims both confirm and deny the existence of a Divine Holy Spirit.
- (G) It is a non sequitur to write out the Divine Spirit throughout an entire existence only to have it suddenly appear in another. That spirit either exists or it does not, and in point (4) above it plainly exists. Therefore, the Muslim denial of its existence is in, and of itself, a palpable falsehood.

**Third**, the process of Qur’ānic inspiration is indicated by:

- (A) Impression of the Divine message from Gabriel on to the heart of Muḥammad. This involved also:
  - (i) Muḥammad's memory of the message.
  - (ii) Muḥammad's understanding of the message.
- (B) This message was then put in human speech from:
  - (i) Which it was promulgated to the entire world,
  - (ii) It was in Arabic.
  - (iii) It had to be in Arabic or it would have been unintelligible to the Arabs, which in turn meant that the Arabs could not have received the faith, which further meant the faith could not have been promulgated to the world at large.

**Fourth**, a lot of the proof of inspiration is simply:

- (A) An adjuration, as in Surāh 81:15-21, where Muḥammad calls to witness the “planets that recede”.
- (B) A simple, “verily, this is the word of a most honourable messenger”, as in Sūrah 81:19
- (C) That the messenger is “incapable of deceit”, Sūrah 81:20. This was so because he (Gabriel) had rank and authority in the angelic kingdom. He was

the head of the angels and by virtue of this he “could convey an authoritative Divine message.”

- (D) Gabriel was like Muḥammad, i.e., faithful to his trust – from this alone the conclusion is,
- (E) Therefore there can be NO QUESTION of the message being delivered in any other way as this because it was by these things that made this message of the Qur’ān from the Divine will and purpose.
- (F) Ali says all the epithets spoken of regarding Gabriel could apply to Muḥammad himself, but in view of Sūrah 81:23, which reads, “And without doubt he (Muḥammad) saw him (Gabriel) in the clear horizon”. It is best to understand them of Gabriel. Again, however we have a simple unqualified “without doubt”. Therefore we are to believe that this event happened.
- (G) In Sūrah 53:1-8, we have the process of “true revelation” which is the same type of argument ending with “will ye then dispute with him (Muḥammad) concerning what he saw?” In Sūrah 53:13 this is reinforced with, “For indeed (Muḥammad) saw him at a second descent”. Hence we have two sightings but one witness, Muḥammad himself. This by itself is enough to alert us to the fact that something is wrong here.

Ali states categorically that those two references are the only occasions that Muḥammad saw Gabriel in visible form. The first was on the mountain of light and the second at the prophet’s mi’rāj or ascension. This is true in the Qur’ān and there are no witnesses to it. No one else saw anything on the horizon other than Muḥammad yet Gabriel was a large figure and since this is vital to the truth of the inspiration of Qur’ānic scripture one would think that many others would witness this event as did many when the Holy Spirit descended on Christ, and later on, the apostles in Acts 2. But we are stuck with Muḥammad’s version, which is unwitnessed and indisputable. If the Qur’ān is true then Muḥammad’s account must be accepted, that is, he saw Gabriel in visible form, on his own, TWICE ONLY.

This is not in fact the truth, for in the Hadith or the sayings of the prophet, one Sahih Muslim, who along with Al-Bukhari, is a respected collector and reporter of the Hadith says this:

“Umar bin al Khattab reported: ‘while we were sitting with the Messenger of Allah [Muḥammad], one day there appeared to us a man wearing very white clothes. His hair was very black. No signs of travel appeared on him, NOR COULD ANY OF US RECOGNISE HIM. He came in and sat facing the Prophet, with his knees touching the Prophet’s knees, and placed his hands on the thighs of the prophet, and said, “O, Muḥammad, tell me, what is Islam?” The prophet answered, ‘Islam is to testify that there is no true god except Allah, and Muḥammad is the messenger of Allah, to perform the Salah, to give the Zakah, to observe fasting of Ramadhan, and perform the Haj if you can afford it.’ The man said, “You have told the truth”. Umar said, “We were amazed about him, he asked him and approved his answer.” The man further asked, “Tell me what is the Iman?” The prophet said, “The Iman is to believe in the oneness of Allah and to believe in his angels, his books, his messengers, and to believe in the final day, and in al-Qadar and in its good and bad consequences.” “You have told the truth,” he said. Then he asked, “Tell me, what is the Ihsan?” He said, “It is to worship Allah as though you see Him. Although you do not see Him, He sees you”. He said, “Tell me, when is the final

hour?” The prophet said, “The one who is asked has no more knowledge about it than the one who is asking.” He said, “Tell me then about its signs”. The prophet said, “When the female slave gives birth to her own mistress, and when you see the poor, naked, shepherds compete with one another in erecting tall buildings.” Then the man left. The prophet kept thinking for a while then he asked, “Umar, do you know who the questioner was?” Allah and His messenger knows,” I said. “THAT WAS JIBREEL [GABRIEL]. HE CAME TO TEACH YOU YOUR DĪN [RELIGION].” The messenger of Allah said.”

Thus we see there was a third occasion Gabriel appeared in visible form. Not only so but, there are witnesses to this and the teaching, which in effect are the six articles of faith of Islam. Again though, only Muḥammad recognised him. The point is, since this is so vital to the proof of the inspiration of the Qur’ān, how is it that this event is not recorded in it? Why does the Qur’ān cite two unwitnessed appearances and leave this Hadith account completely out of the “inspired record?”

How could the prophet himself not see the importance of this third witnessed, yet unrecorded account, in the inspired version of events? How different this account of “Divine Inspiration” is than that of the Biblical record where everything was open and witnessed by many people at one time. As the Bible says, “None of this was done in a corner.” Yet the Qur’ānic account certainly gives the opposite impression.

Here too we have an instance where the Hadith directly contradicts the Qur’ān and not only so - it is a fatal contradiction as it involves the very people (Gabriel and Muḥammad) who brought the inspiration of the Qur’ān

The final point I would make is this: The Arab’s had not received “The Faith” until this time, yet in Acts 2 “The Faith” was preached to every nation under heaven IN THEIR OWN TONGUE. This necessarily includes the Arab nation. This being so (and it is) then, when the Arab’s charge the Christians with perverting that original gospel, who among the Arabs perverted that message since they too received it that day? It would have to have been perverted by their own teachers in the 500 years they had it, for they got that first gospel when every other nation received it and they, like every nation, perverted that message themselves. Thus it never called for a new message, but, Arabs like all others, must go back to the gospel of Acts 2ff and restore the original, not promulgate false doctrine.

Next we will look at biblical revelation and its proofs – scriptural inspiration and the Bible.

## Scriptural Inspiration and the Bible

Last time we looked at the subject of scriptural inspiration and the Qur'ān. We said that the subject is of paramount importance as regards the matters of truth and authority in religion. This time we will look at biblical inspiration and try to understand it from the perspective of the New Testament writers and Christ Himself.

The first point that needs to be made is simply this, that the inspiration of scripture involves the doctrine of God's supreme power and His right to exercise that power over the souls of men. This is important because if God is not seen to have supreme power in the matter of His revelation of Himself to mankind, then He cannot be said to have supreme power in His guidance of rational human beings.

A second point is that scripture itself is a prime factor in God's redemptive work and therefore, is an essential part in the whole range of that redemptive work. From this it follows that if scripture is not inspired by God, then man cannot be redeemed. That is how important this subject is! This can be taken further with a disjunctive argument:

Either the Bible is inspired or the Qur'ān is, BUT NOT BOTH. Therefore, either the Bible or the Qur'ān can redeem man. This is a strong disjunction and lays the case out clearly that one of these documents is that which:

- (1) Involves God's Sovereign power and His right to exercise that power over the souls of people.
- (2) One of these documents is an integral part in the redemptive work of God and one is not.

Further, there are two stages of revelation given by God through which God's Divinity and power are revealed:

- (1) Continuous revelation or general revelation.
- (2) Is exclusive revelation, made exclusively to His chosen people through which His saving grace is made known.

An example of the first type of revelation is found in Romans 1:19-20,

“Because that which is known about God is evident within them for God made it evident to them. For since the creation of the world His invisible attributes, His eternal power and divine nature have been clearly seen, being understood through what has been made so that they are without excuse.”

In the Old Testament in Psalm 19:1-6, we have another example, which brings both stages together for us,

“The heavens declare the glory of God,  
and their expanse is declaring the works of His hands. Day to day pours forth speech, and night to night reveals knowledge. There is no speech, nor are there words, their voice is not heard. Their line has gone out through all the earth, and their utterances to

the end of the world. In them He has placed a tent for the sun, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, it rejoices as a strong man to run his course. Its rising is from one end of the heavens and its circuit to the other end of them; there is nothing hidden from its heat.”

Then in Psalm 19:7,

“The law of the Lord is perfect restoring the soul.”

In the second higher revelation there is a prayer for salvation from sin, ending in a triple acclamation with adoration and gratitude

Psalm 19:14,

“Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord my Rock and my Redeemer.”

From this it becomes evident that without exclusive or special revelation, continuous or general revelation would actually be incomplete and ineffective. In fact, it would be dangerous, as witnessed in Romans 1:20, where those who only had the continuous revelation in their lives, or where they only had access to the one form of revelation, it rendered them WITHOUT EXCUSE. That is why God also gave His exclusive revelation, for having been now rendered without excuse, they needed to know how they were to respond to their creator.

On the other hand, without this general revelation, exclusive revelation would lack that basis in the fundamental knowledge of God as the wise, righteous, good creator and sovereign ruler of all things. It would also render this great God’s intervention into the world for the salvation of sinners as unintelligible, incredible, and inoperative. These two types of revelation are necessarily needed for the truth and integrity of the scriptures as being authored by God.

It is interesting to note that only in the Garden of Eden has general revelation been adequate for human needs. Until man sinned, he did not need God’s grace whereby sinners could be restored back to fellowship with Him. Yet in spite of acting immediately to give man an exclusive revelation of saving truth, the whole heathen world, which held on to general revelation and the general truths of religion, grew weaker and weaker and decayed by virtue of the fact that they refused to retain in their minds the knowledge of the very nature of God, given in His exclusive revelation. They ended up corrupt and without excuse for that corruption (Romans 1:20-32).

From this we can see that revelation and the inspiration of the Bible is no mere reflection of God’s redeeming acts in the minds of men. It is a factor in His redemptive work, a component part of the SERIES OF HIS REDEMPTIVE ACTS WITHOUT WHICH THAT SERIES WOULD BE INCOMPLETE.

Dealing with man as an intelligent being, God has saved him by means of a revelation, (in our case the New Testament), where man has been brought into a more and more adequate knowledge of God (from the Old Testament times). Also, man has been led more and more by this process to be able to “work out his own salvation with fear and

trembling” as he perceived with more and more clarity how God is working it out for him with mighty deeds of grace.

There are three well-marked modes of revelation:

- (1) External manifestations of which theophany is a typical form. Alongside this, there are all of the mighty works by which God makes Himself known, e.g., express miracles and every supernatural intervention.
- (2) Internal suggestion - prophecy, visions and dreams.

If we look at Numbers 12:6 we see this,

“He said, hear now My words. If there is a prophet among you, I the Lord shall make Myself known to him in a vision.”

That verse is a fundamental passage constituting the typical forms of prophecy and with them the whole “prophetic word”, which shares its essential characteristic with visions and dreams, since it comes not by the will of man, but from God.

It is interesting to note in passing here that the Islamic religion claims that Deuteronomy 18:15-19 speaks of the prophet like Moses to be raised up. That prophet was to be Muḥammad rather than Christ. Muḥammad was the prophet of the Qur’ān yet Muḥammad had visions and dreams “inspired” by God of the angel Gabriel, who recited the Qur’ān to him. This is fatally flawed and shows that Muslims either do not understand or do not believe scripture, or they are ignorant of its meaning. We read in Numbers 12:7-8, after giving His statement of prophecy, God then says this of Moses,

“Not so My servant Moses,  
he is faithful in all My household.  
WITH HIM I SPEAK MOUTH TO MOUTH,  
even openly, and not in dark sayings,  
AND HE BEHOLDS THE FORM OF THE LORD...”

