

**THE REPLY**

**Received on 18<sup>th</sup> June 2010**

**Replied on 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2010**

**REPLY TO:** Alan Profitt a Christian Missionary- George Whitfield College, Cape Town

Let us analyse the article sent to us by Alan Profitt a Christian Missionary. Christian Missionaries as understood to mean ‘those who corrupt the pure beliefs of the indigenous peoples of many countries with paganistic beliefs’.

There is a small piece of paper stating: “Title: Medearis, C 2008 Muslims, Christians + Jesus. Bethany USA.” However, the article is under the heading as ‘**THE HISTORY OF THE QUR’AN**’.

The foolish article begins by ignorantly stating:

“Muhammad was not (at least early in his career) building a religion to displace Judaism and Christianity. The vast majority of his teachings were along the same lines as the two other monotheistic religions. In fact, Muhammad viewed his teachings to be “more of the same,” simply directed to his Arab countrymen. For possibly six hundred years after the time of Christ, there were no Arabic translations of Jewish or Christian prophecies, teachings, or holy books. Still, it is known that felt an obligation to turn his countrymen away from idolatry and back to the ways of “the people of the book” (Christians and Jews). [Pages 67-68]

The ill-informed author wrote that: “Muhammad was not (at least early in his career) building a religion to displace Judaism and Christianity.” (Page 67) In the first place, the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allāh is pleased) never brought a ‘**religion**’! A ‘**religion**’ is understood by Christians to mean:

‘The belief in a superhuman controlling power, especially in a personal God or gods entitled to obedience and worship.’ [See The Concise Oxford Dictionary 1990].

This concept is called *Shirk* in Arabic, which means commonly making partners with Allâh! It is therefore that we regard the above evil claim to be insulting to the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allâh is pleased) and the Muslims at large! In fact this claim of the stupid Fool of an author brings out his madness of ignorance!!! He goes on and makes his foolishness clear:

‘The vast majority of his teachings were along the same lines as the two other monotheistic religions.’

How on earth could *man-made theories* called ‘*religion*’ be the same as that of the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân send by Allâh to human beings? Let us leave the Old Testament one side as our book called **“MY BIBLE SAYS THIS... MY BIBLE SAYS THAT...” STRIKES A DEATH BLOW TO IT!!!** Nevertheless, let us discuss the NEW Testament of the Christians which is the main source of their guidance. We will use another gem of ours that **DESTROYS CHRISTIANITY!!!** It is called: **“EVIDENCE OF THE COMPILATION OF THE BIBLE”**:

**“A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work; but it did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text. In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing reading in the Greek, and then the question of the text was usually not raised. A sufficiently laborious task remained in deciding between the rival claims of various which might properly affect the translation. When these were adjusted, our deviations from the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version had next to be indicated, in accordance with the fourth rule; but it proved inconvenient to record them in the margin. A better mode however of giving them publicity has been found, as the University Presses have undertaken to print them in connexion with complete Greek texts of the New Testament. In regard of the readings thus approved, it may be observed that fourth rule, by requiring that ‘the text to be adopted’ should be ‘that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating,’ was in effect an instruction to follow the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of**

**modern times, and therefore to employ the resources of criticism for estimating the value of evidence. Textual criticism, as applied to the Greek New Testament, forms a special study of much intricacy and difficulty, and even now leaves room for considerable variety of opinion among competent critics. Different schools of criticism have been represented among us, and have together contributed to the final result. In the early part of the work every various reading requiring consideration was discussed and *voted on by the Company*.<sup>1</sup>**

In simple English language, 1881 AD is the actual date of real Protestant Christianity, which makes it one of the most recent religions to have come into being in the world. At least, one can say that they gave themselves the right to vote for the contents of this new religion!!!

Firstly, to call Christianity one of the ‘...two other monotheistic religions’ is an insult to any truthful person that knows the truth! Since when can human beings ‘**VOTE**’ on what the words of the Creator shall be and then claim that such man-made words belong to a monotheistic way of life??? But more important to associate the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allāh is pleased) with such man-made concoctions is one of the greatest sins human beings can make!!! Ponder over the truth thus far; how could it ever have been possible for the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allāh is pleased) to have considered a man-made religion that only came into being during the **nineteenth century AD**, when he lived between the sixth and seventh centuries AD??? The important point to know and fully understand is the fact the no Bible in any form existed during the lifetime of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allāh is pleased) – even the Dead Sea Scrolls were not known to anyone until 1947 AD! However, any claim of a Hebrew Bible during the time of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allāh is pleased) cannot be true as the Hebrew language was created by the Greeks – even the name of the language called *Hebrew* is a Greek word!<sup>2</sup>

Coming to the next lie:

---

1 : ‘**Preface**’ of ‘**The NEW TESTAMENT of OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST TRANSLATED OUT OF THE GREEK: BEING THE VERSION SET FORTH A.D.1611 COMPARED WITH THE MOST ANCIENT AUTHORITIES AND REVISED A.D 1881**’ Page xii. Please note in our booklet the article appears on pages 6-8.

2 : Peake’s Commentary on the Bible. 1919, p. 34.

‘In fact, Muhammad viewed his teachings to be “more of the same,” simply directed to his Arab countrymen. For possibly six hundred years after the time of Christ, there were no Arabic translations of Jewish or Christian prophecies, teachings, or holy books. Still, it is known that Muhammad felt an obligation to turn his countrymen away from idolatry and back to the ways of “the people of the book” (Christians and Jews).’ [Pages 67-68]

It is totally wrong to even think that the fundamentals of Islâm could ever be near to Christianity or to the Old Testament which was in fact created by Jerome after he had made his version of the New Testament! Let us give some background:

The following is important information, because it tells us that Genesis derived its name from the Septuagint. According to Peake’s Commentary, referring to the Septuagint, the ‘translators were just as **ignorant** of the meaning as were the Massoretes who vocalised the Bible in the 8th-9th century A.D’ (See Peake’s Commentary on the Bible, 1962 edition, 49c, page 63 - hereafter the abbreviation Peake 1962 will be used). A very significant disclosure concerning the destruction of the Pentateuch is given in the New Bible Dictionary. This will clear all the uncertainty contained in the present non-divine reconstructed Pentateuch. The statement is made in the following words:

“The tradition expressed in 2 Esdras 14:21-22, that the scrolls of the Pentateuch, burned in Nebuchadrezzar’s siege of Jerusalem, were rewritten by Ezra, was apparently accepted by a number of the early church fathers, e.g. Irenaeus, Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome. They did not, however, reject the Mosaic authorship of the original law. The first recorded instance of such a rejection is the statement of John of Damascus concerning the Nasaraeans, a sect of Jewish Christians (PG 94. 688-689) [PG = J. P. Migne, Patrologia Graeca]. The Clementine Homilies teach that diabolical interpolations were made in the Pentateuch to try to put Adam, Noah and the Patriarchs in a bad light” [*Our emphases*].<sup>3</sup>

Irrespective of Protestants and Jewish plotting to find non-divine support for an illegal authorship for the Pentateuch, this will not change the fact that it is only an attempt to find

---

3 : New Bible Dictionary 1988, p. 904.

the author of the long lost Pentateuch. This fact could find support in the following quotation, which states:

“The exact origin of Genesis remains something of a mystery.”<sup>4</sup>

It would be a shame if the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allāh is pleased) would have taught anything coming from the Bible as it was constructed by evil men! One must understand that Jerome’s work lays the foundation of Judaism and Christianity. Here follows the truth:

### **THE VULGATE**

In the year 384 AD Damasus died, “and was succeeded by Siricius, who did not show much friendship for Jerome. He found it expedient to leave Rome, and set out for the East in 385.”<sup>5</sup> The journey took Jerome to Antioch:

“There he was joined by two wealthy Roman ladies, Paula, a widow, and Eustochium, her daughter, one of Jerome’s Hebrew students. They came accompanied by a band of Roman maidens who vowed to live a celibate life in a nunnery in Palestine. Accompanied by these ladies Jerome made the tour of Palestine...and was succeeded by Siricius, who did not show much friendship for Jerome. He found it expedient to leave Rome, and set out for the East in 385. His letters (especially Ep. 45) are full of outcries against his enemies and of indignant protestation that he had done nothing unbecoming a Christian...”<sup>6</sup>

Paula built four monasteries, of which three were for nuns and the fourth for monks:

“Jerome resided over the fourth monastery. Here he did most of his literary work and, throwing aside his unfinished plan for a translation from Origen’s Hexaplar text, translated the Old Testament directly from the Hebrew, with the aid of Jewish scholars. He mentions a rabbi from Lydda, a

---

4 : New Bible Dictionary 1988, p. 413.

5 : Encyclopaedia Britannica, fourteenth edition, 1929, Vol. 13, p. 2.

6 : *ibid.* Vol. 13, op. cit., p. 2.

rabbi from Tiberias, and above all Rabbi Ben Anina, who came to him by night secretly for fear of the Jews. Jerome makes the synagogue responsible for the accuracy of his version: “Let him who would challenge aught in this translation,” he states, “ask the Jews.” The result of all this labour was the Latin translation of the Scriptures, which afterwards became the Vulgate or authorised version; but the Vulgate as we have it now suffered a good deal from changes made under the influence of the older translations; the text became very corrupt during the middle ages, and in particular all the apocrypha, except Tobit and Judith, which Jerome translated from the Chaldee, were added from the older versions.”<sup>7</sup>

The Encyclopaedia Britannica clearly states:

“The text became very corrupt” [*Our emphasis*].

The first secret of Jerome and of the Jewish Rabbis that were caused by fear needs to be explained. How are we going to do this? If there were other Old Testaments, where are they today? Where is the copy from which they made the Vulgate? Or was the reason for the Rabbis to come secretly at night because they knew that Jerome and them were creating something new?

*The first Catholic Bible (Translated on instructions of Pope Damasus)*

Approximately 381 AD the Roman State succeeded in suppressing the Unitarian (under the leadership of Arius) beliefs, which at the time was the closest to the teachings of “Christ” Jesus. Two years later, approximately 383 AD not having destroyed the Unitarian beliefs completely, the state introduced a Bible, which would conform to its ideology. Pope Damasus who was the “Pontifex Maximus” for the state entrusted this task to St. Jerome. The following statement bears the information from which this inference is drawn:

“*The Vulgate* is the translation of the Bible into Latin by St. Jerome (340-420). About 383, at the request of Pope Damasus, he began revising the Old Latin version of the Gospels according to the Greek. He probably

---

7 : *ibid.* Vol. 2, op. cit., pp. 2-3.

revised the other books of the New Testament at the same time. Beginning about 387 in Bethlehem, he revised the Latin version of the **protocanonical books**... of the Old Testament according to the Greek in the Hexapla of Origen. About 390 Jerome began a new Latin translation of the whole Old Testament (except five **deuterocanonical books**) from **the original Hebrew**. The Vulgate is made up largely of Jerome's work in these three revisions and versions. Thus in the Vulgate, the New Testament is his first revision according to the Greek. The Psalms are from his revision of the Old Testament according to the Greek in the Hexapla of Origen. The protocanonical books of the Old Testament are from Jerome's translation of the Hebrew. The five deuterocanonical books omitted by Jerome (Wisdom, Sirach, Baruch, 1 Machabees, 2 Machabees) are from the Old Latin version" [*Our emphases*].<sup>8</sup>

St. Jerome began his task by revising the Old Latin version of the 4 Gospels "according to the Greek." As reported above, St. Jerome probably revised the Old Latin version to conform to the Greek version. If the Old Latin or Greek versions were divine books, there would not have been a necessity for St. Jerome to *revise* them, as it would have been a relatively simple task merely to translate them from one language to another. It is clear that St. Jerome did not engage himself merely in the translation but was engaged in the *revision* thereof. The only conclusion that one can draw from the above event is that he must have been instructed to *revise* the 4 Gospels. The reason could have been that the story of Jesus in the 4 Gospels did not concur with what they wanted it to project. For this reason it had to be amended in order to conform to Constantine's state constitution. After this *revision* was completed, the remaining 23 books (which form the canon or regulations of Christian ideology) - according to the state - had been drawn. This might have been the sequence of events that could have taken place if the statements were analysed. One may understand why the amendments are referred to as *revisions* and not translations.