Maybe Muḥammad forgot this scripture when speaking with Gabriel because he did not get the Qur’ān in this way. He did not speak with God mouth to mouth. God spoke to him (he claims) through Gabriel. Thus he was not the prophet like Moses. On the other hand, Christ did have this relationship with God, and therefore is a prophet like Moses. It is these simple things that cut through the multitude of words that act as a smokescreen in the Qur’ān.

To put the argument in syllogistic form:

God would raise up a prophet like Moses and Moses spoke mouth to mouth with God. Muḥammad was not a prophet who spoke mouth to mouth with God. Therefore, Muḥammad was not a prophet that God raised up like Moses.

This simple syllogism cuts through thousands of words of “argument” to try and prove that Muḥammad was that prophet.

- (3) The third mode of revelation is concursive operation, which is meant or illustrated by an inspired psalm, epistle, or history in which no human activity, not even the control of the will, is superseded. The Holy Spirit works in, with, and through them all in such a way as to communicate to the product, qualities that are clearly superhuman. All of these three things occur in all Bible ages from Moses through to Christ.

Further, the great promise given to Moses secured to ISRAEL the succession of the prophets. For after Moses, if there might never have arisen a prophet like him who knew the Lord face to face, each of the whole series of prophets raised up by God, were raised so that the people might know His will. That people was Israel and those prophets were Jews. They were raised to keep Israel faithful to the covenant made with Moses between God and Israel. This continued through to Christ, who then inaugurated the “New Covenant” between God and the whole world, Jew and Gentile, including the Arab nations. Revelation and inspiration ended when the last apostle of Christ laid down his pen and died.

All prophets were under Divine control and this control was complete and compelling. Thus, under this Divine control, the prophet was not the “mover” but the “moved” in the formation of the message.

This is perfectly captured by Peter in 2 Peter 1:20-21,

“Knowing this first, that no prophecy  
of the scripture is of any private interpretation.  
For the prophecy was never made by an act  
of human will, but men spoke from God  
BEING BORNE (φερόμενοι) by the Holy Spirit.”

This word is significant from φέρω (pherō - to bear), e.g., Luke 23:26, Simon of Cyrene was made to φερεῖν (pherein), bear the cross of Jesus. Luke 24:1, the women came to the tomb of Jesus φέρουσαι (pherousai), carrying the spices they had prepared - the thought being, the thing being borne has no power of its own, it is being borne or carried by another. Thus in 2 Pet 1:21, the prophecy or body of teaching being revealed is not under the power of the prophet. The prophet’s teaching is being borne by the Holy Spirit, which inwardly moves the mind of, and/or prompts the prophet to speak or write. It is never a message from the prophet’s mouth of his own volition. He in fact, has no power at all over the message, which is entirely borne by the Holy Spirit. Thus what we have being reinforced is the PASSIVITY OF THE PROPHET IN RESPECT OF THE REVELATION GIVEN THROUGH HIM.

This is the significance of that phrase, “It was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God.”

Also, to “be borne” φερεῖν is not the same as to be “led”, αγειν (ágein) much less to be “guided” or “directed” (ὁδεγεῖν – hodēgein). He that is “borne” CONTRIBUTES NOTHING TO THE MOVEMENT INDUCED, BUT IS THE OBJECT TO BE MOVED. Compare a man on a stretcher, he is carried along, he is not the carrier. The object to be moved or carried is God’s teaching, the Holy Spirit is the carrier of the teaching and the man is the stretcher on which the message is carried. In saying this however, we must not press the prophet’s passivity too far, for the intelligence of the prophet was active in the reception of the message. Further, the

prophet's intelligence was the instrument of revelation. Their intelligence however, was not active in the PRODUCTION of their message. They were not co-authors with God; they become God's mouth or spokesman.

All this again puts the message of the Qur'ān in a different league as regards inspiration.

- (1) There is no Holy Spirit involved in the message of the Qur'ān and since there must be this element in revelation, the Qur'ān cannot be Divinely inspired, as the "carrier of the message" is totally absent.
- (2) If the Holy Spirit was involved then Gabriel was the prophet (not Muḥammad). Since Gabriel would have been the one under control (the spokesman), why would Muḥammad be needed since he was not the one carrying the message, or having the message carried through him?
- (3) Since the intelligence of the prophet is active in this process, one would naturally assume there would be some degree of literacy and cognizance of the message yet Muḥammad is said to be illiterate. I know of no Bible prophet of whom this was said.
- (4) Each Biblical prophet explicitly stated that they were speaking "the word of God", yet in the Qur'ān, it is at best, merely implied, e.g., Sūrah 96:1, (the very first "revelation" Muḥammad received after Gabriel supposedly physically pressed him) states,

"Read! In the name of thy Lord".

Sūrah 25:1,

"Blessed is He who sent down the criterion..."

Sūrah 26:2,

"There are the verses in the book that make things clear."

Sūrah 33:53,

"O ye who believe."

Sūrah 35:1,

"Praise be to God who created."

Sūrah 68:1,

"Nun, by the pen and by the record by which men write."

Sūrah 72:1,

"Say it has been revealed to me that..."

Sūrah 97:1,

“We (i.e. God) indeed revealed this message.”

The closest we get is Sūrah 97:1, yet even that seems more of a justification than a “thus saith the Lord” or “the Word of the Lord spoke to me”, or as David said in 2 Samuel 23:2,

“The SPIRIT of the Lord spoke by me,  
AND HIS WORD WAS ON MY TONGUE.”

Whose word? The Holy Spirit’s word. This accords with 2 Peter 1:20-21,

“HOLY MEN OF GOD SPOKE AS THEY WERE  
BEING BORNE BY THE HOLY SPIRIT.”

This is the claim of both testaments and this claim is not EVER made in the Qur’ān. It cannot be in there for one reason and that is this:

The Qur’ān does not meet this one simple criterion that is absolutely required to authenticate any God given inspired Revelation. The “criterion sent down” in Sūrah 25:1, is different from the one that endorses revelation for there is no Holy Spirit involved – see the previous chapter on the equivocation Muslims engage in around “Spirit” and revelation.

The biblical idea of inspiration is also interesting and unique from another aspect. In 2 Timothy 3:16, the Greek word θεόπνευστος (theopneustos), does not mean “inspired of God”. That phrase is rather the rendering of the Latin “*divinitus inspirata*.”

The Greek term appears, however, to say nothing of (in)spiring or (in)spiration. It speaks only of a “spiring” or “spiration”. This gives a picture of threads running throughout, but scripture was not “breathed into” by God. Nor was it a product of divine “inbreathing” into the prophets or spokesmen. It was “BREATHED OUT” by God, that is, all scripture is “God breathed.” The word πᾶς (pas), refers to every scripture, every word. That is how they are all threaded together. This fundamental passage declares simply that the scriptures are a Divine product, without any indication how He has operated in producing them. In saying this, we also note that no other term could be used to more emphatically assent the Divine production of scripture than the term used here. “The breath of God,” is in all scripture, it is “God breathed”.

The symbol of His mighty power, the bearer of His creative word is found in Psalm 33:6,

“By the word of the Lord the heavens were made,  
and by the breath of His mouth all their host”.

It is particularly where the operations of God are energetic, as above in the Psalm, that the Hebrew terms (ruah) or neshāmāh) are used to designate them. God’s breath is THE IRRESISTIBLE OUTFLOW OF HIS POWER. Why is this so significant? Simply because of this,

“When Paul declares that EVERY or ALL SCRIPTURE IS THE PRODUCT OF THE DIVINE BREATH [GOD BREATHED], HE IS ASSERTING WITH AS MUCH ENERGY AND EMPHASIS THAT HE COULD MUSTER – THAT SCRIPTURE IS SPECIFICALLY A PRODUCT OF DIVINE OPERATION.”

Every scripture is God breathed and is therefore profitable according to the apostle Paul. It was the value of the scriptures and the source of that value (GOD) in their Divine origin he is asserting in this passage.

We must also observe that Paul does not tell us everything here for which the scriptures are made valuable by their Divine origin. He simply speaks to the immediate point at hand, and is reminding Timothy and us, of the value, which these scriptures by virtue of their Divine origin have for God's people and their spiritual power as "God breathed" is all he alludes to here.

We now go back to 2 Peter 1:19-21, for what Paul says about the Divine origin of the scriptures, is enforced and extended by Peter in this most striking passage.

“And so we have the prophetic word made MORE SURE, to which you do well to pay attention as to a lamp shining in a dark place, until the day dawns and the morning star arises in your hearts. But know this, first of all, that no prophecy of scripture is a matter of one's private interpretation, for no prophecy was ever made by an act of human will, but men spoke from God as they were borne by the Holy Spirit.”

Here Peter is assuring his readers that what he had made known to them of the power and coming of the Lord Jesus Christ did not rest on cunningly devised fables. He offers them the testimony of eyewitnesses to Christ's glory. Then he implies that they have an even better testimony than that of the eyewitnesses. "We have" Peter says, "the prophetic word MADE MORE SURE. Therefore it should most certainly be heeded. To what, is Peter referring? The scriptures. In particular, the New Testament scriptures. Of what other "Prophetic Word" could he be speaking of when it is put over against the testimony of the eyewitnesses of Christ's glory (of which he was one) and then say, "We have it, it is in our hands?" Then immediately he proceeds to speak of it as scriptural prophecy (or teaching), "you will do well," he says, "to pay heed to the prophetic word because we know this first, that every prophecy (and teaching) of scripture..." We say 'teaching' because Peter's statement is equivalent to Paul's "All scripture" (2 Timothy 3:16). It applies to the whole of scripture in all its parts. It is not the result of human interpretation or investigation into the nature of things. It is not a product of the writer's own thinking. This is equivalent to saying that it is of Divine origin. Peter then makes this explicit in his supporting clause, which contains both a negative and positive declaration. "For no prophecy ever came by the will of man, but it was as borne by the Holy Spirit that men spoke from God". Two things stand out:

- (1) The emphatic denial that scripture owes its origin to any human initiative.
- (2) The equally emphatic assertion that its source lies in God.

True, it was spoken by men, but these men spoke from God. Then the remarkable clause is inserted and put forward that the stress may fall on it. It informs us of the fact that men, in speaking, should not speak from themselves but from God. It was "As borne by the Holy Spirit" that they spoke. Therefore, Peter here has, as direct an assertion of the Divine origin of scripture as that Paul makes in 2 Timothy 3:16. It is by virtue of the fact that

these men spoke as borne by the Holy Spirit, an immediately Divine word, that we can see the Divine trustworthiness of all scripture. This is a claim the Qur'ān does not and indeed cannot sustain.

We can further see how all scripture is envisaged by looking at a passage in (John 10:34ff). This in fact, asserts just how far the extreme trustworthiness of scripture is conveyed to us. The Jews here are offended by Jesus, "Making Himself God" (John 10:33), and they were about to stone Him when He said in His defence, (John 10:34ff), "Is it not written in your law, I said ye are gods? If he called them gods to whom the word of God came (and scripture cannot be broken), what about the one whom the Father consecrated as His own and sent into the world. Why do you say I blaspheme because I say I am the Son of God?" (John 10:33)

IN A HIGHER SENSE THAN THAT IN, WHICH YOU ARE GODS, WAS SAID TO THOSE WHOM THE WORD OF GOD CAME? He had just declared in unmistakable terms, "I and My Father are one,". The point to notice, relevant to our discussion, is this - Jesus' defence is in the form of an appeal to scripture. It is very important to observe how He makes His appeal,

He cites the scriptures as LAW. "Is it not written in your law?" He demands, yet the passage He cites is not written in the Torah (law). It is written in the Psalms, in particular Psalm 82:6. That Psalm is as far as possible from what could be presented as having the external characteristics of legal enactment. When Jesus cites this passage as being written in "the law of the Jews," He does it for only one reason – In this act, Christ ascribes LEGAL AUTHORITY TO THE ENTIRETY OF SCRIPTURE. Furthermore, this was a conception that was common enough among the Jews of His day (cf. John 12:34).

"The multitude therefore answered Him,  
we have heard out of the Law that the Christ is to  
remain forever, and how can you say the Son the Man must be lifted  
up? Who is this Son of man?"

This finds expression in the New Testament both on the lips of Jesus Himself and in the writings of the apostles. Thus, on a later occasion, Jesus declares that "It is written in the law of the Jews, They hated Me without a cause" (John 15:25), a clause found in Psalm 35:19. Paul assigns passages from the Psalms and from Isaiah to "the law" (1Corinthians 14:21 and Romans 3:19-20). Paul also writes such sentences as,

"Tell me, you who want to be under the law, do  
you not listen to the law? For it is written that  
Abraham had two sons..."

Here he quotes from Genesis. From this we can plainly see that the entirety of scripture was conceived of as "prophecy" and also that the entirety of scripture is conceived of as "law". These three synonyms – law, prophecy and scripture – are therefore materially strict. By bringing them forward as proof, by varying these terms, ALL SCRIPTURE is authoritative. In addition, when Christ declares that "scripture cannot be broken," it is an explicit declaration that it is impossible for scripture to be annulled. Its authority cannot be withstood or denied. The movement of thought is this: Because it is impossible for scripture in its entirety to be withstood, any particular scripture which is cited, as Christ cited it in John 10:34, MUST BE TAKEN AS IRREFUTABLE AUTHORITY.

Therefore what we have is the strongest possible assertion of the perfect authority of all Scripture, and, the thing that is precisely true of scripture is that “it cannot be broken”. Also, John 10:34 is not to be taken as an isolated passage but a REPRESENTATIVE ONE. This conception of scripture highlights the ground of all Jesus’ appeals to scripture and of all the appeals of the New Testament writers as well. In all cases, an appeal to scripture is an appeal to an absolute authority, whose determination is final. Both Christ and the New Testament writers make their appeal to every part of scripture.

In Matthew 19:1-9, when the Pharisees had come to Jesus with a question on divorce, He met them with this,

“Have you not read that He who made them from the beginning made them male and female, AND SAID for this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and the two shall become one flesh? What therefore God has joined together let not man separate.”

The point to note here is the explicit reference of Genesis 2:24 to God as its author. “He who made them said, what therefore God has joined together”. Yet this passage does not give us a saying of God’s recorded in scripture, but:

JUST THE WORD OF SCRIPTURE ITSELF, yet THIS CAN BE TREATED AS A DECLARATION OF GOD. This can only be so in the event that ALL SCRIPTURE IS A DECLARATION OF GOD’S.

Therefore it is clear that Jesus’ citing of scripture as an authoritative document rests on its imputation of it to God as its author. Thus the idea is that whatever stands written in scripture is a word of God. We can also say that, this view Jesus held of scripture, was not only the current view of His day and age, but also because HE KNEW IT TO BE TRUE, as even in his flesh He is the faithful and true witness. This was the view also of the resurrected Christ, plus that of every New Testament writer.

The Qur’ān simply cannot do this. It has no internal witness such as this within itself. It has no Holy Spirit as its bearer, and this on its own, frankly, disqualifies it as being a Divinely authoritative word. Christ could unequivocally invoke a simple “it is written” as the sufficient ground of confident belief (Luke 24:46) and He could chide His own apostles after He had suffered, died and risen again by saying to them, “O foolish men and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken”. He then asks in Luke 24:26, “was it not necessary for the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into His glory?” Then in Luke 24:27, He “Began with Moses and with all the prophets. He explained to them the things concerning Himself IN ALL THE SCRIPTURES.”

This is the very thing the Qur’ān denies, that Christ suffered crucifixion and died. The Muslims in the Qur’ān say that another took Christ’s place on the cross. Sūrah 4:155-157,

“God has stamped on them their misbelief, so that they cannot believe, except a few... for their saying, ‘verily, we have killed the Messiah, Jesus the son of Mary, the apostle of God’, but they did not kill Him, and they did not crucify him, but a similitude was made

for them.”

Apart from the ethical implications of this Sūrah, it is imputing to God not only falsity but outright immorality in that He would allow someone or MAKE A SIMILITUDE OF CHRIST simply to be crucified in Christ's place. This Sūrah dismisses the very heart of all the scriptures. It makes Christ and the apostles' message absolutely vain and useless. This in turn, strikes a third fatal wound to the Qur'an and its inspiration, for now we find:

- (1) There is no Holy Spirit bearing the Qur'ān's message, thus it is not divine.
- (2) It has no internal evidence that it can point to corroborate its authority.
- (3) It dismisses the facts about the very one to whom all scripture is pointing to.

This can never do as Christ's simple "it is written", has within it, the implication that whatever stands written in scripture is Divinely authoritative and thus cannot be abrogated. The New Testament writers also solemnly justified the Gospel that they preached in every detail by an appeal to the scriptures, e.g.,

1 Corinthians 15:3-4,

“That Christ died for our sins ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES, and that He has been raised on the third day ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURES.”

Philip, in Acts 8:35,

“And Philip opened his mouth, and BEGINNING FROM THIS SCRIPTURE, he preached Jesus to him”.

Paul, in Acts 17:2-3,

“And according to Paul's custom, he went to them and for three Sabbaths reasoned with them FROM THE SCRIPTURES, explaining and GIVING EVIDENCE that the Christ had to suffer and rise again from the dead, and saying this Jesus whom I am proclaiming to you is the Christ.”

Then in Acts 26:22, Paul again,

“And so having obtained help from God, I stand to this day testifying both to small and great, STANDING ON NOTHING BUT WHAT THE PROPHETS AND MOSES SAID WAS GOING TO TAKE PLACE.”

In Acts 26:23,

“The Christ was going to suffer and that by reason

of His resurrection from the dead He (Christ) should be the first to proclaim light to BOTH THE JEWISH PEOPLE AND THE GENTILES.”

Compare with Romans 1:17; 3:4,10; 4:17; 11:26 et al., all of which state – “As it is written” or “the scripture says”. Therefore, wherever and whenever they carried the Gospel, it was no less than a Gospel, resting on scripture that they proclaimed (Acts 17:2). See also Acts 17:24,28. Not only was this the case, but also the nobler recipients of the Gospel tested its truth “BY THE SCRIPTURES” (Acts 17:11).

The holiness of life that the apostles inculcated was based on a clear scriptural requirement:

1 Peter 1:16,

“BECAUSE IT IS WRITTEN, YE SHALL BE HOLY,  
FOR I AM HOLY”

Even the royal law of love which they commended was taught by scriptural sanction in James 2:8,

“If however you are fulfilling the royal law,  
ACCORDING TO THE SCRIPTURE. YOU SHALL  
LOVE YOUR NEIGHBOUR AS YOURSELF, you  
are doing well.”

Every detail of duty was supported by an appeal to scripture e.g., Acts 23:5,

“And Paul said, ‘I was not aware brethren  
that he was a high priest; FOR IT IS WRITTEN –  
YOU SHALL NOT SPEAK EVIL OF A RULER OF  
YOUR PEOPLE.”

Also, Romans 12:19,

“Never take your own revenge, beloved,  
but leave place for the wrath of God,  
FOR IT IS WRITTEN: VENGEANCE IS MINE,  
I WILL REPAY, says the Lord.”

Even the circumstances of their lives, and events occasionally occurring about them, are referred to scripture for their significance,

Romans 2:26,

“If therefore the uncircumcised man  
keeps the requirements of the law,  
will not his uncircumcision be regarded as  
circumcision?”

Romans 9:33,

“JUST AS IT IS WRITTEN, Behold I lay in  
Zion a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence,  
and he who believes in Him will not be disappointed.”

2 Corinthians 4:13,

“But having the same spirit of faith,  
ACCORDING TO WHAT IS WRITTEN,  
I BELIEVED THEREFORE I SPOKE, we  
also believe, therefore also we speak.”

So, just as Christ declared that whatever was written in the scriptures “must needs (emphatic) be fulfilled”, so His followers and the writers of the New Testament explained one of the most startling facts that had occurred in their experience by pointing out,

“IT WAS NEEDFUL THAT THE SCRIPTURE  
SHOULD BE FULFILLED WHICH THE HOLY  
SPIRIT SPOKE BY THE MOUTH OF DAVID.”  
(Acts 1:16)

So we see that the ground of this constant appeal to scripture is that it is enough that a thing is “contained in scripture” (1 Peter 2:6) for it to be of absolute perfect authority. Scripture had to be fulfilled simply because what is contained in it is the Divine declaration of the Holy Spirit through the human author. Thus, what scripture says, God says, and that is one thing the Qur’ān cannot do by virtue of its denial that the Holy Ghost exists in the realm of inspiration. Therefore, its authority is non-existent.

Finally, Christ declared on the cross, “It is finished”, and then in Jude 3 (some 500 years before the Qur’ān existed), it is written that this faith was once for all time delivered to the saints, including Arab saints. Since this too is a Divinely God breathed statement, it necessarily excludes all other “faiths” and above all, it disqualifies absolutely any other “scriptures” that come after it, i.e., Qur’ān, and The ‘Book of Mormon’ to name two. Anything that comes after the close of the New Testament and purports to be an “Inspired Revelation” is patently false. In fact, the best apology (or defence) of Christianity and the closing of the Jewish covenant you will ever read is found in Acts 2:14-40, which reads:

“But Peter, taking his stand with the eleven, raised his voice and declared to them, ‘Men of Judea, and all you who live in Jerusalem, let this be known to you, and give heed to my words. For these men are not drunk, as you suppose, for it is only the third hour of the day; but this is that spoken of by the prophet Joel,’ ‘And it shall be in the LAST DAYS’ God says, ‘that I will pour forth of My Spirit upon ALL MANKIND; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; even upon My bond slaves, both men and women, I will in those days pour forth of MY SPIRIT and they shall prophesy. And I will grant wonders in the sky above, and signs on the earth beneath, blood and fire and vapour of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before the great and glorious day of the Lord shall come. And it shall be, that everyone who calls on the name of the Lord shall be saved.’

'Men of Israel, listen to these words. Jesus the Nazarene, a man attested to you by God with miracles and wonders and signs which God performed through Him in your midst, just as you yourselves KNOW – this Man, delivered up by THE PREDETERMINED PLAN AND FOREKNOWLEDGE OF GOD, YOU NAILED TO A CROSS BY THE HANDS OF GODLESS MEN AND PUT HIM TO DEATH. AND GOD RAISED HIM UP AGAIN, PUTTING AN END TO THE AGONY OF DEATH, SINCE IT WAS IMPOSSIBLE FOR HIM TO BE HELD IN ITS POWER.

For David says of Him, 'I was always beholding the Lord in my presence, for He is at my right hand, that I may not be shaken. Therefore my heart was glad and my tongue exalted; moreover my flesh also will abide in hope because thou wilt not abandon my soul to Hades, nor allow Thy Holy one to undergo decay. Thou hast made known to me the ways of life; thou wilt make me full of gladness with Thy presence.' 'Brethren I may confidently say to you regarding the patriarch David that he both died and was buried, and his tomb is with us to this day. And so, because he was a prophet, and knew that God HAD SWORN WITH AN OATH TO SEAT ONE OF HIS DESCENDANTS UPON HIS THRONE, HE LOOKED AHEAD AND SPOKE OF THE RESURRECTION OF THE CHRIST, THAT HE WAS NEITHER ABANDONED IN HADES, NOR DID HE FLESH SUFFER DECAY.

THIS JESUS GOD RAISED UP AGAIN, TO WHICH WE ARE ALL WITNESSES.

Therefore having been exalted to the right hand of God, and having received from the Father the PROMISE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, HE HAS Poured FORTH THIS WHAT YOU BOTH SEE AND HEAR.

For it was not David who ascended into heaven, but he himself says, 'the Lord said to My Lord,' "sit at My right hand, until I make Thine enemies a footstool for thy feet.

Therefore let all the house of Israel know for certain that God has made Him BOTH LORD AND CHRIST - THIS JESUS WHOM YOU CRUCIFIED."

Now when they heard this, they were pierced to the heart, and said to Peter and the rest of the apostles, 'Brethren, what shall we do?' And Peter said to them, 'Repent and be baptized, every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ and you shall receive the GIFT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, for the promise is for you and your children, and for all who are far off, as many as the Lord our God shall call to Himself. And with many other words he solemnly testified and kept on exhorting them saying, 'Be saved from this perverse generation."