The New Testament conjured up, posed serious problems to the Old Testament, which now had to be *revised* to be compatible with that of the New Testament.

---

8 : J. P. O'Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 29 - hereafter the following abbreviation will be used: C.B.

The sequence of events did not follow in the ordained chronological order. What ought to have happened, was that the Old Testament had to be *translated* first, and then the New Testament, to ensure its divinity. This was not the case as the above statement clearly indicates that they were *revised*.

The proper meaning of the word **revise** according to The New Collins Concise Dictionary 1985 is: “*to change or amend*”, “*or to prepare a new story*”. According to the above statement, St. Jerome did the most unforgivable sin when he began to change or amend, or prepare a new story of the 4 Gospels. Thereafter he changed or amended, or prepared a new story of the remaining 23 books. After 4 years in 387 AD he began to change or amend, or prepare a new story of the Old Latin version of the Protocanonical books (‘meaning the inspiration of the books which was never questioned’) of the Old Testament according to the Greek language in the Hexapla of Origen. After these *revisions* were completed, the stories were adjusted to conform to the constitution of the state’s ideology. Approximately in the year 390 AD Jerome began the new translation of the whole Old Testament (‘except five deuterocanonical books’), (‘whose divinely inspired character was disputed at one time’) ‘from the original Hebrew’. The statement, which refers to ‘the original Hebrew’, could only have referred to the Hebrew in the Hexapla of Origen, as it did not contain vowels. It was derived from various copies of copies and it included the Septuagint which together with the entire works of the Hexapla of Origen. Jerome’s work is therefore non-divine.

Consequently, there are no true ***prophecies*** in the Bible as they were all concocted by the Holy Saint Jerome of the first Church in Christianity! We do not blame the Protestants as they did not exist during the period when Christianity was created by evil men!

The next is another statement made with full extreme ignorance of the truth:

‘Muslims believe that during the last twenty years of Muhammad’s life, he was given messages from God in instalments. The Qur’an is the perfect and unimpeachable recording of God’s words, which came down in full and intact to Muhammad. According to Muslim belief, the Qur’an exists eternally in heaven in the form of tablets, and the angel Gabriel helped Muhammad collect these revelations, word for word from the stone tablets in heaven, which are also in Arabic.’ [Page 68]



We do not know of any such Qur'anic guidance. Would you please give us the full evidence from the Arabic Glorious Qur'an itself! We also have never seen the word '*angel Gabriel*' in the Arabic Glorious Qur'an itself! And should you be able find such words, then we would also like to know in which category the verse/s are which you found in the Arabic Glorious Qur'an itself!

The argument seems to have been made under having too much Holy Communion that could have been given to him during a Mass service, as it could be that he has moved around in the Church or he might have come from a booze party before writing. If the above was not the case, then only could the following be the result of extreme hatred based on extreme ignorance which only fools possess:

'Muhammad verbally transmitted these revelations, but there was no complete Qur'an written at the time of his death in 632. As time went on, different individuals wrote down the teachings, and there was some variation between scripts, though perhaps not significant variances. It wasn't until the year 650 or so that there was an "official" version of the Qur'an, which rendered all others obsolete.' [Page 68]

The above statement revealed that the FOOL who wrote the above did not read the Arabic Glorious Qur'an himself! What a FOOL is he to reveal his lies in this stupid manner!!! The Arabic Glorious Qur'an did not leave it to historians to reveal its history, Allâh Himself revealed the history of the Qur'an within it! No doubt the Arabic Glorious Qur'an was first a memorised Book before it was put into writing during the life time of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad (with whom Allâh is pleased)! All history books that reveals the contrary to the Arabic Glorious Qur'an can be thrown in the dirt bin where it belongs.

The evil hatred of the author who is clearly uncovered as a FOOL who argues the next pagan Christian minded comment:

'Fragments of early Qur'anic scripts have been found, dating back to the eighth century. Interestingly, the script excluded punctuation and vowels, which, according to some, makes for a transcription that could be translated a number of ways.' [Page 68]

How foolish could a FOOL become! He reveals that he has no knowledge of the Quraishi Arabic whatsoever! I am very sorry to say that I believe only a drunkard could make such foolish claims!!!

Under the heading ‘**THE QUR’AN AND THE BIBLE**’ we will not comment on the first paragraph, except say that the FOOL has made the difference between the Bible and the Qur’ân absolutely clear!

The second paragraph only brings out more of the pagan ignorance of the FOOL, he states:

‘Many Muslims consider the Bible to be a holy book, but they are reticent to read it because they think the Qur’an says that early Christians and Jews changed the original wording. However, this is one example of how many Muslims are not very knowledgeable about the Qur’an. It does not say the Bible has been changed, though it has become commonplace to believe it has been changed anyway.’ [Page 69]

It could be true of those Muslims who were taught in Christian Universities or even in Muslim countries where Christians controlled the faculty of Islâm, that they may ‘consider the Bible to be a holy book’. A Muslim who have knowledge of the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân will never believe or accept such rubbish!!! We have given sufficient evidence above to reject the Bible, as a holy book, from Christian writings!!! The Arabic Glorious Qur’ân do not use the man-made term Bible! We will only quote one verse from the Qur’ân, namely chapter 3, verse 78:

**3:78:** “And there is certainly a party of them<sup>9</sup> who lie about the Book that you may consider it to be (a part) of the Book while it is not (a part) of the Book; and they say, It is from Allâh, while it is not from Allâh; and they forge a lie against Allâh whilst they know.”

It is not necessary to go into details of the next paragraph, except to clear some lies:

---

9 : In this case we refer it to the Jews and Christians. For the true understanding of the term Jews, see the book by Ex Jewish Rabbi from Romania Al-Haj Mofsowitz Potashnickh called ‘The History of the Jews’.

In the Arabic Glorious Qur'ân, the pagan name '*Joseph*' does not appear. Also the pagan names '*Mary*' and '*Jesus*' does not appear in the **Arabic** Glorious Qur'ân. Again the term '*Psalms*' does not appear in the only Divine Book in the world. In the Arabic Glorious Qur'ân, the term 'religion' does not appear! The term Âyah or Âyât has many meanings; it depends on the contents of the subject in which the term appears.

This brings us to the last paragraph. We will clarify the understanding of how a true Muslim sees a translation of the Arabic Glorious Qur'ân. Firstly, no translation is the Qur'ân! A translation is the opinion of the translator, as he or she chooses a word in another language as they deem fit; he or she will select the meaning which in many cases are wrong as none is a master of every subject contained in the Arabic Glorious Qur'ân!!! Yes, Muslims ought to like every translator as they have tried their best.

We shall now analyse the subjects under the heading: '**WHAT THE QUR'AN SAYS ABOUT ...**' of which the first is under the heading 'THE CONCEPTION AND BIRTH OF JESUS':

'God FOREORDAINED THE BIRTH OF Jesus (Isa) – Q 3:47 (Matthew 1:23)' [Page 70]

The Divine Book states in chapter 3, verse 47:

**3:47** "She said: My *Rabb*, how can I have a son and man has not yet touched me? He said: Even so; Allâh creates what He pleases. When He decrees a matter, He only says to it, Be, and it is."

Reading a verse of the Arabic Glorious Qur'ân without knowing in what category a verse belongs to, one will not understand the real meaning conveyed. Furthermore, this verse has been taken out of a subject and therefore the real understanding of the meaning relating to the subject matter will remain hidden. It is therefore necessary for us to give the full story in order to realise the true meaning of this verse. We shall quote all the verses and then explain the subject where necessary:

**35** “When a woman of ‘Imrân said: My *Rabb*, I vow to You what is in my womb, to be devoted (to Your service), so accept (it) from me; surely You, only You, are the Hearing, the Knowing.

**36** So when she brought it forth, she said: My *Rabb*, I have brought it forth a female — and Allâh knew best what she brought forth — and the male is not like the female, and I have named it Maryam, and I commend her and her offspring into Your protection from the accursed *shaitân*.<sup>10</sup>

**37** So her *Rabb* accepted her (Maryam) with a goodly acceptance and made her grow up a goodly growing, and gave her into the charge<sup>11</sup> of Zakariyyâ. Whenever Zakariyyâ entered the sanctuary to (see) her, he found food with her. He said: O Maryam, from where comes this to you? She said: It is from Allâh. Surely Allâh gives to whom He pleases without measure.

**38** There did *Zakariyyâ* pray to his *Rabb*. He said: My *Rabb*, grant me from You goodly offspring; surely You are the Hearer of prayer.

**39** So the *Malâ'ikah* (the *medium* with which Allâh communicates and interacts with human beings) called to him as he stood praying in the sanctuary: Allâh gives you the good news of *Yahyâ*, verifying a word from Allâh, and honourable and chaste and a prophet from among the good ones.

**40** He said: My *Rabb*, how can I have a son when old age has already come upon me, and my wife is barren? He said: Even thus does Allâh do what He pleases.

**41** He said: My *Rabb*, appoint a sign for me. Said He: Your sign is that you speak not to men for three days except by signs. And remember your *Rabb* much and glorify (Him) in the evening and early morning.

**42** And when the *Malâ'ikah* said: O Maryam, surely Allâh has chosen you and purified you and chosen you above the women of the world.

**43** O Maryam, be obedient to your *Rabb* and humble yourself and bow down with those who bow.

**44** This is of the tidings of things unseen which We reveal to you. And you was not with them when they cast their pens (to decide) which of them

---

10 : *Shaitân* (i.e. the evil inclinations developed in one's mind)

11 : The root word *Kafala* means much more than simply taking *charge*. It means to give support, to provide what is necessary, to be answerable, to be responsible, liable, and to guarantee her upbringing etc. With this background Maryam was properly prepared for womanhood, and as a result was fully capable to guide her offspring correctly that will please Allâh! Her character was of such a high standard that it was fitting to call nabi 'Īsâ son of Maryam!

should have Maryam in his charge<sup>12</sup>, and you was not with them when they contended one with another.

**45** When the *malâ'ikah* said: O Maryam, surely Allâh gives you good news with a word from Him (of one) whose name is the *Masîh*, 'Îsâ, son of *Maryam*, worthy of regard in this world and the Hereafter, and of those who are drawn nigh (to Allâh),

**46** And he will speak to the people when in the cradle and when of old age, and (he will be) one of the good ones.

**47** She said: My *Rabb*, how can I have a son and man has not yet touched me? He said: Even so; Allâh creates what He pleases. When He decrees a matter, He only says to it, Be, and it is.

**48** And He will teach him the Book and the Wisdom and the *Taurât* and the *Injîl*:

**49** And (make him) a messenger to the Children of Isrâ'îl (saying): I have come to you with a sign from your *Rabb*, that I determine for you out of dust the form of a bird (i.e. out of the people who were of the evil lowly type), then I *nafakha* (advance) into it (i.e. them) and it (i.e. they) becomes (like) a bird (meaning above the transgressors) with Allâh's permission, and I heal the blind (i.e. those who were blind to the truth) and the leprous (i.e. those who were inflicted with evil inclinations), and bring the dead (i.e. those of whom it was thought that they would never return to the path of truth) to life with Allâh's permission; and I inform you of what you should eat and what you should store in your houses. Surely there is a sign in this for you, if you are believers.

**50** And (I am) a verifier of that which is before me of the *Taurât*, and I allow you part of that which was forbidden to you; and I have come to you with a sign from your *Rabb*, so keep your duty to Allâh and obey me.

**51** Surely Allâh is my *Rabb* and your *Rabb*, so serve Him. This is the right path.

**52** But when 'Îsâ perceived disbelief on their part, he said: Who will be my helpers in Allâh's way? The disciples said: We are Allâh's helpers: we believe in Allâh, and bear you witness that we are submitting ones.

---

12 : The future husband to be also was given a similar kind of responsibility as the same root word was used. Hence, nabî 'Îsâ had a goody up bringing!

53 Our *Rabb*, we believe in that which You have revealed and we follow the messenger, so write us down with those who bear witness.