This apology stands to this day. Islam, in short, tries abrogating this defence by calling Peter a liar yet those people understood what he said and what they had done. They had CRUCIFIED CHRIST.

I submit to you that until Islam can come up with an apology that can abrogate scripture, an apology that makes the same sense that Peter does here, (other than what they do which is a simple denial with no attending evidence), then Islam is bereft, impoverished, false and Godless.

You see they deny Peter's apology, they deny Christ was crucified, they deny the internal evidence of scripture and they deny the verity of God Himself. The problem is, they offer nothing in place of these denials. They simply hark back to Judaism, yet even that is inferior to the original. They are truly of their father Ishmael, not sons of promise, but poor sons of a bondwoman. This is the sadness of it all. But sadder still, is that they cannot see it and "they search their 'scriptures', for in them they think they have eternal life, but those 'scriptures' do not bring them to Christ so they can have eternal life".

I never take comfort in this for there are 1.3 billion souls who are lost and in need of a saviour and my prayer is that some at least will awaken and seek out the truth before the last day dawns and their eternal night descends on them.

## Islam and Deuteronomy 18

When we look at some of the claims of Islam when placed with Bible teaching, we are left in no doubt that one of them is certainly not from God. This is simply because one flatly contradicts the other in almost every theologically based teaching. Logically, we are left with a situation in which one of these documents is true and one is false or, they are both false. This is so because both cannot be true.

Muḥammad claimed explicitly to be “The Seal of the Prophets,” i.e., the final spokesman from God to mankind.

Sūrah 33:40 states,

“Muḥammad is not the father of any of  
your men, but (he is)  
1. The Apostle of God and  
2. The SEAL OF THE PROPHETS...”

This means he completes the prophetic word from God to man and there can be no further addition. When a document is sealed or signed, it is complete. That is the meaning in this verse of the Qur’ān.

There is an old tradition (which may or may not be true), which is pertinent to this discussion. Legend has it that, having just captured Alexandria; a general asked Caliph Umar what to do with the books of the great library of Alexandria. Caliph Umar’s reply was this,

“If they are in agreement with the Qur’ān, they are unnecessary and may be destroyed; if they are not in agreement with the Qur’ān, they are dangerous and should certainly be destroyed.”

This reasoning is of course applied to the Bible in that it does not agree with the Qur’ān. Therefore it must certainly be destroyed - at least that should be the case by parity of reasoning!

However, after employing this type of reasoning we find in the Qur’ān, Sūrah 12:111 which says that the Qur’ān is a,

“CONFIRMATION OF PREVIOUS SCRIPTURE.”

Also in Sūrah 46:9, Muḥammad explicitly says that he is,

“NO BRINGER OF A NEW-FANGLED DOCTRINE.”

If this is really true, then by the above reasoning, the Qur’ān is unnecessary and may thus be destroyed!

If, on the other hand the Qur’ān should not be destroyed, then the claim that it confirms previous scripture cannot be true. And, one cannot go on to say (as Muslims do) that the Qur’ān “corrects previous scripture.” For if that were true, it means there is not a confirmation at all. Thus, the Bible ought to be destroyed, as it is not in agreement with the Qur’ān. The Qur’ān however,

owes its very survival to the Bible. If one destroys the Bible, the Qur'ān would never stand on its own.

The problem becomes clear when one sees that in fact, the Qur'ān does not confirm or agree with the Bible at all. Therefore, one or the other of these documents is indeed dangerous and should be destroyed. In that much we agree with Caliph Umar!

If we go back to creation, in the Qur'ānic account we find that although it resembles the Biblical account in some ways, in essence, it is very different. In Sūrah 15:29, Adam's creation is spoken of in this way: That God created Adam from clay and breathed His spirit into him. Then, if we read Sūrah 96:2, we find that man is created out of a clot of congealed blood. Finally, in Sūrah 25:54, we find that it was He who created man from water. In and of itself, this may not mean anything other than man is made from all three elements so we need not get into an argument over which it was. I do know there is no problem with the three elements.

The real deviation comes however in passages such as Sūrah 2:30-32, which says:

“And when the Lord said unto the angels,  
‘Verily I am about to place a vice-regent  
[Kalifah] on earth.’ They [the angels] said,  
‘Wilt thou place therein one who will bring  
corruption therein and will shed blood,  
while we, we hymn Thy praise and sanctify  
Thee?’ He said, ‘Surely I know that which  
ye know not.’ And he taught Adam all the  
names, then showed the angels saying,  
‘Inform me of the names of these if ye  
are truthful.’ They said, ‘Be glorified  
we have no knowledge save that which you  
have taught us!’”

The angels were then commanded by God to prostrate themselves before Adam. They all did so except Iblis [Satan]. He refused because of his pride. He considered that because his nature was made of fire and Adam's was made of clay, he did not need to prostrate himself before Adam.

Adam and his wife were then placed in paradise and God allowed them to eat of all the fruits except that of the forbidden tree (which Muslims believe was wheat), but Satan caused them to deflect from the command and the fall of man ensued.

On the face of this account we may not be too worried about it, but this account turns things on their head. In fact, it denies Biblical teaching and raises serious implications regarding the inspiration of the Qur'ān itself.

Let us consider some things about the Qur'ānic account of creation.

[1] In this view, Adam, the prototype or representative of the human race is by implication, SUPERIOR TO THE ANGELS in at least three ways:

- (a) By virtue of his knowledge of the names of all things.
- (b) By being the reflection of all the divine names and qualities.

- (c) By the fact that God commanded the angels to prostrate themselves (i.e., worship) before Adam.

[2] This means that in fact, the Qur'ānic account does not confirm the Biblical account of man in this sense at all. The Bible explicitly says that Adam [Man] was created a little LOWER THAN THE ANGELS (Psalm 8:5, and Hebrews 2:7,9 – Even Christ was less than or lower than angels). The word used is ἐλάττω (elattoō), to make less or inferior in dignity. Literally it means to 'be made less.' In Hebrews 2:7 it is used in the 'active voice' of man – "you made him". The active voice is used when the subject of the verb is spoken of as acting or doing something - God made man less in dignity or inferior to the angels. In Hebrews 2:9, when speaking of Christ, it is used in the passive voice. This voice is used when its subject is spoken of as suffering or being acted upon - "Jesus was made" or suffered the lesser dignity of being less than the angels.

Now this impacts directly on the authority of Qur'ānic inspiration in a major way. In fact, if the Qur'ānic account is indeed true, it must necessarily, (in my view), refute the claim of Muḥammad as to how he got the inspiration of the Qur'ān. I say this for the following reasons. Consider:

- (1) If indeed the angels were commanded to bow down to Adam, which implies Adam's superiority to them, then the Qur'ān was authorized by an inferior being to man regarding its proof of inspiration through the medium of Gabriel.
- (2) Since the medium of inspiration is inferior to man, it follows that it is therefore an inferior revelation to the Bible, which claims its revelation through the Holy Spirit, which is Deity, thus above both angels and man. This applies in both Old and New Testaments, cf. 2 Samuel 23:2, where the Patriarch David says:

"The Spirit of the Lord spoke by me and  
His word was on my tongue."

2 Timothy 3:16,

"All Scripture is inspired by God...."

2 Peter 1:21,

"...Holy men of God spoke as they were moved  
by the Holy Spirit."

- (3) Further, the Holy Spirit stated that the New Testament was the full and FINAL revelation to mankind (Jude 3).
- (4) Paul in Galatians 1:8-9 states that if an angel from heaven spoke a teaching different or beside what was received by him then that angel was to be cursed eternally. The word is παρα' (para), which means among other things, a violation, beyond or amiss, aside from in composition – the gospel of Christ – if an angel teaches anything in violation of, besides, or amiss from that teaching – let that angel be anathema – eternally cursed.

- 
- (5) All the above does not mean that God could not use an angel – as he has done, but the Biblical account places angels above men not below them as the Qur’ān implies in its creation account. That however, makes the point very clearly that; any angel who violates by changing God’s express teaching is cursed eternally by God Himself!
  - (6) This then puts the Qur’ānic inspiration in jeopardy on at least two counts:
    - (a) It was given by a being inferior to man (Sūrah 2:30-32).
    - (b) Since it abrogates and changes (violates) God’s express teaching, then it is, according to God, an accursed inspiration.
  - (7) If an angel is used by God (as in Revelation) then that angel is not cursed unless he deviates from God’s teachings. In the book of Revelation which Jesus signified by His “Angel.” You will not find any changes to the revealed word in the other 26 books of the New Testament. Thus, the test of truth in inspiration is laid down very clearly.

To use the Islamic tradition it is this:

If an angel teaches the same gospel as is written in the New Testament then it is unnecessary as that angel confirms what we already know. If, on the other hand, that angel teaches something different to the gospel as it is written in the New Testament then that angel is dangerous and should not be heeded. God in fact will destroy that angel in hell.

Another point of the Qur’ānic account of creation is this - the Qur’ān mentions Adam’s wife but does not name her. It seems that in order to rectify this omission the Hadith (tradition) sources confirm that her name was Eve [Hawwâ’]

The Muslims then claim that Islam is the final religion of the cycle of revelations and by implication therefore supplants all others including Judaism and Christianity, which are “sisters” to Islam. Thus, the Qur’ān is said to “complete the message of previous sacred texts without in any way denigrating their significance.” That is what they say, but it is clearly evident that this is not the case at all. Even their own account of creation makes their claim of truth by inspiration very tenuous, even suspect, as God is presented as using a medium inferior to man himself, given the angels were commanded to prostrate themselves to Adam. By that very command, this implies without doubt, that Adam was considered to be a superior being. Thus we seem to have the case that an inferior being is giving a superior being a revelation of truth. This, I submit, strengthens the Bible’s case immensely since it claims explicitly that Deity, in the form of the Holy Spirit, eminently superior to both angel and man, inspired its teachings in which there are no logical contradictions whatsoever. How can we explain that without repudiating the Qur’ānic claim of divine, superior revelation than that of the Bible?

In Hebrews 7:22, we are told that Jesus is a surety of a better covenant. Κρείττονος (Kreittonos) i.e., it is more advantageous than the old covenant, more excellent than the Jewish covenant made with Moses. This presents a real problem to Islam simply because it lapses back into an inferior covenant as it is more Mosaic than the more excellent one Jesus instituted. Perhaps this follows from inferior inspiration as we cited above! I suspect however, that it is because they totally ignore or misunderstand certain Biblical

---

passages. We have a glaring example of this from Deuteronomy 18:15-18, where Moses speaks, saying,

“The Lord your God will raise up a prophet like me from among your brothers, you shall listen to Him. This is according to all that you asked of the Lord your God in Horeb on the day of assembly, Saying, ‘Let me not hear again the voice of the Lord my God, let me not see this great fire any more, lest I die.’ And the Lord said to me, ‘they have spoken well. I will raise up a prophet from among their brothers like you, and I will put my words in His mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command Him. And it shall come about that whoever will not listen to My words, which He shall speak in my name, I Myself will require it of him.’”

This passage of scripture goes two ways - backwards to give its context, and forward to its fulfillment. In context Moses is speaking of the time when Israel was assembled and receiving the Ten Commandments, Exodus 20:18-22 and Deuteronomy 5:23-27. The people were afraid and said to Moses:

“Speak to us yourself and we will listen but let not God speak to us lest we die.”  
(Exodus 20:19)

Also in Deuteronomy 5:27,

“Go near and hear all that the Lord our God says; then speak to us all that the Lord our God will speak to you and we will hear and do it.”

Then in Deuteronomy 5:28,

“And the Lord heard the voice of your words of this people, which they have spoken to you. They have done well in all that they have spoken.”

This is echoed in Deuteronomy 18:17,

“And the Lord said to me [Moses] they [those assembled at the mountain] have spoken well.”

We are left absolutely in no doubt about who those people were and what the occasion was that called forth the prophecy in Deuteronomy 18:18. The prophet that God raises up from among those people will be like Moses, which in context is a spokesman. This points

back to Exodus 20:19 and Deuteronomy 5:27 EXPLICITLY. Twice the people ask Moses to be the spokesman between themselves and God. Moses then, was the MEDIATOR of that covenant between God and the Jews of that day. Also in Deuteronomy 29:1, Moses states this,

“These are the words of the covenant which the Lord commanded Moses to make with the SONS OF ISRAEL (i.e., Jacob) in the land of Moab besides the covenant, which he made with them (sons of Israel) at Horeb.”

Then in Deuteronomy 5:1-5 we have it spelled out for us,

“Then Moses summonsed all Israel, and said to them ‘Hear O Israel, the statutes and ordinances which I am speaking to you in your hearing, that you may learn them and observe them carefully. The Lord God made a covenant WITH US at Horeb. The Lord DID NOT MAKE THIS COVENANT WITH OUR FATHERS BUT WITH US, WITH ALL THOSE OF US ALIVE HERE TODAY (literally with us ourselves).

The Lord spoke to you face to face at the mountain from the midst of the fire while I (Moses) was STANDING BETWEEN THE LORD AND YOU AT THAT TIME for you were afraid because of the fire and did not go up the mountain.”

Thus we have very explicit references as to the occasion, the spokesman and those to whom it was directed. This is sound exegesis by Moses himself in context and we can be left with no doubt as to what Deuteronomy 18:18 points back to.

Now, that verse also speaks of a future event, a prophet like Moses will be raised up as a spokesman, “I will put My words in His mouth.” In John 17:8, Christ says:

“For the words which thou gavest Me I have given to them.” [The Apostles]

Peter in John 6:68, posed a question around this doctrine,

“Lord [Jesus] to whom shall we go? YOU [JESUS] HAVE THE WORDS OF ETERNAL LIFE.”

Then in John 12:49, Jesus says,

“For I did not speak on My own initiative, but the Father [GOD] HIMSELF WHO SENT ME HAS GIVEN THE COMMANDMENT, WHAT TO SAY AND WHAT TO SPEAK.”

Then in John 12:50,

“AND I KNOW THAT HIS COMMANDMENT IS  
ETERNAL LIFE; therefore, THE THINGS I SPEAK,  
I SPEAK, JUST AS THE FATHER [GOD] HAS TOLD ME?”

Again it is very explicit. Jesus is God’s spokesman exactly like Moses was. He speaks exactly what God tells him to. He stands between God and mankind as Mediator.

We go now to Act 3:22-23, where Peter, speaking of Christ, explicitly tells us that it is Him who Moses spoke of in Deuteronomy 18:18. Also, in Stephen’s defence of Christ in Act 7:37, he alludes to Moses’ prophecy and says it was of Christ that Moses spoke (Acts 7:52). Again we are left in no doubt as to who this prophet (spokesman) was to be.

Muhammad (says Islam) was the real spokesman Moses alluded to. To legitimize this, they say of Deuteronomy 18.

- (1) He will be like Moses.
- (2) He will come from the brothers of the Israelites, that is the Ishmaelites (Isaac’s half brother).
- (3) God will put His words into this prophet’s (Muhammad’s) mouth.

They further say that Abraham had two sons, Ishmael and Isaac (Genesis 21). Ishmael (claims Islam) was the GRANDFATHER of the Arab nation, while Isaac was the GRANDFATHER of the Jewish nation. The prophet (says Islam) was not to come from the Jews themselves but from among their brothers, i.e., the Ishmaelites. Since Muhammad is a descendant of Ishmael then he is the prophet Moses spoke of, and, God put His words (the Qur’ān) into Muhammad’s mouth. Thus in Deuteronomy 18:19, “If anyone does not listen to Muhammad’s words, God will call that one to account.”

This is not exegesis. It is eisogesis and it is false. It is also cunning in the sense that it is implying that if one really believes the Bible on this point then he must also believe that this prophet is Muhammad.

If we only had Deuteronomy 18:18-19 then we could never know if the Qur’ān was the truth and Muhammad was not the prophet Moses spoke of, but as we have seen, this is just not the case at all.

Moses has already explicitly told us that God did not make this covenant (and promise) to the Jewish fathers or anyone else but the children of Israel (i.e., Jacob – Deuteronomy 5:1-5) who were all alive when it was made. Thus Jacob, as the “Father” of the Jews (according to Islam) had no part in this covenant, his children were the beneficiaries. Therefore, if the “Father” was not part of this covenant HOW IN THE WORLD COULD THE “GRANDFATHER” i.e., Isaac and the other “Grandfather” Ishmael be spoken of by Moses in the context of Deuteronomy 18? It is plainly impossible even by Islamic reasoning. If a covenant was not made with the father of a present generation, then it was not made with the grandfather either. It was made AFTER THEM, with Jacob’s children. Add to this the pains that Moses takes to explain this in context.

Now we alluded to the point that Christ was the Mediator of a better covenant (than that of Moses). Islam however says that Muhammad's covenant is like Moses', since Muhammad is more like Moses than Jesus is (and this is true). But don't they see that in claiming this they are going backwards from Christ's κρείττονος (more excellent covenant) into something Moses said ought not to be "you must heed the prophet (spokesman) who is to come i.e., Christ."

Again we can see that Islam is inferior. It has an inferior being bringing their inspiration (if they really believe their creation account). That inferior being has delivered an inferior covenant with inferior moral precepts (especially in the realm of marriage and divorce) built on inferior promises (than those Christ made). But what comes to the fore is this - there is just no way an angel of God, if he is a true one, could not know the true state historically of what Moses was saying both forward and backward in context. And, like it or not, Muslims have absolutely no grounds to substantiate their claim in this regard except by calling into question the veracity of God, Moses, Jesus and His Apostles. It is no proof at all to simply blame an ancient scribe and/or interpreter when external history also validates what Moses said in Deuteronomy 18:15-19, et al.

Well did the prophet Hosea say,

"My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge. Because you have rejected knowledge I also will reject you..."  
(Hosea 4:6)

Isaiah the prophet also,

"But they do not pay attention to the deeds of the Lord, nor do they consider the work of His hands. Therefore my people go into exile for their lack of knowledge."  
(Isaiah 5:12-13)

Which is why every person is exhorted to,

"Study diligently to present yourself approved of God as a workman who does not need to be ashamed, handling ACCURATELY the word of truth."  
(2 Timothy 2:15)

Muslims work on the premise that the canonical text of the Bible is corrupt – hence the Qur'ān was given to confirm that which is correct and correct that which is in error. Thus we have an absolutely pure in every sense revelation. However, what we really have is a document that confirms little and completely abrogates the major doctrines of both testaments. Their context is a pretext, which allows them to absorb some of what God teaches, but simply in order to develop a new body of religious OPINION. In that sense it is spiritually bereft and fatal, as is Christian denominational opinion – both deny the truth of God's word.

In fact the Qur'ān confirms nothing pertaining to salvation at all. At best it merely confirms faith in Allah and his apostle and there it ends. That is as "theological" as it gets.

We have seen what it does to try and substantiate their claims with just one prophecy of Moses. Yet it is that one deviation that is fatal to their theology. Consider this - by doing this, Islam has in one fell swoop, made the very first promise of God (given in the garden of Eden referring to redemption, reconciliation and salvation) of no effect at all. This is found in Genesis 3:15,

“And I will put enmity between you (Satan) and the woman (Eve) and between your seed and her seed. He shall bruise you on the head and you shall bruise him on the heel.”

This is made explicit in the book of Revelation 12:19, where we read,

“And the great dragon was thrown down the serpent of old who is called the devil and Satan...”

Then in Revelation 12:17,

“And the dragon was enraged with the woman and went off to make war with the rest of her offspring (seed) who,  
(a) Keep the commandments of God and  
(b) Hold to the testimony of Jesus.”

The last phrase is significant as it is those who do this who will be saved. This is underscored and emphasized a number of times in the book of Revelation:

John “bore witness to the word of God  
And to the testimony of Jesus Christ...”  
(Revelation 1:2)

“And when He (Christ) broke the fifth seal  
I (John) saw underneath the altar the souls  
of those who had been slain because of  
(a) The word of God  
(b) Because of the testimony (of Christ).”  
WHICH THEY HAD MAINTAINED  
(Revelation 6:9)

“Here is the perseverance of the saints  
who keep their faith in God and their  
faith in Jesus Christ.”  
(Revelation 14:12)

Then in Revelation 19:10, we have a powerful endorsement of this whole theme. Christ’s angel speaking to John delivers a message that makes it crystal clear. In fact we will look at Revelation 9:9-13,

“And he (the angel) said to me, write,  
Blessed are those who are invited to the  
marriage supper of the Lamb (Christ) and  
His Bride (the true church). And he said

to me, THESE ARE THE TRUE WORDS OF GOD.

And I fell at his (the angel's) feet to  
worship him. And he said to me. Do not  
do that, I am a fellow servant of yours  
and your brethren who

(A) HOLD THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS

(B) WORSHIP GOD FOR,

(C) THE TESTIMONY OF JESUS IS THE SPIRIT  
OF PROPHECY.

And I saw heaven opened and behold a  
white horse, and He who sat upon it is  
called Faithful and True and in righteousness  
He (Christ) judges and wages war.

And His eyes are a flame of fire  
(*cf.* Christ in revelation 1:12-18)....

And He (Christ) is clothed with a robe  
dipped in blood and His name is called  
THE WORD OF GOD." (*cf.* John 1:1)

All this is the culmination of the "seed promise" from which the Messiah (Christ) would be produced. The history of the Bible is very specific about the lineage of that promise. Satan tried so hard to destroy it and almost did it by the time of Noah and then in Rome by the vicious persecution of the church. The point is Satan could not destroy it! The Qur'ān tries to do so by changing the lineage from Isaac to Ishmael, even to the point of saying that Ishmael was the one Abraham was going to sacrifice, not Isaac. Surely this begins to unmask the "revelator" of the Qur'ān. It goes back to the oldest ploy Satan used - abrogate the seed promise and you get rid of Christ as Saviour. If you can do that you must come up with another one, then all bets are on because there is no promise left on which to know whom it might be.

That is what the Qur'ān does by twisting the prophecy of Moses to mean Muḥammad and not Christ. God did say that Ishmael's descendants would be a great nation, and they could be, as 1.3 billion follow Islam. Imagine the power they would have if they embraced the truth.

From the abrogation of that seed promise the Qur'an then goes on to abrogate the next important aspect of the salvation story.

Sūrah 22:37 states this,

"Neither their flesh (that of sacrificed animals)  
nor their blood will ever reach God.  
It is piety that will reach Him."

Again it sounds good, but look at the implications of this verse:

- (1) It is saying that blood sacrifices are of no use.
- (2) Piety (personal) is what reaches God, that is, works you do will save you.

Again this simply abrogates the entire sacrificial system of the Old Testament, and that of Christ in the New Testament. In Hebrews 9:12-15, it tells us explicitly that it was the blood that sealed both Covenants, the New Covenant was sealed with Christ's own blood. In Hebrews 9:14, we read,

“How much more (than the Old Testament sacrifices)  
will the blood of Christ, who through the  
ETERNAL SPIRIT offered Himself without  
blemish to God, cleanse your conscience  
from dead works to serve the living God?”

Christ tells us to drink the fruit of the vine in memory of that sacrifice, “This is the new covenant – in my blood.”

The Qur'ān simply abrogates this whole system. Therefore, the last covenant (Islam) is not sealed in any way other than by Muḥammad's say so (Sūrah 33:40), “Muḥammad is the Apostle of God and SEAL OF THE PROPHETS (The Qur'ānic covenant). This implies that God has “changed His mind” regarding the seed promise and the way He sealed both great Biblical covenants, as well as covenants made with Abraham, Noah, even back to Adam's day, which all had animal sacrifices (*cf.* Abel).

It is mandatory that if one believes a document then one should at the very least try to check out its truthfulness. Sadly, 1.3 billion Muslims have not done this in regard to the Qur'ān. It appears as though it is accepted “blindly”. No self respecting Bible student would do this. That is why we are to study and handle the word accurately as a result of that study. If Muslims did that they would find that there are, as we have seen, disagreements about matters of fact – some of them serious. Some examples are:

- (1) When Moses was taken out of the Nile we are told in Exodus 2:8-10, that Moses was brought up by Pharaoh's daughter. Yet, in Sūrah 28:8-9,

“The wife of Pharaoh said, (Here is) a joy  
of the eye, for me and for thee: slay him  
not. It may be that he will be of use to us,  
or we may adopt him as a son...”