54 And (the Jews) planned and Allâh (also) planned. And Allâh is the best of planners.

55 When Allâh said: O ‘Îsâ, I will cause you to die and exalt you in My presence and clear you of those who disbelieve and make those who follow you above those who disbelieve to the day of Resurrection. Then to Me is your return, so I shall decide between you concerning that wherein you differ.

56 Then as to those who disbelieve, I shall chastise them with severe chastisement in this world and the Hereafter, and they will have no helpers.

57 And as to those who believe and do good deeds, He will pay them fully their rewards. And Allâh loves not the unjust.

58 This We recite to you of the messages and the Reminder full of wisdom.

59 The likeness of ‘Îsâ with Allâh is truly as the likeness of Âdam. He created him from dust, then said to him, Be, and he was.

60 (This is) the truth from your *Rabb*, so be not of the disputers.

61 Whoever then disputes with you in this matter after the knowledge that has come to you, say: Come! Let us call our sons and your sons and our women and your women and our people and your people, then let us be earnest in prayer, and invoke the curse of Allâh on the liars.

62 Surely this is the true account, and there is no deity but Allâh. And Allâh! He surely is the Mighty, the Wise.

63 But if they turn away, then surely Allâh knows the mischief-makers.

64 Say: O People of the Book, come to *sawâ-in* (i.e. an *equitable*, or a *just*, or *right*, or *proposition*) word between us and you, that we shall serve none but Allâh and *that we shall not associate aught with Him*, and *that some of us shall not take others for lords besides Allâh*. But if they turn away, then say: Bear witness, we are Muslims.”

The first important point that needs to be explained is the fact that the Qur’ân has laid down certain principles about human beings’ nature, which is applicable to all human beings! In order for human beings not be able to misconstrue the guidance of the **Arabic** Glorious Qur’ân, Allâh has laid down the rule for the interpretation of His guidance! This fact will

bring out the reason as to why many people misconstrued chapter 3, verse 47. In the very chapter in which the information about nabî ‘Îsâ (with whom Allâh is pleased) is been given, Allâh guides as follows:

“He it is Who has revealed the Book to you, some of its verses are *Muhkamât* (absolutely clear and lucid, decisive); they are *Ummul-Kitâb* (the core of the original foundation of all revelation; the Essence of Allâh’s Will and Law. The basis of the Book and also its protector, hence the ‘*mother of the Book*’); and others are *Mutashâbihât* (allegorical). Then those in whose hearts is perversity follow the part of it, which is allegorical, seeking to mislead and seeking to give it (their own) interpretation. (What it means is that one is not searching for its hidden meanings). And *mâ ya’lamu* (none can exhaust its): *ta’wilahu ’illallâh* (*ta’wilahu* = the discovering, detecting, revealing, developing or disclosing or the explaining, expounding or interpreting of which a thing is or may be reduced or that which it may come to be, [within the framework of the Qur’ânic teachings]), save Allâh. And those firmly rooted in knowledge, they say - ‘We believe in it, it is all from our *Rabb*.<sup>13</sup> And none will grasp the message except people of understanding.’<sup>14</sup>”

We are told in no uncertain terms in the Qur’ân that the Qur’ân only contains *two types* of verses. The first type is: “...*Muhkamât* (absolutely clear and lucid, **decisive**); they are *Ummul-Kitâb* (the core of the original foundation of all revelation; the Essence of Allâh’s Will and Law. The basis of the Book and also its protector, hence the ‘*mother of the Book*’)...” This part of the law is very important. It prevents one from interpreting literally verses which requires interpretation based on decisive facts. But there is another reason for the *Muhkamât* (**decisive** verses), and that is so that one cannot write the Book with his or her own ideas; as they simply do not possess the absolute knowledge of everything that Allâh has created! When the above verse is carefully studied then this fact will become manifest by itself! The second type of verses is: “*Mutashâbihât* (allegorical).” The word *Mutashâbih* is derived from its root word *Shibh* that means: Things like or resembling one another or

<sup>13</sup> : According to Ar-Râghib al-Isfahânî, it means ‘*to nurture a thing in such a manner as to make it attain one condition after another until its goal of completion*’ Mufradât alfâz al-Qur’ân by ar-Râghib al-Isfahânî. Please note that the word has different meanings when it does not refer to the Creator.

<sup>14</sup> : Al-Qur’ân 3:7.

*likeness or resemblance, that which is co-similar [like each other] or conformable in its various parts. Mutashâbihât are therefore things like or resembling one another, hence susceptible to different interpretations.*

The most appropriate English word for *Mutashâbihât*, although maybe not sufficient, is the term “*allegorical*”. It is derived from the word “*allegory*” which means:

“A figurative representation conveying a meaning other than and in addition to the literal. ...The etymological meaning of the word is wider than which it bears in actual use. An allegory is distinguished from a *metaphor* by being longer sustained and more fully carried out in its details, and from *analogy* by the fact that the one appeals to the imagination and the other to reason...”<sup>15</sup>

The *Mutashâbihât* verses are of different categories.

(a) *The first category*

Those verses of which the meaning becomes known by using the clearly expressed guidance contained in the *Muhkamât* (**decisive**) verses. This is made clear from chapter 11:1: -

كِتَابٌ أَحْكَمَتْ آيَاتُهُ ثُمَّ فُصِّلَتْ مِنْ لَدُنْ حَكِيمٍ خَبِيرٍ

“... (This is) a Book, whose verses are characterised by *uhkimat* (wisdom), then they are made plain, from One Wise, Aware.”

This is further supported in chapter 39:23: -

اللَّهُ نَزَّلَ أَحْسَنَ الْحَدِيثِ كِتَابًا مُتَشَابِهًا مَثَابًا

“Allâh has revealed the best announcement, a Book *Mutashâbihâm-mathânî* (conformable in its various parts)...”

Therefore, the *Mutashâbihât* (allegorical) verses must not be seen in isolation, nor can a literal meaning be extracted from them without intense research and conferring them with the

<sup>15</sup> : Encyclopaedia Britannica, fourteenth edition, 1929, Vol. 1, p. 645.



**Muḥkamât** (decisive) verses contained in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân, as all Qur’ânic verses are *consistent* and never in conflict with one another. It is important to remember that the literal translation of the phrase *Ummul-Kitâb* is ‘*mother of the book*’. Hence, the **Muḥkamât** (decisive) verses should be regarded as protectors and supporters for the meaning of the **Mutashâbihât** (allegorical) verses. The **Muḥkamât** (decisive) verses thus act as controllers against misconstruing information about creation. The combination of the **Muḥkamât** (decisive) and the **Mutashâbihât** (allegorical and those of which the knowledge are not yet uncovered) verses contains the necessary guidance that provides the “*stimuli*” for research. They are the criteria against which humankind’s findings must be judged to ensure that interpretations of these findings are in accordance with Allâh’s laws. This is supported in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân as follows:

ثُمَّ إِنَّ عَلَيْنَا بَيَانَهُ

“Then surely it is for Us (Allâh) to make it clear to you.”<sup>16</sup>

This *unique system*, which Allâh has used in His Book, which is the only surviving Divine guidance; makes it impossible for human beings to forge it.

In relation to what has been said above; we shall now reveal some of the laws in relation to procreation. However, we need to reveal the command *to test what Allâh has revealed*:

**67:3-4**: “Who (i.e. Allâh) created the seven *samâwât* alike. You see no incongruity in the creation of the Beneficent. Then look again: Can you see any disorder? Then turn the eye again and again — your look will return to you confused, while it is fatigued.”

The next important point to understand is that *all prophets of Allâh were human beings*. This fact is made clear in the following verses:

**21:7-8**: “And We (i.e. Allâh) sent not before you (i.e. Muḥammad) any but *men* to whom We (i.e. Allâh) sent revelation; so ask the followers of *Al-*

---

16 : Al-Qur’ân 75:19.

*Dhikr* (the Reminder)<sup>17</sup> (i.e. Al-Qur'ân) if you know not. Nor did We (i.e. Allâh) give them bodies not eating food, nor did they abide.”

It is therefore that all prophets are subjected to the laws of procreation! Here follows some of the laws:

**36:36:** “Glory be to Him Who created pairs of all things, of what the earth grows, and of their kind and of what they know not!”

**43:12:** “And Who created pairs of all things...”

**51:49:** “And of everything We have created pairs that you may be mindful.”

**49:13:** “O mankind, surely We have created you from a male and a female, and made you tribes and families that you may know each other. Surely the noblest of you with Allâh is the most dutiful of you. Surely Allâh is Knowing, Aware.”

**78:8:** “And We have created you in pairs.”

**53:45-46:** “And that He creates pairs, the male and the female: From the *nutfah* (i.e. droplet, minute quantity of liquid. However, it is a comprehensive term which true meaning can only be deduced from Qur'ânic text. It includes the male and female gametes and associated cellular fluid. It is also a descriptive term for fertilized egg, the morula and blastocyst) when it is adapted.”

**75:39:** “Then He made of human beings two kinds, the male and the female.”

**35:11** And Allâh created you from *turâb* (i.e. earth, wet earth, layer or lamina of dust; land which is good in terms of its natural constituents of the earth), then from the *nutfah* (i.e. droplet, minute quantity of liquid. However, it is a comprehensive term which true meaning can only be deduced from Qur'ânic text. It includes the male and female gametes and associated cellular fluid. It is also a descriptive term for fertilized egg, the morula and blastocyst), then He made you pairs. And no female bears, nor brings forth, except with His knowledge. And no one living long is granted

---

<sup>17</sup> : *Al-Dhikr* is one of the name of Al-Qur'ân.

a long life, nor is aught diminished of one's life, but it is all in a book. Surely this is easy to Allâh.

**30:21:** “And of His signs is this that He created mates for you from yourselves that you might find quiet of mind in them, and He put between you love and compassion. Surely there are signs in this for a people who reflect.”

Then Allâh informs us that these *laws are not changeable*:

**30:30:** “So set your face for *dîn* (the way of life as prescribed by Allâh), being upright, the nature made by Allâh in which He has created human beings. ***There is no altering Allâh's creation.*** That is the right *dîn* (the way of life as prescribed by Allâh) — but most people know not —”

We shall now analyse the verses of chapter 3, verses 35-64 where it needs clarity in order to understand it in conformity with laws given by Allâh. To make it easy we shall only explain as we deem necessary:

**3:35-36:** “When a woman of ‘Imrân said: My (i.e. the mother of Maryam) *Rabb*, I vow to You what is in my womb, to be devoted (to Your service), so accept (it) from me; surely You, only You, are the Hearing, the Knowing. So when she brought it (i.e. Maryam) forth, she said: My *Rabb*, I have brought it forth a female — and Allâh knew best what she brought forth — and the male is not like the female, and I have named it Maryam, and I commend **her and her offspring into Your protection from the accursed *shaitân*.**”

**From these two verses it is clear that Maryam's mother prayed for the offspring of Maryam also, not outside the laws of Allâh, as she made no such impossible request.** We are then informed:

**3:37:** “So her *Rabb* accepted her (Maryam) with a goodly acceptance and made her grow up a goodly growing, **and gave her into the charge of Zakariyyâ.** Whenever Zakariyyâ entered the sanctuary to (see) her, he

found food with her. He said: O Maryam, from where comes this to you?  
She said: It is from Allâh. Surely Allâh gives to whom He pleases without measure.”

The important point made in this verse is that fact that Allâh has placed Maryam ‘**into the charge of Zakariyyâ.**’ The next part of the verse is not about miraculous food coming from above, but that her guidance were such that she as a child knew that Allâh is the provider irrespective who gives whatsoever to her – it all belongs to Allâh! Even Zakariyyâ (with whom Allâh is pleased) saw the piety of this child that he prayed for a child similar to her:

**3:38-39:** “There did *Zakariyyâ* pray to his *Rabb*. He said: My *Rabb*, grant me from You goodly offspring; surely You are the Hearer of prayer. So the *Malâ'ikah* (the *medium* with which Allâh communicates and interacts with human beings) called to him as he stood praying in the sanctuary: Allâh gives you the good news of *Yahyâ*, verifying a word from Allâh, and honourable and chaste and a prophet from among the good ones.

The first part is in decisive terms, which is easy to understand. The next part contains *Mutashâbihât* (allegorical) contents. Hence, it is important to understand the following verse:

**6:104:** “Vision comprehends Him (i.e. Allâh) not, and He comprehends (all) vision; and He (i.e. Allâh) is above all comprehension, the aware.”