- (2) In Exodus 2:16ff, Moses married Zipporah the daughter of Jethro. Yet in the Qur'ān, Sūrah 28:23-27, on this same incident, says that Moses married one of two daughters after eight years service.
- (3) Haman, who was the villain in the book of Esther, is the Vizier of Pharaoh in Sūrah 28:5 and Sūrah 40:36ff.
- (4) In Sūrah 12:19, the well in which Joseph was thrown had water in it yet in Genesis 37:24, we read,

“And they took him and threw him into the  
pit. NOW THE PIT WAS EMPTY, WITHOUT  
ANY WATER IN IT.”

- (5) In Sūrah 4:134, “God took Abraham as His friend” but compare that with Isaiah 41:8,

“But you Israel, My servant  
Jacob WHOM I HAVE CHOSEN  
 Descendant of Abraham My friend.”

- (6) In Sūrah 12:100, Joseph’s parents go to Egypt, but this could not be as in Genesis 35:19, Rachel was dead.
- (7) The most serious of all is found in Sūrah 4:156, which emphatically states that Jesus was not crucified.
- (8) Sūrah 112:1-4 states,

“Say He is God, the one and only,  
 God the eternal, absolute,  
HE BEGETTETH NOT, NOR IS HE BEGOTTEN  
 And there is none like Him.

John 3:16,

“...He gave His ONLY BEGOTTEN SON”

Hebrews 1:1-6, shows that God has spoken one last time through Jesus Christ, HIS BEGOTTEN SON...Then in Hebrews 1:6,

“LET ALL THE ANGELS OF GOD WORSHIP HIM.”

All these things show that Muḥammad and his ‘revelator’ are ignorant of the truth, history, and other matters of fact.

Ironically though, Hebrews 1:6, brings us to the beginning – the Qur’ānic account of creation where all the angels of God were to prostrate before Adam for it again gives the lie to Muḥammad’s revelation and again turns the account on its head. The angels (all of them) are commanded to worship Christ.

It is strange that almost every argument along those lines in the Qur’ān goes from the lesser to the greater only to be turned over in the Bible. It could be summed up like this: We are the created God is the creator. Worship does not, indeed cannot, come from the creator to the created. It always goes up from the created to the creator. In this sense only are angels and men equal – both worship their creator, that is why angels would never be commanded to worship a mere man who is inferior to an angel. But God puts it plainly “Let all the angels worship Him” – Christ – My only begotten Son. Why? Because He is superior to them all. He is Deity. Christ confirmed this many times. In Matthew 4:10, Christ said you shall worship God only (*cf.* Deuteronomy 6:13) yet after saying this – to Satan, He accepted worship, (John 20:25). How could this be if He were not Deity?

No, the Qur’ān and its author have so many flaws and amount to nothing but a denial of revealed truth by very spurious even naïve means.

## An Answer To The Muslims Regarding Pericyltos περικλυτος

Muslims claim categorically that the Comforter foretold by Christ in John's Gospel (14:16, 26; 15:26; and 16:7) refers exclusively to the prophet Muḥammad. True Christians on the other hand, claim just as categorically it refers exclusively to the Holy Spirit. The dispute centres on the Greek words παρακλετος (paraclētos), and περικλυτος (pericyltos). Muslims claim that the word paraclētos is a corrupt and incorrect translation, which was deliberately changed by Christians to uphold their position. Thus the battle lines have been drawn.

Muslims tell us that pericyltos is the correct translation of the Greek. However, at worst they offer no proof at all that this is the case, and at best offer very spurious and suspect arguments to "prove" their case.

Let us review some of their arguments.

Firstly, the Greek word 'pericyltos', according to Liddell and Scott, means "Noble", "glorious", "famous", "excellent." It also means, "praised." All of these appellatives have of course been given to Muḥammad.

Yusuf Ali, a respected scholar on the Qur'ān says this when explaining Sūrah 61:6, which reads,

"And remember Jesus, the Son of Mary said: 'O children of Israel, I am sending the Apostle of God (sent) to you, confirming the law (which came) before me, and giving glad tidings of an Apostle to come after me whose name shall be Aḥmad. But when he Mūḥammad) came to them (with clear signs, they said, 'This is evident sorcery.'"

Ali states this,

"Aḥmad or Muḥammad" the "praised one" is ALMOST A TRANSLATION OF THE GREEK WORD PERICYLTOS."

Now that is disreputable scholarship. Aḥmad either is, or it is not, a translation of pericyltos.

Ali goes on to say,

"In the present Gospel of John, in the English Version, the word 'comforter' is used for the Greek word paraclētos, which means, "advocate", "one called to the help of another", "a kind friend", rather than a comforter."

Here Ali gives only half of the story (a trait common among Muslim "scholars"). It is, to quote his words, "ALMOST A TRANSLATION." While it is true that paraclētos does mean these things, he leaves out the fact that the word, as Thayer tells us, also means "in its widest sense, a helper, a succorer (comforter)". It is in this wider context that John uses paraclētos, and context, not wishes or opinion determines what the word means.

Ali then goes on,

“Our (Muslim) Doctors [Scholars] contend that paraclētos is a corrupt reading for pericytos”. In the original saying of Jesus, there was a prophecy of the holy prophet Aḥmad by name.”

If this is not enough, Ali then goes on to try and have it both ways by saying,

“Even if we read paraclete, it would STILL APPLY TO THE HOLY PROPHET who is a “mercy to all creatures” (Qur’ān 21:107) and “Most kind and merciful to the (Muslim) believers” (Qur’ān 9:128).

To add to this subterfuge one S Abdullah Tariq, who states,

“The language spoken by Jesus was Syriac. Unfortunately there are no ancient manuscripts available in the world today to know what the exact word spoken was by Christ.”

This surely begs the question as to why he is bothering to argue at all as it now becomes mere speculation since, by his own admission, the exact word is unknown. Tariq goes on,

“Whatever the original word, it was translated into Greek, which has in turn been translated as comforter, counsellor, consolator, advocate, et al.”

Again, since the exact word is unknown he can never know that these translations are in fact wrong. Tariq continues,

“What was the Greek word in the earliest Greek translations can also not be known as the oldest available Greek translation today is from the 4<sup>th</sup> Century A.D”.

Now it is worse, we don’t know the word in either Syriac or Greek. But he ploughs on,

“The present Greek Canon records it as paraclētos.”

Again, how can he KNOW? This is not correct given this line of argument! Then he goes on and says,

“Muslim scholars believe that **IT WOULD HAVE BEEN PERICLYTOS IN THE EARLIER GREEK TRANSLATIONS.**”

(Even though this is totally unknown to him or the Muslim scholars who state this). Tariq then goes on to say,

“Pericytos may be translated as “Aḥmad”, while paraclētos has been translated “comforter” among other words. (Here we see the agenda being made explicit).

But notice the progression. Pericytos (‘praised’, ‘noble’ etc), becomes Aḥmad, which then becomes Muḥammad - all from a word that “could have been” or could be “almost translated”, but is unknown in Syriac or Greek. Tariq continues in this vein,

“The language of Palestine remained Syriac up to well after the 9<sup>th</sup> Century when Hebrew replaced it.”

Notice how when you argue illogically you will be exposed. Tariq has said previously that there were no ancient manuscripts from the First Century to know what the word was. Yet 900 years later, the Syriac language is still being spoken in Palestine – Christ’s homeland. Further, the Greek translations go back to 500 years previous and translate the word as *paracletos* which Muslim scholars say is corrupted from *pericytos*.

Now let us go a bit further and look at the problem of corrupted words. Tariq goes on to say,

“The famous [unnamed] Muslim historian of that 9<sup>th</sup> century in his famous work “Seera” (the life of Muḥammad) has mentioned quoting Ibn-e-Ishaq, the Syriac word of the 8<sup>th</sup> Century versions of the New Testament. The word he writes is *Munḥamanna*, which means Aḥmad in Arabic and may be translated *pericytos* in Greek (the unknown word).

This record PROVES that the original, translated in earlier times, would have been *pericytos*, meaning Aḥmad in Arabic instead of *paraclete*.

Now this is a huge leap, is it not? Absolute proof of a word that was unknown in the First century, a word which they say we have no manuscript for in the Syriac language; a language still spoken 900 years later. Why did they not ask then what the word was? And that word had been translated *paracletos* 400 years earlier in the Greek.

We need to also point out here that *Koinē* or common Greek was the language employed in Christ’s day. It was in fact, the language that even dominated Latin. All this aside, it is my belief that these Muslim “scholars” have in fact, perhaps even unwittingly, left us a clue by which we can get to the truth of the matter.

It would appear that the ‘corruption’ is not in this word *paracletos* or *comforter* at all, but it is to be found in the Arabic word *Munḥamanna* which is said to mean Aḥmad in Arabic and hence *pericytos* in Greek. (Remember *Munḥamanna* is this unknown word).

Consider this - *paracletos* or *comforter* in the Greek used in John’s gospel, corresponds to a Hebrew word *Menahem*. This was the name given by the Hebrews to the Messiah. That word *Menahem* means *comforter*, and *counsellor*. Thus the Messiah (in Greek *Christos* or *Christ*) is both the *consolation* and *counsellor*. Compare this with Isaiah 9:6, where the prophet, referring to Christ calls Him among other things “*counsellor*”.

Now going further, Jesus promised His apostles He would send them “Another *comforter*” after He left them in John 14:16. Now we have already seen that the sense in which *παρακλητος* is used here means *comforter*. What is significant however is the fact that Jesus says in this verse, “I will send you (apostles) ANOTHER COMFORTER, but this one is *αλλος* (*allos*). [Another of the same kind as Me]. That is, the Holy Spirit, who would counsel the apostles by guiding them into “All” truth, and also to comfort them with the fact that Jesus was the *Menahem* (Messiah) as He said He was, and that He had indeed taught them the truth. It was this witness that enabled the apostles to God and give their lives in service to God and the Gospel.

Also we must consider this fact concerning the prophecy of Christ. If Christ really did mean that the prophet Muḥammad was the object of this prophecy, then in the context of the whole discussion, Muḥammad would have had to appear **DURING THE LIFETIME OF THE APOSTLES**. This is another fact conveniently left out by Muslim “scholars”.

Christ very deliberately and very specifically words His prophecy this way. He was to send the comforter to them (apostles), John 14:16,

“He (God) shall give you (apostles) another comforter...”

If Muslims are right, then Jesus is telling His apostles, “I am telling you that God shall give you Aḥmad.” or, in John 14:26, “...the comforter (Aḥmad)...will teach you (apostles of Christ) all things, and bring to your (apostles of Christ) attention or remembrance. Everything Christ taught His apostles. He (Aḥmad) will guide you (apostles of Christ) into all truth.

The question now is, ‘did Muḥammad fulfil these terms? The answer is no. He was born 600 years later, and in fact, DENIED WHAT JESUS TAUGHT (compare Matthew 19:1-9 with Qur’ān Sūrah 33). From this alone we can see how dishonest these so called Muslim “scholars” really are.

It would be better if these scholars turned their minds to another Greek word παραβασις (parabasis) which among other things, means a disregarding, violation, or prevaricating, or, in its absolute sense, “a breach of a definite promulgated, ratified law.”

In the case in point, two laws have been broken:

- (1) The law of Christ as written in the New Testament.
- (2) The law of sound scriptural exegesis.

The breaking of these two laws guarantees their perpetrators a place in hell as God does hold all accountable to these two laws. An example of the word “parabasis” is found in Hebrews 2:2-4,

“For if the word spoken by angels was steadfast and every parabasis - [transgression] and parakoē (disobedience) received a just recompense, How shall we escape if we neglect so great a salvation; which at first began to be spoken by the Lord (Christ) and was confirmed to us (Christians) by them that heard Him (Apostles). God also bearing them (Apostles) witness with signs and miracles and gifts of the Holy Spirit (the paraclete) according to His (God’s) own will.”

So, do not be fooled by Muslim “scholarship” as, at least in this case, it is devoid of logical reasoning. It misquotes scripture, it is prepared to lie to ‘prove’ its theology, and it equivocates using red herrings instead of true facts.

As true Christians we must never let the duplicity of the Muslims or the selling out of the truth by Christendom in general, as witnessed by the Catholics, Protestant denominations, and Charismatics, shake our faith in the Bible. As true Christians of the New Testament church we need to study Muslim teachings so we can “give an answer” to this 1.3 billion strong apostate faith marching into hell. They post a serious threat to

the truth and therefore the church of the Lord by their heresy and we must answer the call to “arms” and expose it for what it is.

### **The Status of Women in Islam**

According to an article by Hamuda Abdul Ati (PhD), the status of women in Islam constitutes “no problem”. The attitudes of the Qur’ān and early Muslims attest to the fact that woman is “at least as vital to life as man himself.” He goes on to say, “The status of women in Islam is something unique, something novel, something that has no similarity in any other system”.

Islam does not blame Eve alone for the first sin. The Qur’ān makes it clear that both Adam and Eve were tempted. They both sinned and were responsible for their own sin. “There was no original sin” as men and women are each responsible for their own sins before God. Both Adam and Eve repented of their sin and were pardoned. The Qur’ān gives the impression that Adam, in fact, was more to blame than Eve for that first sin, from which (it is claimed) emerged prejudice against women and suspicion of their deeds. However, Islam (Ati claims), “does not justify such prejudice or suspicion”, because both Adam and Eve were equally in error and if we are to blame Eve then we should blame Adam as much – or even more.

From this we are shown that in sin and error at least, men and women are to be considered as equals. As Christians there is a partial agreement to this argument - that being both sinned and sin has equal consequences for both. However, in the garden itself, we are told in 1 Timothy 2:14 that,

“Adam was not deceived, but,  
Eve being deceived was in the transgression.”

The words used in describing Eve are *εξαπατηθεισα εν παραβασει* (*exapatetheisa en parabasei*) - “being deceived in transgression.” The ‘ex’ in front of the verb strengthens it above its simple form, showing in fact, Eve was “completely deceived”. This word is used also in Romans 7:11; 16:18; 1 Corinthians 3:18; 2 Corinthians 1:3 (again applying to Eve) and 2 Thessalonians 2:3. Even then is considered to be the one deceived and Adam was not.

Adam’s sin consisted of “Listening to Eve’s voice” and then eating the fruit (Genesis 3:17). Both ate the forbidden fruit, which was the sin, but both came to it differently. Eve was completely deceived by Satan, while Adam listened to Eve and instead of rebuking her, he gave in and ate. Thus, both are responsible for their own sin but Eve and only Eve is said to be the one who was deceived. Both though, were told of the consequences of their actions.

We also agree with Muslim theology on the doctrine of original sin. This is a false doctrine of Catholic origin we are not responsible for or because of Adam and Eve’s actions. We are solely responsible for our own sins. However, it is for those sins alone that we answer to God.

Ati goes on to say,

“What Islam has established for woman is that which suits her nature, gives her full security, and protects her against disgraceful circumstances and uncertain channels of life.”

Thus woman are recognised in Islam as:

- (1) A full and equal partner of man in the procreation of humankind. Her role is no less vital than his. She has an equal share in every respect. To this equal partnership in reproduction the Qur’ān says,

“O mankind! We created you from a single (pair) of a male and a female, And made you into nations and tribes, that ye may know each other (not that ye may despise each other). Verily the most honoured of you in the sight of God is (he who is) the most righteous of you. And God has full knowledge and is well acquainted (with all things). (Sūrah 49:13)

- (2) She is equal to man in bearing personal and common responsibilities and in receiving rewards for her deeds. She is acknowledged as an independent personality, in possession of human qualities and worthy of spiritual aspirations. Her human nature is neither inferior to, nor deviant from that of man. Both are members of one another. The Qur’ān says,

“And their Lord has accepted (their prayers) and answered them (saying), ‘Never will I cause to be lost the work of any of you, be he male or female; you are members, one of another.’ ” (Sūrah 3:195; cf. Sūrah 9:71; 33:35-36; 66:19-21).

- (3) She is equal to man in the pursuit of education and knowledge. Muḥammad declared (according to Ati) that the pursuit of knowledge was incumbent on every Muslim, male or female.

- (4) She is entitled to freedom of expression as much as a man is. Her sound opinions are to be taken into consideration and **CANNOT BE DISREGARDED BECAUSE SHE IS A FEMALE**. In Sūrah 58:1-4, we read,

“God has indeed heard (and accepted) the statement of the woman who pleads with thee concerning her husband, And carries her complaint (in prayer) to God. And God (always) hears the arguments between both sides among you: for God sees and hears (all things). If any men among you divorce their wives by Zihar (calling them mothers), they cannot be their mothers: None can be their mothers except those who gave them birth. And in fact they use words (both) iniquitous and false: but truly God is one that blots out (sins) and forgives

(again and again).

But those who divorce their wives by Zihar then wish to go back on the words they uttered, - (it is ordained that such a one) should free a slave before they touch each other. This are ye admonished to perform: and God is well acquainted with (all) that ye do.

And if any has not (the where withal) He should fast for two months consecutively before they touch each other. But if he is unable to do so, he should feed sixty indigent ones. This that ye may show your faith in God and His apostle. Those are limits (set by) God. For those who reject (Him) there is a grievous penalty”.

Then in Sūrah 58:5,

“Those who resist God and His apostle will be humbled to dust as were those before them: for we have already sent down clear signs. And the unbelievers (will have) a humiliating penalty.”

Then we read in Surah 60:10-12,

“O ye who believe! When there come to you believing women refugees. Examine and (test) them. God knows best as to their faith: if you ascertain that they are believers then send them not back to the unbelievers. They are not lawful (wives) for the unbelievers nor are the (unbelievers) lawful (husbands) for them. But pay the unbelievers what they have spent (on their dower). And there will be no blame on you if you marry them on payment of their dower to them. But hold not the guardianship of unbelieving women: ask for what ye have spent (on the dowers of women who come over to you). Such is the command of God. He judges (with justice) between you, and God is full of knowledge and wisdom.

And if any of your wives desert you to the unbelievers and ye have an accession (by the coming over of a woman from the other side) then pay to those whose wives have deserted the equivalent of what they had spent (on their dower), and fear God in whom you believe.

O prophet! When believing women come to you to take the oath of fealty to Thee, they will not associate in worship any other thing whatever with

God, and that they will not steal, that they will not commit adultery (or fornication) that they will not kill their children, that they will not utter slander, intentionally forging falsehood and that they will not disobey thee (Muhammad) in any just matter. Then do thou receive their fealty, and pray to God for the forgiveness (of their) sins: For God is oft forgiving and most merciful.”

Yusuf Ali says of 58:1-4,

“This is the second of the ten Medina Sūrahs. Its subject matter is the acceptance of a woman’s plea on behalf of herself and her children, and a condemnation of all secret counsels and intrigues in the Muslim brotherhood.”

The immediate occasion is what happened to Khaula bint Tha’laba, wife of Aus, son of Samit. Though in Islam he divorced her by an old pagan custom - the formula known as Zihar, consisting of the words “Thou art to me as the back of my mother”. This was held by pagan custom to imply divorce and freed the husband from any responsibility for conjugal duties but did not leave his wife free to leave the husband’s home or to contract a second marriage. Such a custom was in any case degrading to a woman. And it was particularly hard on Khaula, for she loved her husband and pleaded that she had little children whom she had no resources herself to support and whom under Zihar her husband, was not bound to support. She urged her plea to the prophet and in prayer to God. Her just plea was accepted, and this iniquitous custom, based on false words was abolished.

God then is a just God and will not allow human customs or pretence to trample on the just rights of His weakest creatures (women). Were it not that God, in His mercy, makes allowances for our weaknesses and the various grades of motives that actuate us, such conduct would be inexpiable. But he prescribes expiation, Sūrah 58:3-4, because He wishes to blot out what is wrong and give us a chance to reform by His forgiveness.

If Zohar were to be ignored as if the words were never uttered, it would mean that men might foolishly resort to it without penalty. It is therefore recognized in respect of the penalty which the man incurs, but safeguards the woman’s rights. She can sue for maintenance for herself and her children, but her husband could not claim his conjugal rights until after the performance of his penalty as set out. If she loved him, as in Khaula’s case, she could also herself sue for conjugal rights in the legal sense of the term and compel her husband to perform the penalty and resume marital relations. The penalty is to get a slave his freedom, whether it is your own slave or you purchase his freedom from another. If that is not possible you fast for two months in the matter of Ramadhan. If that is not possible, you feed sixty people who are poor.

In Surah 60, Ali says,

“Even with unbelievers unless they are rampant and out to destroy us and our faith, we should deal kindly and equitably, as is shown by our holy prophet’s own example.”

Under the treaty of Hudaibiya, (Feb, 628) which stipulates:

- (1) That there was to be peace between the pagans of Mecca and Muḥammad for 10 years.
- (2) That any tribe or person was free to join either party or make an alliance with it.
- (3) That if a Quraish person from Mecca, under guardianship, should join the prophet without the guardians' permission, he (or she) should be sent back to the guardian. However, in the contrary case, they should not be sent back.
- (4) That the prophet and his party were not to enter Mecca that year but they could enter unarmed next year.

From condition (3) women under guardianship (including married women), who fled from the Quraish in Mecca to Muḥammad's protection in Medina were to be sent back. But before this Ayat was issued, the Quraish had already broken the treaty and some instruction was necessary as to what the Medina Muslims should do in those circumstances. Muslim women married to pagan husbands in Mecca were oppressed for their faith and some of them came to Medina as refugees. After this, they were not to be returned to the custody of their pagan husbands at Mecca, as the marriage of believing women with non-Muslims was held to be dissolved if the husbands did not accept Islam. But in order to give no suspicion to the pagans that they were badly treated as they lost the dower they had given on marriage, that dower was to be repaid to the husbands. Thus helpless women refugees were to be protected at the cost of the Muslims.

The condition was that they were to be Muslim women. How were the Muslims to know? The true state of her heart and mind would be known to God alone. But if the Muslims, on an examination of the woman, found that she professed Islam, she was to have protection. The examination would be directed (among other things) to the points mentioned in Sūrah 60:12.

As the marriage was held to be dissolved, there was no bar to the remarriage of the refugee Muslim women with a Muslim man on the payment of the usual dower to her.

Unbelieving women in a Muslim society would only be a clog and a handicap. There would be no happiness for them, nor could they conduce in any way to the healthy life of the society in which they lived as aliens. They were to be sent away, as their marriage was held to be dissolved; and the dower paid to them were to be demanded from the guardians to whom they went back, just as in the contrary case, the dowers of believing women were to be paid back to the pagan ex husbands.

In Surah 60:11,

“If any of your wives desert to the unbelievers.”

A very unlikely contingency (says Ali), considering how much better position the women occupied in Islam than under pagan custom. But all contingencies have to be provided for equitably in legislation. If a woman went over to the pagans, her dower would be recoverable from the pagans and payable to the deserted husband.

If the dowers were equal, the one would be set against the other as between the two communities. However, within the communities, the deserted individual would be compensated by the individual who gains a wife. If the dowers were unequal the balance would be recoverable and the adjustment would be between the individuals. In practice, the common fund compensated the deserted husband in anticipation of any necessary adjustments.

In Sūrah 60:12, come the directions as to the points on which women entering Islam should pledge themselves. Similar points apply to men, but here the question is about women and especially such as were likely in those early days of Islam to come from pagan societies into Muslim societies. A pledge on these points would search out their real motives:

- To worship none but the one true God  
(This denies Christian thought of the Godhead and Deity thus, a Christian woman would be considered pagan).
- Not to steal.
- Not to indulge in sex, before marriage and extra maritally.
- Not to kill their children.
- Not to indulge in slander or scandal.
- Not obey the law and principles of Islam.

The theme then, of this Surah is that, no Muslim should turn for friendship and intimacy to those who break God's laws and are outlaws in God's kingdom. This of course necessarily includes Christians in this ban as Christians among other things are considered to be "polytheists". This is the unforgivable sin in Islam. We are polytheists because we believe that Christ and the Holy Spirit are also Deity.