We are then told:

**42:11:** “The Originator of the *samâwât* and the earth. He has made for you pairs from among yourselves, and pairs of the cattle, too, multiplying you thereby. ***Nothing is like Him; and He is the Hearing, the Seeing.***”

This makes it absolutely clear that Allâh is beyond humankind’s visionary ability to comprehend Him. The ‘1926’ “Heisenberg’s Uncertainty Principle”, as conveyed in the quote below, supports the notion that if something cannot be observed experimentally, it does not necessarily imply that it is non-existent.

“...No physical measurements can tell you that there is an electron on this table and that it is also lying still. Experiments can be made to discover where the electron is; these experiments will then destroy any possibility of finding simultaneously whether the electron is moving and if so at what speed. And conversely there is an inherent limitation on our knowledge, which appears to have been decreed “in the nature of things”” [*our emphasis*].<sup>18</sup>

The above-mentioned verses are of such a nature that the subject/object cannot be explained in tangible terms. However, an understanding of these *Mutashâbihât* (allegorical) verses, in consonance with the general understanding of the *Muḥkamât* (decisive) verses of the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân, can emerge if the *Muḥkamât* (decisive) verses are properly applied. What should be understood is the fact that a Muslim bears witness to the fact that Allâh exists. The basis, on which the witnessing is based, is the fact that Allâh’s creation is subjected to an order. Consequently, human beings know that *order* is planned, but the One who is responsible for the order of creation is not tangible. The *Order* or *Nature* of creation and the revelation of the *unknown* in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân are the basis on which our witnessing of the Creator is established. Hence, when a Muslim performs the call to prayer and says: “*Ash-hadu an lâ ilâha ill-Allâh*” i.e. I bear witness that nothing deserves to be worshipped except Allâh. What it means is the confirmation of a Muslim’s witnessing, which is based on the fact that human beings cannot reveal the *unknown*, which we find in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân. Furthermore, the entire creation is in conformity with the nature and order in which Allâh has created it. We find no incongruity with natural facts and the revelation in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân.

The important point to remember is that any verse of the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân, which **seems** to defy factual knowledge of the universe, must be interpreted in the context of the guidance of the *Muḥkamât* (decisive) verses. Thus one has to be able to distinguish between *allegorical* and *decisive* verses.

---

18 : Al-Tawhid Vol. IV, No. 4, July-September 1987, p. 66. Concerning The ‘1926’ “Heisenberg’s (1901-76, German physicist) Uncertainty Principle”.

It is for these reasons that the term *Malâ'ikah*<sup>19</sup> was used by Allâh. The reason ought to be easily understood, as Allâh do not talk like human beings!

Nevertheless, Allâh made the whole interaction easy to understand:

Allâh reveals in chapter 2, verse 97:

قُلْ مَنْ كَانَ عَدُوًّا لِجِبْرِيلَ فَإِنَّهُ نَزَّلَهُ عَلَى قَلْبِكَ بِإِذْنِ اللَّهِ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْهِ وَهُدًى وَبُشْرَى لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ

“Say: Whoever is an enemy to *jibrîl* (i.e., an enemy of the Divine revelation sent to the Prophets or human beings for the guidance of human beings) - for surely *it is revealed to your heart*<sup>20</sup> *by Allâh's command*, verifying that which is before it and guidance and glad tidings for the believers.”

Therefore, the understanding of the following part of verse 39 means which states:

So the *Malâ'ikah* (the *medium* with which Allâh communicates and interacts with human beings) called to him as he stood praying in the sanctuary: Allâh gives you the good news of *Yahyâ*, verifying a word from Allâh, and honourable and chaste and a prophet from among the good ones.

Allâh simply informs *Zakariyyâ* that He has accepted his request, and reveals to *Zakariyyâ* ‘the good news of *Yahyâ*, verifying a word from Allâh, and honourable and chaste and a prophet from among the good ones.’

After receiving the good news *Zakariyyâ* now ponders over what seems to worry him. He asks:

**3:40-41:** “He said: My *Rabb*, how can I have a son when old age has already come upon me, and my wife is barren? He said: Even thus does Allâh do what He pleases. He said: My *Rabb*, appoint a sign for me. Said He (i.e. Allâh): Your sign is that you speak not to men for three days except

---

19 : *Malâ'ikah* is not a being.

20 : This *Mutashâbihât* term means the mind.

by signs. And remember your *Rabb* much and glorify (Him) in the evening and early morning”.

Firstly, *Zakariyyâ* thinks that he is too *old*, and that his wife is *barren*. The answer from Allâh does not touch his fears; Allâh guides him:

“...Your sign is that you speak not to men for three days except by signs. And remember your *Rabb* much and glorify (Him) in the evening and early morning.”

In simple words *Zakariyyâ* was over worked and full of worry, performing his duties as a prophet, calling his people towards Allâh and what he needed was to become restful.

Now we come to the part where Allâh reveals that Maryam is now a woman and no more a child! Allâh states:

**3:42-43:** “And when the *Malâ’ikah* said: O Maryam, surely Allâh has chosen you and purified you and chosen you above the women of the world. O Maryam, be obedient to your *Rabb* and humble yourself and bow down with those who bow.”

Maryam is informed that she has been successfully guided in order to continue being a pious person and that her status has reached a degree of piety above other women. The next guidance for her as woman is to ‘...be obedient to your *Rabb* and humble yourself and bow down with those who bow.’ In simple words, she is being instructed of her obligation to regularly pray with those who pray!

The next part of the information is very important as it is a part which most has misconstrued. It states:

**3:44:** “This is of the tidings of things *ghaib*<sup>21</sup> (that was unseen and unknown) which We (i.e. Allâh) reveal to you (i.e. Muḥammad and to those

---

21 : The term *al-ghaib* is a very important word used in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân, as its meaning has far more reaching effects than what is commonly understood. The word includes all things not perceivable with the naked

who received the message). And you were not with them when they cast their pens (to decide) which of them should have Maryam in his charge, and you were not with them when they contended one with another.”

What the verse reveals in the opening words means that this was not common knowledge which Tom Dick and Harry knew! In other words only the inner circle knew about the casting of ‘...their pens (to decide) which of them should have Maryam in *his* charge...’ One must keep in mind that this *charge* is not about taking a *child* into *his* care. It is taking a *woman* into *his charge*! In verse 37 Allâh has placed *Zakariyyâ* in charge of Maryam as he was related to her, but that he was also a prophet. Maryam as a child could not be placed in the care of an outsider who was not related to her! Hence, Allâh chose *Zakariyyâ*! In verse 44 Maryam was a woman who needed a different type of care. The words: ‘...which of them should have Maryam in his charge...’ could only be understood in terms of the *Muḥkamât* (decisive) verses as quoted above to mean marriage. This is also supported by the words: ‘...and you were not with them when they contended one with another.’ There is no need for

---

eye and what have not yet been understood, which includes difficult subjects such as the *uncertainty principle* or *quantum mechanics*. The usage for the term *al-ghaib* could sometimes refer to ‘The Almighty Allâh’ and also to ‘the Unknown’, ‘beyond the human ken’ or ‘the Unknowable’ but most commonly, it means *unseen* or that which is *hidden*, and these are the literal meanings of the term. According to Lane it means the following:

“*Ghaib* Whatever is absent, or hidden, from one; (The Sihâh, The “Asâs” of Ez-Zamakhshereh, The “Miṣbâḥ” of El-Feiyoomee, The “Tâj el-‘Aroos;) as though it were an inf. n. used in the sense of the active participial noun [in which the meaning of a substantive is predominant]; (The “Tâj el-‘Aroos;) and so *ghâib*, which [in this sense] is a substantive, like *kâhil*, (The *Kâmoos*, The “Tâj el-‘Aroos,) or an active participial noun used in the sense of a substantive; (Moḥammad Ibn-El-Teiyib El-Fâsee, author of “Annotations on the *Kâmoos*”.) *anything that is absent, or hidden, from the eyes; invisible, unseen, or unapparent; whether it be, or be not, perceived in the heart, or mind* : (Ibn-El-Aarâbee, The “Tâj el-‘Aroos;) [or *anything unperceivable; absent from the range, or beyond the reach, of perception by sense, or of mental perception; or undiscoverable unless by means of divine revelation; a mystery, or secret, such as an event of futurity;*] *a thing that has been hidden from men, and with which the Prophet has acquainted them, of the events of the resurrection and of Paradise and of Hell etc.; thus in the *Kuran* ii. 2; (Ez-Zejjâj The “Tâj el-‘Aroos;) and [hence] Ez-Zejjâj explains *Al-Ghaib* as meaning, in the *Kuran* Lxxxii. 24, *that which has been revealed*: (The “Tâj el-‘Aroos in article *dhan*.”)*

To conclude the subject, it is important to state that one must remember that Allâh knows the unknown. Therefore, if He has made anything forbidden or has prohibited the use of His created things for human consumption, then we might think that it is not necessary to obey the command, as if we know everything there is to know about it. Let’s give an example: The flesh of the swine is made forbidden to eat. However, some think that they have found the method to keep the swine clean. That is to keep the swine from eating things, which they know is not healthy for human consumption, although it is taken in by the pig. But they forget that still do not know everything there is to know about the flesh of the swine. There might be many other uses for the animal, which human beings have not yet discovered. However, it has been scientifically proven that the flesh of swine is harmful to human beings health. This fact is recorded in the Qur’ân.



further arguments as it discusses the affairs of a woman and not a child! Consequently, Allâh reveals the natural information that follows on what was decided. Allâh says:

**3:45-46:** “When the *malâ’ikah* said: O Maryam, surely Allâh gives you good news with a word from Him (of one) whose name is the *Masih*, ‘*Îsâ*, son of *Maryam*, worthy of regard in this world and the Hereafter, and of those who are drawn nigh (to Allâh), And he will speak to the people when in the cradle and when of old age, and (he will be) one of the good ones.”

The events that follow the decision about the *chosen husband* of Maryam is now being revealed to her. And that is she will bear a child from this marriage ‘...O Maryam, surely Allâh gives you good news with a word from Him (of one) whose name is the *Masih*, ‘*Îsâ*, son of *Maryam*, worthy of regard in this world and the Hereafter, and of those who are drawn nigh (to Allâh), And he will speak to the people when in the cradle and when of old age, and (he will be) one of the good ones.’ In simple words, Allâh has also chosen what he will be called! As explained above nothing functions outside the natural laws which Allâh has ordained. Therefore, it is a foregone conclusion that the words ‘...he will speak to the people when in the cradle and when of old age, and (he will be) one of the good ones’ do not mean that he as a baby will talk. It only means as a youngster he will utter words with wisdom as Allâh was his tutor! Furthermore, he will reach ‘*old age*’ and not as most taught he was taken “up” as a young man. His mission will end when he has reached ‘*old age*’! Maryam was not yet informed about her husband to be, inquired:

**3:47:** “She said: My *Rabb*, how can I have a son and man has not yet touched me? He said: Even so; Allâh creates what He pleases. When He decrees a matter, He only says to it, Be, and it is.”

The question Maryam presented reveals that she fully understood that a husband was needed for her to bear a child! The answer by Allâh does not imply that she will bear a child outside the framework of His natural laws! The words: “...Even so; Allâh creates what He pleases. When He *decrees a matter*, He only says to it, Be, and it is.” If Allâh had decree that she will not need a husband, then Allâh would not have allowed what He revealed in verse 44 to happen!!! The next two verses reveal some very important information that needs careful consideration:

**3:48-49:** “And He will teach him the Book and the Wisdom and the *Taurât* and the *Injil*: And (make him) a messenger to the Children of Isrâ’îl (saying): I have come to you with a sign from your *Rabb*, that I determine for you out of dust the form of a bird (i.e. out of the people who were of the evil lowly type), then I *nafakha* (advance) into it (i.e. them) and it (i.e. they) becomes (like) a bird (meaning above the transgressors) with Allâh’s permission, and I heal the blind (i.e. those who were blind to the truth) and the leprous (i.e. those who were inflicted with evil inclinations), and bring the dead (i.e. those of whom it was thought that they would never return to the path of truth) to life with Allâh’s permission; and I inform you of what you should eat and what you should store in your houses. Surely there is a sign in this for you, if you are believers.”

There are four important sources mentioned. The first is that *nabî ‘Îsâ*, son of *Maryam* did receive lessons from Allâh concerning *the Book*. This could only mean that the main teachings that all prophets were taught was also given to him. The second was *Wisdom*. The third was the *Taurât*. The *Taurât* was not the Old Testament that only dates from 916 AD in Hebrew, a language create by the Greeks. And the fourth was the *Injil*. The *Injil* was not the New Testament which is still not completed as stated in the New Bible Dictionary: “Thus the task of New Testament textual criticism<sup>22</sup> is vast and unfinished.”<sup>23</sup>

---

22 : “The science that seeks to determine as **nearly** as possible the original biblical text as it was written by the authors themselves. This science applies to other literature besides the Bible, for example, to the Latin classics such as the works of Horace or Cicero, or to the plays of Shakespeare. In each case, all the available evidence is gathered to determine the history of the transmission of the text, and then compared **to establish what seems to be the original text**. There are two kinds of evidence which the textual critic uses in order to determine the text: external (documents) and internal (conjecture). As regards external evidence for both the Old and New Testaments, there are thousands of Hebrew and Greek manuscripts which have been preserved through the centuries. Besides, there are many copies of the old translations of the Bible, such as the **Greek Septuagint**, the **Latin Vulgate**, and the **Syriac Peshitto**. All these versions are important because they tell us about **the state of the biblical text at a time not long after the original text was written**. Hence the textual critic must master all these Languages in order to use these sources, and then by comparison of text and translations he strives to reach the original reading. Some parts of the Bible have been corrupted (i.e., the original reading has been lost) during the course of its history. **If the corruption occurred very early, it may be impossible for the textual critic to arrive at the original by use of documents**. Then he must resort to conjecture: taking into account the context, and various possibilities of error in the script, he strives to restore the text as he conceives it was originally written. For example: “Return, O Lord, you who ride upon the clouds,” in Numbers 10:36 is a conjectural emendation of a corrupt Hebrew text. While the substantial integrity of biblical text has been preserved by the providence of God; **there is still a place for textual criticism**, as the Church recognizes. In the *Divino afflante Spiritu*... Pope Pius XII said that the art of textual criticism is “quite rightly employed in the case of the sacred books...to ensure that the sacred text be restored, as perfectly as possible, and be purified from the corruptions due to the carelessness of the copyists...” [*Our emphases*] [C.B., pp. 242-243]

The next part of the verse is much misunderstood as most want to believe in miraculous things which emanates from the pagans! Let us first reveal what Allâh has to say about who can create:

**16:20-21:** “And those whom they call on besides Allâh created naught, while they are themselves created. Dead (are they) not living. And they know not when they will be raised.”

All personalities that are taken by people as Deities created naught! Surely, Christians do take “Jesus” as a deity. Hence, the above revelation reveals that he *created naught!* Consequently, the statement: “...I have come to you with a sign from your *Rabb*; that I determine for you out of dust the form of a bird, then I breathe into it and it becomes a bird with Allâh’s permission, and I heal the blind and the leprous...” cannot be taken literally. It is not necessary to reinvent the wheel, let us quote a footnote on the subject: “To understand the significance of this passage it is necessary to bear in mind that the chief characteristic of ‘Îsâ’s speeches is that he spoke in parables and preferred to clothe his ideas in allegorical language. If this is kept in mind, there is no difficulty in interpreting this passage. The first of the statements in this passage speaks of the making of birds and breathing into them. It is perfectly intelligible if taken as a parable, but quite incomprehensible as a statement of fact. If on the one hand a prophet’s dignity is much above such actions as the making of toy birds, on the other the act of creation is not attributable to any but the Divine Being. To understand this parable, however, the several words used may be explained first. In the passage under discussion four words require to be explained: *khalq*, *tîn*, *nafkh*, and *tair*. The primary significance of *khalq* is *measuring, proportioning*, synonym *taqdîr* (*Arabic-English Lexicon* by Edward William Lane); hence *khalq* comes to signify the mere act of *the determining of a thing*. The word was used in this sense in pre-Islâmic poetry. The act of *khalq* in the sense of creation cannot be attributed to any being except Allâh. The Arabic Glorious Qur’ân has laid the greatest stress upon this point. It again and again speaks of the Divine Being as *the Creator of everything*, so that there is nothing of which anyone else may be said to be a creator. And of those who are taken as deities by any people, it says in particular that *they do not create anything, while they are themselves created* (16:20; 25:3).

Then there are the two words *tîn* and *nafkh*. Human beings is spoken of as being created from *tîn* or *dust*, which stands for his humble origin, but the *nafkh* or *breathing* into him makes him deserving of respect by the *malâ'ikah*. This, while hinted at on various occasions, is clearly stated in 38:71, 72: "When your *Rabb* said to the *malâ'ikah*: Surely I am going to create a mortal from dust. So when I have (justly) adapted and expanded it (the component parts of the mortal) by My divine inspiration, and grow submissively (according to Allâh's divine scheme)". Thus it is by the divine inspiration which human beings receive that they may achieve the desired status.

The word *tair* or *tâ'ir* means *a bird*, but just as the word *asad* (lit., *a lion*) is metaphorically used for *a brave man*, in a parable it is quite unobjectionable to take the word *tair* as signifying *one who soars into the higher devotional regions and is not bent low upon earth or earthly things*. In 6:38 it is said: "And there is no animal in the earth, nor a bird that flies on its two wings, but (they are) communities like yourselves", the meaning apparently being that among human beings there are those who only walk upon the earth and do not rise above their earthly concerns, while others soar into the higher devotional regions. Elsewhere (7:179; 25:44), those who having hearts do not understand, and having ears do not hear, are likened to cattle. So what is meant here is that 'Îsâ, by receiving divine inspiration, will make them rise above those who are bent low upon the earth, and the apostles of 'Îsâ, who were all men of humble origin (which is referred to in the word *dust* in the parable), whose thoughts had never risen higher than their own humble cares, left everything for the master's sake and went into the world by the command of the master preaching the truth. Here was, no doubt, mere dust having the form of a bird, which the messenger of Allâh converted into high-soaring birds by delivering the truth contained in the divine inspiration to them. The fact that a story of 'Îsâ making birds is related in a Gospel of Infancy is in no way a bar to this explanation, for it is very likely that a parable was misunderstood by the writer of that Gospel, and the Qur'ân has only referred to it to cast light upon the truth. The miracle of 'Îsâ healing the sick has been rationally explained in the *Encyclopaedia Biblica* by the Rev. T. K. Cheyne, who has shown that all the stories of healing of the sick have arisen from the devotional healing of the sick, as in Matthew 9:12; "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick"; and as in Jesus' message to John the Baptist: "The blind receive their sight and the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the deaf hear, the dead are raised up, and the poor have the Gospel preached to them" (Matthew 11:5). The concluding words clearly show that the sick and the lame and the blind belong to the same category as the poor to whom the Gospel is preached, being the poor in heart. Compare also Matthew 13:15: "For this people's

heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes and hear with their ears and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them.” Here the *healing* cannot refer but to healing of the spiritual diseases. The Arabic Glorious Qur’ân gives an explanation of the healing of the sick when, speaking of itself, it says that it is “a healing for what is in the breasts” (10:57), i.e. for the devotional diseases. The prophet’s healing is about devotional matters, not healing of the physical diseases. The Qur’ân speaks of the blind and the deaf frequently, but it never means those who have lost the senses of seeing and hearing.” [The Holy Qur’ân by M. Muhammad Ali].

The next part of verse 49 which states: “...and bring the dead to life with Allâh’s permission...” needs first a Qur’ânic explanation concerning the dead:

**23:99-100:** “Until when death overtakes one of them, he says: My *Rabb*, send me back, that I may do good in that which I have left. **By no means! It is but a word that he speaks. And before them is a barrier, until the day they are raised.**”

Consequently, no one can raise the dead to life as clearly revealed by Allâh. Therefore, the verse needs to be explain in accordance with Qur’ânic guidance. Let’s quote a readymade explanation: “Last, come those who are dead. The Qur’ân says plainly that those who die are not sent back to this world: “Allâh takes (human being’s) *nafs* at the time of their death, and those that die not, during their sleep. Then He withholds those on whom He has passed the decree of death and sends the others back till an appointed term” (39:42). And again speaking of the dead: “And before them is a barrier, until the day they are raised” (23:100). But the use of the word *mautâ*, i.e. *the dead*, and of their *being raised to life*, is frequent in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân in a devotional sense: “Is he who was dead, then We raised him to life ... like him whose likeness is that of one in darkness” (6:122). And again: “O you who believe, respond to Allâh and His Messenger, when He calls you to that which gives you life” (8:24). Similarly we have: “Neither are the living and the dead alike. Surely Allâh makes whom He pleases hear, and you cannot make those hear who are in the graves” (35:22). The prophets are raised only for quickening to life those who are devotionally dead, and it is to this quickening through ‘Îsâ that the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân refers here. It should be noted that three classes of human beings are spoken of as being regenerated, viz.: (1) those who were

found in the natural state of dust, and who, like dust, humbly submitted themselves to the prophets' handling, and who were made to soar high into the devotional regions, not caring for their worldly concerns, (2) those who were devotionally diseased, and they were healed and made whole, and (3) those who were quite dead and were devotionally quickened. Hence, there are three different descriptions.” [The Holy Qur’ân by M. Muhammad Ali].

The next verse which needs to be explained is verse 55 which states:

**3:55:** “When Allâh said: O ‘Îsâ, I will cause you to die and exalt you in My presence and clear you of those who disbelieve and make those who follow you above those who disbelieve to the day of Resurrection. Then to Me is your return, so I shall decide between you concerning that wherein you differ.”

This information is very important, as it reveals that nabî ‘Îsâ will not be killed nor will he die as a result of unnatural means; but that Allâh will cause him to die!

Then we have verse 59 that needs some explanation:

**3:59:** “The likeness of ‘Îsâ with Allâh is truly as the likeness of Âdam. He created him from dust, then said to him, Be, and he was.”

Once the laws as expounded above are taken into consideration, then the verse is easy to understand that both of them were subjected to the laws of Allâh and they were both normal human beings! One must keep in mind that this Âdam is the one mentioned in **3:33!**

Let us now analyse **Matthew 1:23:**

Matthew 1:23: “The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel<sup>24</sup>—which means, “God with us.”” [New International Version]

---

24 : Matthew 1:23 Isaiah 7:14

If it is claimed that Matthew wrote “*THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.*” Then we cannot agree with it because the first Church in Christianity deny the claim that Matthew wrote ‘The Gospel according to Matthew.’ We refer to their claim:

“It is true that this Gospel was largely dependent upon an earlier Aramaic writing, which tradition assures us was composed by St. Matthew. But this work of St. Matthew no longer exists, and the Gospel which now bears the name of Matthew was written in Greek and based on the work of St. Mark.”<sup>25</sup>

### THE CLAIM THAT “JESUS”<sup>26</sup> WAS BORN MIRACULOUSLY AND THAT HE WAS “GOD” FROM HIS BIRTH

This claim could be based on the story of Mary as it appears in the following verses:

“Then Joseph her husband, being a just *man*, and not willing to make her a publick example, was minded to put her away privily. But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which *is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost*” [*Our emphases*].<sup>27</sup>

As a result of this claim made by Matthew, as it runs contrary to reason, thereby forcing us to analyse the story:

(1). The first problem, which arises, is, ‘what caused Joseph not to *‘make her a publick example’*”? We can understand that Joseph could have accepted Mary even being pregnant by another man before marriage, if she informed him beforehand - but to keep silent about her

---

25 : Virtue’s Catholic Encyclopaedia. 1965. Volume one, page 141 - hereafter the following abbreviation will be used: V.C.E.

26 : Please note that whenever the name *Jesus* appears, it means that it refers to a fictionous person. He was not the Israelite Prophet known to the Muslims as *nabî ‘Îsâ* (with whom Allâh is pleased). We shall not continue hereafter with “Jesus” in inverted commas, as it should be known that there was never an Israelite prophet know by that name!