5. Islam grants women equal rights to contract, to enterprise, to earn and possess independently. Her life, her property, her honour are as sacred as those of a man. If she commits any offence, her penalty is no less or more than a man's of a similar case. If she is wronged or harmed, she gets due compensations equal to what a man in her position would get. (Qur'ān 2:178; 4:45, 92-93)

So we are being told that woman is equal to man in these respects. She is to be treated as an equal in Islam.

Someone once said that a hidden agenda is activism masquerading as altruism, and I get the distinct feeling that this is the case in this long convoluted explanation taking great pains to assure us that women in Islam are treated according to that which, "suits her nature and gives her full security". It is at great pains to tell us she is equal to a man in almost every area. But is this really the case?

Consider this - Hammuda Abdul-Ati says this,

"In some instances of bearing witness to certain civil contracts, two men are required or one man and two women." He hastens to add, "This is no indication of the woman being inferior to man. It is a measure of securing the rights of the contracting parties, because the woman as a role is not so experienced in practical life as a man. This lack of experience may cause a loss to any party in a given contract. So Islamic law requires that at least two women should bear witness with one man. If a woman of the witness forgets something the other one would remind her. Or if she makes an error, due to lack of experience the other would help to

correct her. This is a precautionary measure to guarantee honest transactions and proper dealings between people. In fact, it gives a woman a role to play in civil life and helps to establish justice. At any rate (he again states) lack of experience in civil life does not necessarily mean that women are inferior to men in their status”.

Again we are shown how altruistic this all is. It establishes justice, gives women a role in civil life, it helps her lack of experience in these and such matters and the other woman can help her remember what she forgets. All these appear noble at face value. They appear to raise women up from their pagan roots, but this is truly activism, dressed up, as altruism, and the prophet himself, in spite of all his words, did not really believe that this was so.

In the Hadith (the sayings of the prophet) we have a different view than the one Ati is at pains to give us:

Narrated by Abu Huraira,

“The prophet said, ‘were it not for Eve, no woman would ever betray her husband.’”  
(Bukhari 4:400; 56.22.611).

We were told that Islamic doctrine strongly refutes the notion of original sin. This hadith certainly raises the question of whether Eve’s sin has been passed on to women who betray their husbands. If not, then is it making Eve the scapegoat so that the sin or guilt of women is lessened?

In another Hadith, narrated by Abdullah bin Umar, it states,

“I heard the prophet saying, ‘An evil omen is in three things; the horse, the woman, and the house.’”  
(Bukhari 4:74; 52.47.110).

How would a woman feel if she knew she was thought of by the founder of Islam as an evil omen?

Yet another, narrated by Aisha, (Muḥammad’s wife) states,

“The things which annul the prayers were mentioned before me (by the prophet). Prayer is annulled by a dog, a donkey and a woman (if they pass in front of praying people). I said, ‘you have made us (women) dogs.’”  
(Bukhari 1:291; 9.13.490).

Aisha, the wife of the prophet, took great exception to being compared with dogs and donkeys, which are in themselves unclean in Islam and that is why they violate the sanctity of the prayer area. The prophet here is comparing a woman to unclean animals.

Now concerning the attesting of women and the explanation we have just been given of how it helps them, Muḥammad had a totally different idea of why two women and one man must bear witness.

Consider this hadith, narrated by Abu Al-Khudri,

“Once Allah’s apostle went out to the Musalla (to offer the prayer) of Al Fitr prayer. Then he passed by the women and said, ‘O women! give alms, as I have seen that the majority of the dwellers of hell fire were you (women)’. They asked, ‘Why is it so O Allah’s apostle?’ He replied, ‘you curse frequently and are ungrateful to your husbands. I have not seen any more deficient in intelligence and religion than you (women). A cautious sensible man could be led astray by some of you.’ The women asked, ‘O Allah’s apostle! What is deficient in our intelligence and religion?’ He said, “Is not the evidence of two women equal to the witness of one man?” They replied in the affirmative. He said, ‘This is the deficiency in your intelligence. Isn’t it true that a woman can neither pray nor fast during her menses?’ The women replied in the affirmative. He said, **THIS IS THE DEFICIENCY IN YOUR RELIGION.**”  
(Bukhari 1:181-82; 6-8-301).

Here Muḥammad is explaining why the majority of dwellers of hell are women. They are there because of their lack of intelligence, evidenced by the fact that their testimony in a court of law is only worth half that of a man. In religious matters they are deficient because they cannot pray or keep a fast during their monthly period. They are also declared worthy of hell because of their cursing and ingratitude to their husbands.

The question is - Is Muhammad saying that women are born stupid?

All this shows the duplicity of Muslims in this area. Muḥammad declares all this denigration of women on one hand, then says that paradise is under the feet of mothers.

Also it is said that Muslims who give their lives in the cause of Islam will in paradise, have houris, or dark eyed virgin wives, not the ones they left behind. Further, they will have multiple wives in heaven so it must be that the majority of heaven will be houris – these other women – better than their own wives. I am certain this cannot raise the esteem of Muslim women.

I will close this by putting side by side, Joseph Smith’s Mormon inspiration and Sūrah 33 of the Qur’ānic inspiration, both of which use, abuse and denigrate women to mere sexual playthings.

All of this is so far removed from the New Testament view of women. It is exactly what Christ came to ‘put right’ (Matthew 19:1-9)- to protect and raise women’s position where Smith and Muhammad want to go backwards. Both claim that God both approved of and commanded plural wives in the Old Testament. He did not. Moses commanded divorce because of their hard and obdurate hearts. God tolerated it for a while. He never approved of it. See Malachi 2:13-17.

Again we see the overt duplicity and misinformation the Muslims give to try and justify their position.

<b>Doctrine and Covenants 132 of Joseph Smith</b>	<b>Sūrah 33 of the Qur'ān of Muḥammad</b>
<p>1. Verily thus saith the Lord unto you my servant Joseph, that is as much as you have enquired of my hand to know and understand <u>wherein I, the Lord justified my servants Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, as also Moses, David and Solomon my servants, as touching the principle and doctrine of their having many wives and concubines.</u></p> <p>2. Behold, and lo, I am the Lord Thy God, and will answer you as touching this matter.</p> <p>3. Therefore prepare thy heart to receive and obey the instructions, which I am about to give you; for <u>all those who have this law revealed unto them, must obey the same.</u></p> <p>4. For behold, I reveal to you a new and an everlasting covenant. Then ye are damned; for no one can reject this covenant and be permitted to enter My glory.</p> <p>32. Go ye therefore and do the works of Abraham...</p> <p>38. David also received many wives and concubines, and also Solomon and Moses my servants, from the beginning of creation until this time; <u>in nothing did they sin save in those things, which they received not of me.</u></p> <p>39. David's wives and concubines were given unto him of me by the hand of Nathan my servant and others of the prophets who had the keys to this power; and in none of these things did he sin against me except in the case of Uriah and his wife. And, therefore he hath <u>fallen from his exaltation, and received his portion; and he shall not inherit them out of the world for I give them to another saith the Lord.</u></p> <p>* Compare this statement with verses 4a, and 23.</p> <p>49. ....<u>I seal upon you (Joseph Smith) your exaltation and prepare a throne for you in</u></p>	<p>38. There can be no difficulty to the prophet in what God has indicated to him as a duty. It was <u>a practice approved of God amongst those of old that have passed away. And the commandment of God is a decree determined.</u></p> <p><u>Sura 48:28-29:</u> It is He (God) who has sent His apostle with guidance and <u>the religion of truth, to proclaim it over all religion:</u> and enough is God for a witness. <u>Muhammad is the apostle of God.</u></p> <p>62. <u>Such was the practice approved of God aforetime. No change wilt Thou find in the practice approved of God.</u></p> <p>40. Muhammad is not the father of any of your men. But he is the Apostle of God. <u>and Seal of the Prophets,</u> and God has full knowledge of all things.</p>

the kingdom of my father, with Abraham your father.

23. But if you receive me in the world, then ye shall know me and shall receive your exaltation (seal).

40. I am the Lord Thy God, and I give unto Thee, my servant Joseph, an appointment and restore all things. Ask what ye will, and it will be given unto you according to My word.

41. As ye have asked concerning adultery, verily, verily I say unto you, if a man receiveth a wife in the new and everlasting covenant, and if she be with another man, and I have not appointed unto her by the Holy anointing, she has committed adultery and shall be destroyed.

42. If she be not in the new and everlasting covenant, and she be with another man, she has committed adultery.

45. For I have conferred on you the keys and powers of the priesthood, wherein I restore all things, and make known to you all things in due time.

51. Verily I say unto you, 'A commandment I give unto my handmaid Emma Smith your wife, whom I have given unto you. That she stay herself and partake not of that which I commanded you to offer unto her; for I did it saith the Lord to prove you all, as I did Abraham...

54. And I command mine handmaid Emma Smith to abide and cleave to My servant Joseph and to none else. But if she abide not in this commandment she shall be destroyed saith the Lord, for I am the Lord Thy God and will destroy her if she abide not in my law.

55. But if she will not abide this commandment, then shall my servant Joseph do all things for her even as he has said. And I will bless him and multiply him and give unto him an hundredfold in the

51. Thou mayest defer the conjugal rights of any of them that thou pleasest and there is no blame on thee if thou invite one whose turn thou has set aside. This were higher to the cooling of their eyes, the prevention of their grief, and their satisfaction. That of all of them with which thou hast to give them. And God knows all that is in your hearts, and God is all knowing and most forebearing.

30. O wives of the prophet, if any of you are guilty of evident unseemly conduct, the punishment would be doubled unto her.

53. ...Not is it right for you that you should annoy God's prophet, or that ye should marry his widows after him at any time. Truly such a thing is in God's sight an enormity.

36. It is not fitting for a believer, man or woman, when a matter has been decided by God and His apostle **to** have any option about their decision. If anyone disobeys God and His apostle, he is indeed on a clearly wrong path.

37. Behold Thou didst say to one who had received the grace of God and Thy favour, retain Thou in wedlock thy wife (of his adopted son Zaid) and fear God. But thou didst hide in thy heart, which God was ABOUT TO make manifest. Thou didst fear the people, but it is more fitting that thou shouldst fear God. Then when Zaid had dissolved his marriage with her with the necessary formality. We joined her in marriage to you in order that in future there may be no difficulty for the believers in the matter of marriage with the wives of their adopted sons, when the latter have divorced

world, of fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, wives and children, and crowns of eternal lives in the eternal worlds.

56. And again, verily, I say, let mine handmaid forgive my servant Joseph his trespasses; and then she shall be forgiven her trespasses, wherein she has trespassed against me, and I, the Lord Thy God, will bless her and multiply her and make her heart to rejoice.

60. Let no one therefore set on My servant Joseph, for I will justify him, for he shall do the sacrifice which I require at his hands for his transgressions saith the Lord your God.

61. And again, as pertaining to the law of the priesthood – if any man espouse a virgin, and desire to espouse another, and the first give her consent, and if he espouse the second and they are virgins, and have vowed to no other man, then he is justified. He cannot commit adultery for they are given unto him (by God) for he cannot commit adultery with that that belongeth to him and no one else.

62. And if he have ten virgins given unto him by this law (of God) he cannot commit adultery, for they belong to him, and they are given unto him. Therefore he is justified.

63. But, if one or other of the ten virgins, after she is espoused, shall be with another man, she has committed adultery, and shall be destroyed; for they are given (by God) to him (only).

them and God's command must be fulfilled.

50(b) If the prophet wishes to wed her; this is only for thee, and not for the believers at large; We know what we have appointed for them as to their wives and captives whom their right hand possesses – in order that there be no difficulty for thee. And God is oft forgiving and most merciful.

50(a) ...O prophet, we (God) have made lawful for thee thy wives to whom thou hast paid their dowers, and those whom thy right hand possesses out of the prisoners of war whom God has assigned to thee, and daughters of thy maternal uncles and aunts who migrated from Mecca with thee; and any believing woman who dedicates her soul.

(Muhammad was allowed 10 wives).

49. O ye who believe! When you marry believing women and then divorce them without touching them. No period of 'Iddat' ye have to count in respect of them. So give them a present and set them free in a handsome manner.