27 : Matthew 1:19-20. King James Version 1984.

pregnancy would cast bad light on her integrity. Hence, the above verse caused doubt about Mary's virtuous integrity. The following statement causes the reason for this conclusion:

*“Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.”*<sup>28</sup>

This means that if the “angel”<sup>29</sup> did not ‘inform’ Joseph, Mary would have remained silent about the pregnancy.

(2). Why did Joseph believe what he was told in the dream? Is it because he knew about a similar incident concerning another woman who was made pregnant by the “Holy Ghost”<sup>30</sup>?

(3). What is of more importance is the fact that Joseph is referred to as ‘*thou son of David*’. Is the son of Mary also the son of David as stated in Matthew 1:1?

Let us rather explain the names of Jesus and whose son he was. In the first book of the New Testament, we find that Jesus is referred to by five different names as given by Matthew in chapters 1 and 2:

(1). Matthew begins his book by introducing Jesus as follows:

“The book of the **generation** of *Jesus Christ*, the son of David, the son of Abraham” [*Our emphases*]<sup>31</sup>

(2). The “angel” informs Joseph that a child will be born to Mary, and Joseph “shall call his name *JESUS*: for he shall save his people from their sins” [*Our emphasis*].<sup>32</sup>

To understand the implication of this is difficult, because in Matthew 1:1 he is said to be the ‘**son**’ of David who was a descendant of Abraham, and not the “child of the “Holy Ghost”.”<sup>33</sup>

This verse is problematic, if considered in the context of verse 16, which states:

---

28 : Matthew 1:20.

29 : Is it possible to define ‘angel’ rationally? Pagans believe in small baby like animals with wings.

30 : Is it possible to define ‘Holy Ghost’ rationally?

31 : Matthew 1:1.

32 : Matthew 1:21.

33 : Matthew 1:18. *Pagans believe in a ghost becoming a dove, and then having sex with a big women and impregnating her to bear a baby god.*



“And Jacob begat Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ.”<sup>34</sup>

This would imply that Joseph was the *last blood descendant* of David.

Hence, in the light of this verse, the “Holy Ghost” could not have been the father of Jesus, as it is reported:

“**For that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost**” [Our emphasis].<sup>35</sup>

(3). Although “*the angel of the Lord*” said they must call the child Jesus, the New Testament makes a reference to the Old Testament about the name of Jesus:

“...Which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet’ ...THEY SHALL CALL HIS NAME EM-MAN’-U-EL, which being interpreted is, God with us” [Our emphasis]<sup>36</sup>

(4). The fourth reference to the name of Jesus is depicted in the verses dealing with the arrival of the wise men from the east to Jerusalem, who claimed, by asking:

“Saying, Where is he that is born **King of the Jews?** for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him.” [Our emphases] (Matthew 2:2).

(5). The fifth reference to the name of Jesus is articulated through the concern of Herod the enemy of Jesus, when he inquired:

“...**Where Christ should be born**” [Our emphases]<sup>37</sup>

---

34 : Matthew 1:16.

35 : Matthew 1:20.

36 : Matthew 1:22-23.

37 : Matthew 2:4.

This means, that Herod [a pagan] introduced the name “Christ.” Moreover, according to Matthew we can conclude that all except one of the descriptions regarding Jesus’ name can be rejected. Except for description 2, for the reason that the “angel” christening him as “Jesus” - this claim is compatible with description 2, although it is not based on any evidence which could cause a firm belief.

The question then arises: What about the other four names?

Let us clarify why it is difficult to concur with the authors of the Bible that the other four names do belong to Jesus. In addition, historically, the name “Jesus” is not a divine revealed name, because “Jesus” is a Greek translation of the unknown original name which is lost for the Christians. There are no original divine manuscripts of the New Testament in the Aramaic language, which the original Israelite Prophet had spoken, so that we could examine if the translation was done correctly. Let us examine the above five names in the following manner:

(a). In (1) above it is clear that ‘*Jesus Christ*’ was the name used by Matthew, if it is claimed that he wrote “***THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO MATTHEW.***” However, we cannot agree with it because the *first Church in Christianity* deny the claim that Matthew wrote ‘The Gospel According to Matthew.’ We refer to the first Church in Christianity’s claim:

“It is true that this Gospel was largely dependent upon an earlier Aramaic writing, which tradition assures us was composed by St. Matthew. But this work of St. Matthew no longer exists, and the Gospel which now bears the name of Matthew was written in Greek and based on the work of St. Mark.”<sup>38</sup>

For the reason that Matthews’ text is non-existent, and the latter is a primary source used to derive Jesus’ name, we deduce that **none of the names are divine.**

(b). According to (2) above, if Joseph informed Matthew that the “angel” told him to call the baby’s name “Jesus”, then we must agree that “Jesus” could not be his real name; because no evidence exists that the statements in Matthew of the New Testament are divine. What is of

---

38 : Virtue’s Catholic Encyclopaedia. 1965. Volume one, page 141 - hereafter the following abbreviation will be used: V.C.E.

more importance is the fact that the meaning of “*Jesus*” (although it was a common Greek name) is drawn from the pagan Greek religious methodology and means:

“*For he shall save his people from their sins*”<sup>39</sup>

This proves that it could not have been a divine name, as no one can undo or be responsible for another person’s sins. Therefore, even Jesus could not be his real name, as Joseph would not have used a Greek name.

(c). The name ‘*Im-man’-u-el*’ according to Isaiah 7:14 could not be accepted to refer to “Jesus”, as it appears in Matthew, as stated in (3) above. We refer to the Jewish comment on this subject:

“‘Similarly, in connection with Isaiah vii, 14, A virgin shall conceive,’ Christians scholars today admit that ‘virgin’ is a mistranslation for the Heb. word *almah*, in that verse. A ‘maid’ or unmarried woman is expressed in Hebrew by *bethulah*. The word *almah* in Isaiah VII, 14 means no more than a young woman of age to be a mother, whether she be married or not. The most famous passage of this class is the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. For eighteen hundred years Christians theologians have passionately maintained that it is a Prophetic anticipation of the life of the Founder of their Faith. An impartial examination of the chapter, however, shows that the Prophet is speaking of a *past historical fact*. and is describing one who had already been smitten to death. Consequently, a reference to an event which is said to have happened many centuries later is excluded. These three instances may be taken as typical. Modern scholarship has shattered the arguments from the Scriptures which missionaries have tried, and are still trying, to impose upon ignorant Jews.”<sup>40</sup>

---

39 : Matthew 1:21.

40 : ‘The Pentateuch and Haftorahs’, 1961, refers to it as the ‘Bible’ - which includes the Torah (Pentateuch) and Haftorahs [Haftorahs = the prophets]. Edited by Dr. J. H. Hertz, p. 202 - hereafter the following abbreviation will be used: Hertz).

Therefore, '*EM-MAN'-U-EL*' is not his name, as he was not "God with us", as stated in (3) above, because he ate food like all men do and answered the call of nature [i.e. going to the bush or toilet].

(d). According to (4) above, the claim of the wise men can not be accepted as a divine instruction, as they were believers in the theory of astrology, which is in contradiction with monotheism. Everyone who has the necessary knowledge of the historical facts must support this statement. Remember what the first Church in Christianity has said about Matthews' Gospel - they further claim that:

"In writing the first two chapters of their Gospels, Matthew and Luke were not concerned simply to relate a number of isolated incidents from Christ's infancy, and it would do them an injustice to treat them as such. Their purpose was more profound: to deepen the faith of their readers in the meaning of Christ's work. Christ had already been presented in the first preaching of the Gospel as the fulfilment of all the Old Testament hopes. But this had dealt only with his public life (see Mark, John, Acts). The purpose of the Infancy Gospels is to show that the same was true even of his hidden life. The story of the Magi in Matthew 2: 1-12 forms part of this purpose."<sup>41</sup>

Then, the story goes on to give all references of the Old Testament concerning the subject. It then states:

"To these texts have been added other reminiscences from Numbers 24, Isaias 60 and Psalm 71, which told of the Old Testament hope that the Messiah would receive the homage of all nations. What precise historical events lay behind this meditation on the Old Testament we no longer have the means of knowing, and there does not seem to be much point in speculating about the nationality, number or names of the Magi. It is sufficient that we recognize the freedom with which Matthew has elaborated his sources to show forth what Christ meant for him - the climax and fulfilment of the whole history of salvation. It is as such that this

---

41 : V.C.E. Vol. 2, op. cit., p. 642.

passage from Matthew is used by the liturgy to celebrate the Epiphany or manifestation of Christ.”<sup>42</sup>

Consequently, the term ‘*King*’ was not his title. (It is important to state that the story in the Book of Mormon, which appears in Helaman 14:5, concerning the wise men, must be rejected). However, it was used when the evil Jews and the Pagans were mocking him at the crucifixion. So the Romans put up a written notice stating:

“*THIS IS JESUS THE KING OF THE JEWS.*”<sup>43</sup>

(e). According to (5) above, it is sad to note that according to the New Testament the title ‘*Christ*’ was first used independently by his enemy Herod. However, what is the meaning of the Greek term “Christ” according to the New Testament? It is reported under the heading “*Jesus Anointed by a Sinful Woman*” that:

“You did not put oil on my head, but she has poured perfume on my feet.”<sup>44</sup>

This is the meaning of “Christ” according to the New Testament, which is based on the pagan Greek religious methodology. According to the Arabic title used for ‘Îsâ is *Al-Masîh* (Allâh is pleased with him) as used in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân, and means: The one who journeys or goes about much for the sake of devotion, or as a devotee.<sup>45</sup> Therefore, ‘*Christ*’ as defined by Christians, could also not be a divine revealed name.

As a result of our analysis, it is clear from Matthews’ Gospel, with which we must agree that the term “**KING**” is not a name or title given to him by “God”. Let us now examine why Muslims refer to “Jesus” as *nabî* ‘Îsâ (Allâh is pleased with him). According to the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân he is referred to as:

“... *Al-Masîh*, ‘Îsâ son of Maryam...”<sup>46</sup>

---

42 : ibid, p. 642.

43 : Matthew 27:37.

44 : Luke 7:46 New International Version.

45 : See Lane.

46 : Al-Qur’ân 3:45.

The reason as to why Muslims call him *nabî* ‘Îsâ (Allâh is pleased with him) is because he is referred to in chapter 19:30 as:

“A prophet”

Fortunately for the Christians, the real name of Jesus was revealed to the last Prophet of Islâm (Allâh is pleased with him).

Nonetheless, the question about whose child Jesus was should have been cleared when he was born. The uncertainty surrounding the question, of whose child Jesus was, could not have been resolved. They must have known after the dream, that Jesus was born as the son of the “Holy Ghost” and not the son of “God” as claimed. Even if it is claimed that the “Holy Ghost” is “God”, then it means that Jesus is the son of both the “Holy Ghost” and “God” the father, as Jesus himself makes the three so that “God” could be one, which is called Trinity. This was what Joseph and Mary must have been aware of, if they had any knowledge of a prophecy. The wise men must have informed them that they had to worship Jesus. Thereby removing any doubt as who Jesus really was. This also in effect meant that they, as his earthly parents, also now had to worship him as he was declared to be “God”. The following illustrates the reason why the above statements are made:

“And when they were come into the house, they saw the young child with Mary his mother, and fell down, and worshipped him...”<sup>47</sup>

Furthermore, if all this is true then the following question must be asked, why, as stated in Luke:

“And when they saw him, they were amazed: and his mother said unto him, Son, why has thou dealt with us? Behold, thy **father** and I saw thee sorrowing.”<sup>48</sup>

---

47 : King James. Matthew 12:11.

48 : King James. Luke 2:48.

Is this not clear proof from the Bible that both Joseph and Mary could not have regarded him as the son of “God” or the son of the “Holy Ghost” (whatever it means), or even part of “God”? It is clear that Mary could not have regarded Jesus to be “God” from his birth.

**The next point made by the ignorant author:**

‘GOD COMMANDED JESUS’ BIRTH – Q 3:47 (Luke 1:31, 35)’ [Page 70]

**We have fully explained 3:47 and it is absolutely clear that the Qur’ân makes no such claim!**

It should be known that Luke was a student of Paul who was a liar!!!

**Luke 1:31:** “You will be with child and give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus.”

**Luke 1:35:** “The angel answered, “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. So the holy one to be born will be called the Son of God.”

Could you please explain to us factually with evidence what an angel is? Similarly we would like also a factual explanation with evidence about what a Holy Spirit is and what are the actual facts concerning the message of Luke 1:35 which one can prove? It seems as if the writer could not make up his mind what to name the child has not helped with the problem at the time!!!

**The next argument:**

‘JESUS’ BIRTH WAS A MIRACLE TO MANKIND – Q 21:91 (Luke 2:8 -20; Matthew 2:1 – 12)’ [Page 70]

**21:91:** “And she who guarded her chastity, so We (i.e. Allâh) advance into her of Our Devine revelation, and made her and her son a sign for the nations.”

Guarding her chastity has nothing to do with a miracle birth. Again, guarding her chastity does not stop a lawful marriage!

They can quote the Bible but what is of utmost importance is the significant facts as reported by the first Church in Christianity as well as the new late comers in the 16<sup>th</sup> century, the Protestants:

**“Bible, Manuscripts of the.** Copies of the biblical text, written by hand. The text of the Bible has been handed down to us through handwritten and printed copies of the original writings and through translations into various ancient and modern languages. **None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist, but there are many ancient copies of the originals”** [*Our emphases*].<sup>49</sup>

The Protestants are forced to agree:

**“Since no autograph of any book of the Bible has survived,** textual criticism plays an important part in Bible study. The material on which textual critics of the Bible work includes not only manuscript copies of the books of the Bible in their original languages but also ancient translations into other languages and quotations of biblical passages by ancient authors” [*Our emphases*].<sup>50</sup>

These two factual submissions make the Bible a paradoxical absurd fictitious book!

In other words the Christians are playing cat and mouse with the people! We will also play cat and mouse by quoting the fictitious Bible:

Luke 2:8-20 “And there were shepherds living out in the fields nearby, keeping watch over their flocks at night. <sup>9</sup>An angel of the Lord appeared to them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were terrified.

---

49 : J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30.  
50 : New Bible Dictionary 1978, p. 151.



<sup>10</sup>But the angel said to them, “Do not be afraid. I bring you good news of great joy that will be for all the people. <sup>11</sup>Today in the town of David a Savior has been born to you; he is Christ the Lord. <sup>12</sup>This will be a sign to you: You will find a baby wrapped in cloths and lying in a manger.”

<sup>13</sup>Suddenly a great company of the heavenly host appeared with the angel, praising God and saying, <sup>14</sup>“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men on whom his favor rests.”

<sup>15</sup>When the angels had left them and gone into heaven, the shepherds said to one another, “Let’s go to Bethlehem and see this thing that has happened, which the Lord has told us about.”

<sup>16</sup>So they hurried off and found Mary and Joseph, and the baby, who was lying in the manger. <sup>17</sup>When they had seen him, they spread the word concerning what had been told them about this child, <sup>18</sup>and all who heard it were amazed at what the shepherds said to them. <sup>19</sup>But Mary treasured up all these things and pondered them in her heart. <sup>20</sup>The shepherds returned, glorifying and praising God for all the things they had heard and seen, which were just as they had been told.”

**Matthew 2:1-12:** <sup>1</sup>After Jesus was born in Bethlehem in Judea, during the time of King Herod, Magi from the east came to Jerusalem <sup>2</sup>and asked, “Where is the one who has been born king of the Jews? We saw his star in the east and have come to worship him.”

<sup>3</sup>When King Herod heard this he was disturbed, and all Jerusalem with him. <sup>4</sup>When he had called together all the people’s chief priests and teachers of the law, he asked them where the Christ was to be born. <sup>5</sup>“In Bethlehem in Judea,” they replied, “for this is what the prophet has written: <sup>6</sup>““But you, Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, are by no means least among the rulers of Judah; for out of you will come a ruler who will be the shepherd of my people Israel.”<sup>[d]</sup>”

<sup>7</sup>Then Herod called the Magi secretly and found out from them the exact time the star had appeared. <sup>8</sup>He sent them to Bethlehem and said, “Go and make a careful search for the child. As soon as you find him, report to me, so that I too may go and worship him.”

<sup>9</sup>After they had heard the king, they went on their way, and the star they had seen in the east<sup>[e]</sup> went ahead of them until it stopped over the place where the child was. <sup>10</sup>When they saw the star, they were overjoyed. <sup>11</sup>On coming to the house, they saw the child with his mother Mary, and they bowed down and worshiped him. Then they opened their treasures and presented him with gifts of gold and of incense and of myrrh. <sup>12</sup>And having been warned in a dream not to go back to Herod, they returned to their country by another route.”

It is well known that the paradoxical fictitious Bible is not in compliance with the undisputed facts of the natural laws relating to human beings!!! So to waste one's time trying to explain the jokes and yarns are neither just worthwhile nor beneficial!!!

**The next argument:**

‘THE DAY OF JESUS’ BIRTH WAS BLESSED – Q 19:33 (Luke 2:10-14)’ [Page 70]

**19:33:** “And peace on me the day I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) was born, and the day I die, and the day I am raised to life.”

Nevertheless, the same was first said about *Yahyâ* before that of ‘Îsâ (Allâh is pleased with both of them):

**19:15:** “And peace on him (i.e. *Yahyâ*) the day he was born and the day he died, and the day he is raised to life!”

This type of blessing is to the normal *modus operandum* of Allâh towards all His messengers! No distinctions as stated in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân time and again.

We wish to state that the Bible is a man-made book but shall quote when needed:-

**Luke 2:10-14:** “<sup>10</sup>But the angel said to them, “Do not be afraid. I bring you good news of great joy that will be for all the people. <sup>11</sup>Today in the town of David a Savior has been born to you; he is Christ the Lord. <sup>12</sup>This will be

a sign to you: You will find a baby wrapped in cloths and lying in a manger.”

<sup>13</sup>Suddenly a great company of the heavenly host appeared with the angel, praising God and saying, <sup>14</sup>“Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace to men on whom his favor rests.”

**The next argument:**

‘JESUS IS THE SON OF MARY (Maryam) – Q 3:36; Q 3:45 (Luke 2:7; Matthew 13:55)’  
[Page 71]

**3:36:** “So when she brought it forth, she said: My *Rabb*, I have brought it forth a female — and Allâh knew best what she brought forth — and the male is not like the female, and I have named it Maryam, **and I commend her and her offspring into Your protection from the accursed shaitân.**”

Surely this is a grievous error, or a devious trick as this verse does refer to ‘Îsâ as the son of Maryam! Yes, the next is correct:

**3:45:** “When the *malâ`ikah* said: O Maryam, surely Allâh gives you good news with a word from Him (of one) whose name is the *Masîh*, ‘Îsâ, son of *Maryam*, worthy of regard in this world and the Hereafter, and of those who are drawn nigh (to Allâh)”

There is nothing sinister about the verse, as all children are the sons or daughters of their mothers! The process of guidance which was meted out to Maryam was definitely very important which gave her a special place in her society! Hence, he was named ‘...the *Masîh*, ‘Îsâ, son of *Maryam*...’.

**Luke 2:7:** “<sup>7</sup>and she gave birth to her firstborn, a son. She wrapped him in cloths and placed him in a manger, because there was no room for them in the inn.”

**Matthew 13:55:** <sup>55</sup>“Isn’t this the carpenter’s son? Isn’t his mother’s name Mary, and aren’t *his brothers James, Joseph, Simon and Judas?*” [our emphases]

**The next argument:**

‘JESUS CONFIRMS HIS OWN LEGITIMACY (IN THE CRADLE) – Q 19:29 (MATTHEW 1:18-25)’ [Page 71]

**19:29:** “But she pointed to him. They said: How should we speak to one who is a child in the cradle?”

This is a *Mutashâbihât* (allegorical) verse, it in no way means that ‘Îsâ was really a baby in the cradle! *This is the normal Eastern manner of speech in relation to one that is much younger than the elders!* The answer ‘Îsâ gave explains this fact to any truthful rational being:

**19:30-32:** “He said: I am indeed a servant of Allâh. He has given me the Book and made me a prophet: And He has made me blessed wherever I may be, and He has enjoined on me prayer and poor-rate so long as I live: And to be kind to my mother; and He has not made me insolent, unblessed.”

**Matthew 1:18-25:** <sup>18</sup>This is how the birth of Jesus Christ came about: His mother Mary was pledged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together, she was found to be with child through the Holy Spirit. <sup>19</sup>Because Joseph her husband was a righteous man and did not want to expose her to public disgrace, he had in mind to divorce her quietly.

<sup>20</sup>But after he had considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, “Joseph son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary home as your wife, because what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit. <sup>21</sup>She will give birth to a son, and you are to give him the name Jesus, because he will save his people from their sins.”

<sup>22</sup>All this took place to fulfill what the Lord had said through the prophet:  
<sup>23</sup>“The virgin will be with child and will give birth to a son, and they will call him Immanuel” —which means, “God with us.”

<sup>24</sup>When Joseph woke up, he did what the angel of the Lord had commanded him and took Mary home as his wife. <sup>25</sup>But he had no union with her until she gave birth to a son. And he gave him the name Jesus.”

**The next argument:**

‘NO MAN HAD TOUCHED MARY WHEN SHE BECAME PREGNANT WITH JESUS –  
 Q 19:20; Q 21:91 (Matthew 1:18)’ [Page 71]

**19:20:** “She said: How can I have a son and no mortal has yet touched me, nor have I been unchaste?”

This verse in no way suggests that she became pregnant without being touched by a man!  
 Only a Christian can see and believe such nonsense!

**21:91:** “And she who guarded her chastity, so We (i.e. Allâh) advance into her of Our Devine revelation, and made her and her son a sign for the nations.”

The same is applicable with this verse as that of the previous one!

**Matthew 1:18:** <sup>18</sup>“This is how the birth of Jesus Christ came about: His mother Mary was pledged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together, she was found to be with child through the Holy Spirit.”

**There is no need for much comment as it is a plain gibberish statement, except to say that Christians believe that a dove can have sex with a women and have a human baby that becomes God’s son!!!**

**The next argument:**

‘GOD SENT HIS SPIRIT TO MARY AND IT TOOK THE FORM OF A MAN – Q 19:27<sup>51</sup>  
(Luke 1:26-35)’ [Page 71]

**19:17:** “So she screened herself from them. Then We sent to her Our *Rûhanâ* (i.e. Divine revelation in *Mutashâbihât* terms) and it appeared to her as a well-made man.”

It was not a *spirit*<sup>52</sup> (whatever a *spirit* may mean, which we rational Muslims do not know) that took on the form of a man. The verse makes it clear: ‘...it appeared to her as a well-made man’- that does not mean that it was a man, as it must have been in a vision! This is the consequence of the term *Rûhanâ* (i.e. Divine revelation in *Mutashâbihât* terms)!!!

**The next argument:**

‘GOD SENT HIS SPIRIT TO GIVE MARY A SINLESS SON – Q 19:19; Q 66:12 (Luke 1:35)’ [Page 71]

**19:19:** “He said: I am only bearer of a message of your *Rabb*: That I will give you a *Ghulâman zakiyyan*.”

According to chapter 19:19 of the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân ‘Îsâ (Allâh is pleased with him) is described as being “GHULÂMÂN ZAKIYYÂ”. Unfortunately Christians misconstrue the expression, by translating it to mean the sinlessness of Jesus. This expression signifies the devotional development of ‘Îsâ as subsequently elucidated.

**Firstly**, the noun “GHULÂM” denotes a “male child...one from the time of his birth until he attains to the period termed “shabâb”, meaning young manhood.”<sup>53</sup>

**Secondly**, the adjective “ZAKIYYÂ” signifies “...one that shall in the future become purified ...or increasing in goodness and righteousness...”<sup>54</sup>

---

51 : We think the poor ignorant Christian means verse 17.

52 : The term *spirit* is a paradoxical absurd pagan term!

53 : Arabic - English Lexicon by E. W. Lane.

54 : *ibid*.

It is therefore clear that the adjectival phrase describes ‘Îsâ (Allâh is pleased with him) as a “GHULÂM” who will develop into a “righteous” person. However, this transformation of ‘Îsâ (Allâh is pleased with him) would encounter the characteristic, which was the natural development of **all** prophets chosen by Allâh to disseminate His Law. What the verse explains is the mortality of ‘Îsâ (Allâh is pleased with him), who like all other prophets was chosen by Allâh. In other words ‘Îsâ (who would appear on the scene) should be regarded as a “GHULÂMÂN” who would eventually become “ZAKIYYÂ” and should not be considered as being immortal and faultless.

**66:12:** “And Maryam, the daughter of ‘Imrân, who guarded her chastity, so We *Nafakha* (advanced) into him of Our *Rûhanâ* (i.e. Divine revelation in *Mutashâbihât* terms), and she accepted the truth of the words of her *Rabb* and His Books, and she was of the obedient ones.”

**Luke 1:35:** “The angel answered, “The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Most High will overshadow you. So the holy one to be born will be called the Son of God.”

The Biblical statement is absurd!!! An invisible pagan spirit and a shadow performing sexual acts with a woman!!!

### **The next argument:**

‘JESUS WAS SENT DOWN FROM HEAVEN - Q 3:53 (Philippians 2:5-8)’ [Page 71]

**3:53:** “Our *Rabb*, we believe in that which You have revealed and we follow the messenger, so write us down with those who bear witness.”

The above verse or any other of the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân will never make such an absurd claim - ‘JESUS WAS SENT DOWN FROM HEAVEN’!

**Philippians 2:5-8:** <sup>5</sup>“Your attitude should be the same as that of Christ Jesus: <sup>6</sup>Who, being in very nature God, did not consider equality with God something to be grasped, <sup>7</sup>but made himself nothing, taking the very nature

of a servant, being made in human likeness. <sup>8</sup>And being found in appearance as a man, he humbled himself and became obedient to death — even death on a cross!”

The statement: ‘...Who, being in very nature God...’ is extremely paradoxical, it is beyond the comprehension of human beings! It falls within the **piggerish gibberish rubbish!!!**

**The next argument:**

‘GOD CREATED JESUS – Q 3:47, BUT ALSO SEE Q 21:91 (MATTHEW 1:18-20)’ [Page 71]

**3:47** “She said: My *Rabb*, how can I have a son and man has not yet touched me? He said: Even so; Allâh creates what He pleases. When He decrees a matter, He only says to it, Be, and it is.”

**21:91**: “And she who guarded her chastity, so We (i.e. Allâh) advance into her of Our Devine revelation, and made her and her son a sign for the nations.”

We have already explained the above verses, however, the stupid absurd insinuation that: ‘GOD CREATED JESUS’ *when he was the result of ordinary procreation caused by a father and a mother as all men!* Everyone and everything was created by Allâh so please do not try and be absurdly stupid! Have you been drinking?

**Matthew 1:18-20**: <sup>18c</sup>“This is how the birth of Jesus Christ came about: His mother Mary was pledged to be married to Joseph, but before they came together, she was found to be with child through the Holy Spirit. <sup>19</sup>Because Joseph her husband was a righteous man and did not want to expose her to public disgrace, he had in mind to divorce her quietly.

<sup>20</sup>But after he had considered this, an angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream and said, “Joseph son of David, do not be afraid to take Mary home as your wife, because what is conceived in her is from the Holy Spirit.”



No truthful sane rational being can accept the above biblical paradoxical gibberish rubbish, it simply makes no sense!!!

**The next argument:**

‘THE CHARACTER OF JESUS:

GOD MADE JESUS AN EXAMPLE TO THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL – Q 43:49 (TIMOTHY 18-20)’ [Page 71]

**43:49:** “And they said: O enchanter, call on your *Rabb* for us, as He has made the covenant with you; we shall surely follow guidance.”

Please note that the above verse relates to *nabî Mûsâ* and not to *nabî ‘Îsâ* (Allâh is pleased with both). The author must have had a few drinks it seems as he quotes the wrong verse.

I think it is 3:49 that all stupid Christians refer to as they have absolutely no knowledge how use the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân. This verse is clearly a *Mutashâbihât* (allegorical) verse! Let us quote the verse again:

**3:49:** “And (make him) a messenger to the Children of Isrâ’îl (saying): I have come to you with a sign from your *Rabb*, that I determine for you out of dust the form of a bird (i.e. out of the people who were of the evil lowly type), then I *nafakha* (advance) into it (i.e. them) and it (i.e. they) becomes (like) a bird (meaning above the transgressors) with Allâh’s permission, and I heal the blind (i.e. those who were blind to the truth) and the leprous (i.e. those who were inflicted with evil inclinations), and bring the dead (i.e. those of whom it was thought that they would never return to the path of truth) to life with Allâh’s permission; and I inform you of what you should eat and what you should store in your houses. Surely there is a sign in this for you, if you are believers.”

**The first important rule that Allâh has made clear, is as follows:**

**30:30:** “So set your face for *dîn* (the way of life as prescribed by Allâh), being upright, the nature made by Allâh in which He has created human beings. ***There is no altering Allâh’s creation.*** That is the right *dîn* (the way of life as prescribed by Allâh) — but most people know not —”

**However, Allâh did leave it at that; Allâh wants that human beings must put it to a test:**

**67:3-4:** “Who (i.e. Allâh) created the seven *samâwât* alike. You see no *tafâwut* (incongruity) in the creation of the Beneficent. Then look again: Can you see any *fuṭûr* (disorder)? Then turn the eye again and again — your look will return to you confused, while it is fatigued.”

It is blasphemous in the extreme to take verse 49 of chapter 3 literally!!! Furthermore, it brings out the utmost stupidity of a person who wants to believe that an ordinary human being can ‘...determine for you out of dust the form of a bird, then I breathe into it and it becomes a bird with Allâh’s permission, and I heal the blind and the leprous, and bring the dead to life with Allâh’s permission...’, the law of Allâh is clear, the words of a *Mutashâbihât* (allegorical) verse cannot be taken literally and outside the guidance of the *Muhkamât* (**decisive**) verses, as only the *Muhkamât* (**decisive**) verses are the *Ummul-Kitâb* (the core of the original foundation of all revelation; the Essence of Allâh’s Will and Law. The basis of the Book and also its protector, hence the ‘*mother of the Book*’)...” Hence, the protectors of the meaning of the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân!!!

Please note that there is no ‘TIMOTHY 18-20’, could it be TIMOTHY 1:8-20? He must have had another few drinks to misquote his own Bible now! That is why Allâh in the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân forbids Muslims to drink. Let us quote the statement by Paul, the untruthful person:

**TIMOTHY 1:8-20:** <sup>8</sup>“We know that the law is good if one uses it properly. <sup>9</sup>We also know that law is made not for the righteous but for lawbreakers and rebels, the ungodly and sinful, the unholy and irreligious; for those who kill their fathers or mothers, for murderers, <sup>10</sup>for adulterers and perverts, for slave traders and liars and perjurers—and for whatever else is contrary to

the sound doctrine <sup>11</sup>that conforms to the glorious gospel of the blessed God, which he entrusted to me.

#### The Lord's Grace to Paul

<sup>12</sup>I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who has given me strength, that he considered me faithful, appointing me to his service. <sup>13</sup>Even though I was once a blasphemer and a persecutor and a violent man, I was shown mercy because I acted in ignorance and unbelief. <sup>14</sup>The grace of our Lord was poured out on me abundantly, along with the faith and love that are in Christ Jesus.

<sup>15</sup>Here is a trustworthy saying that deserves full acceptance: Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners—of whom I am the worst. <sup>16</sup>But for that very reason I was shown mercy so that in me, the worst of sinners, Christ Jesus might display his unlimited patience as an example for those who would believe on him and receive eternal life. <sup>17</sup>Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory for ever and ever. Amen.

<sup>18</sup>Timothy, my son, I give you this instruction in keeping with the prophecies once made about you, so that by following them you may fight the good fight, <sup>19</sup>holding on to faith and a good conscience. Some have rejected these and so have shipwrecked their faith. <sup>20</sup>Among them are Hymenaeus and Alexander, whom I have handed over to Satan to be taught not to blaspheme.”

#### **The next argument:**

‘GOD COMMANDED JESUS TO HONOR HIS MOTHER - Q 19:32 (John 19:26)’ [Page 71]

**19:32:** “And to be kind to my mother; and He has not made me insolent, unblessed.”

**This was the nature of all prophets.**

**19:14:** “And kindly to his (i.e. Yahyâ) parents, and he was not insolent, disobedient.”

**John 19:26:** “<sup>26</sup>And you see and hear how this fellow Paul has convinced and led astray large numbers of people here in Ephesus and in practically the whole province of Asia. He says that man-made gods are no gods at all.”

### **Do you mean that Paul knew they made Jesus (the Greek) a man God?**

The word ‘*blessed*’ only appears twice in John and in 12:13 and 21:29! In any case, what the paradoxical Bible is stating makes no difference, as it is not the words of the Creator; it is the words of evil men! This fact is further supported by the statement in Luke 1:41 where it states: ‘<sup>41</sup>When Elizabeth heard Mary’s greeting, the baby leaped in her womb, and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit.’ The NIV change the word ‘Ghost’ to another pagan term ‘Spirit’.

Please do not try and hide the rudeness of Jesus (the Greek) who said to his mother as recorded in your man made Bible:

“Jesus saith unto her (i.e. his mother) **Woman, what have I to do with thee?** Mine hour is not yet come.” (The Holy Bible in the King James Version – Self-Pronouncing Red Letter Edition. John 2:4). [Our emphases]

In the eastern tradition of those days and still today, this is rudeness in the extreme, but to westerners and drunks it is quite normal.

### **The next argument:**

GOD DID NOT MAKE JESUS PROUD OR REBELLIOUS – Q 19:32 (Mark 7:36)’ [Page 71]

**19:32:** “And to be kind to my mother; and He has not made me insolent, Shaqiyan (unblessed).”

**Mark 7:36:** <sup>36</sup>“Jesus commanded them not to tell anyone. But the more he did so, the more they kept talking about it.”

Please note that I could not find the word ‘REBELLIOUS’ in the New Testament! The word ‘PROUD’ do not appear in connection with Jesus as you insinuated, in the New Testament! The author is now getting dangerously drunk, as he is concocting new words for the Bible. He better stop drinking, please.

**The next argument:**

‘JESUS IS RIGHTEOUS – Q 3:46; Q 6:85 (John 8:46)’ [Page 71]

**3:46:** “And he will speak to the people when in the cradle and when of old age, and (he will be) one of the good ones.”

‘Îsâ throughout the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân is spoken of as “one of those drawn nigh,” “one of the righteous,” thus showing that he is regarded only as one of the prophets. As to speaking in the cradle and when of old age, neither of them can be considered a miracle. Every healthy child who is not dumb begins to talk when in the cradle, and *speaking when of old age* also shows that this speaking is the ordinary experience of every human being who is healthy, and lives to an old age. The good news consists in the fact that the child announced will be a healthy child and shall not die in childhood. According to *Al-Tafsîr al-Kabîr* (Commentary), by Imâm Fakhr al-Dîn Râzî, the reason for mentioning ‘Îsâ speaking in childhood and old age is *to show the change of condition of ‘Îsâ from childhood to old age, while change in the Divine Being is impossible.*

*Kahl* is, according to *Al-Mufradât fî Gharîb al-Qur’ân* (Dictionary of Qur’ân), by Shaikh Abu-l-Qâsim Al-Husain al-Râghib al-Isfahânî, *he in whose hair hoariness or greyness has become intermixed.* *Arabic-English Lexicon* by Edward William Lane has, on the authority of *Al-Misbâh al-Munîr fî Gharîb al-Sharh al-Kabîr* (Dictionary), by Ahmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alî al-Muqrî al-Fayûmî, and *Tâj al-‘Arûs* (Dictionary), by Imâm Muḥibb al-Dîn Abu-l-Faid Murtaḍâ, and *Mughnî al-Labîb* (Grammar), by Al-Shaikh Jamâl al-Dîn ibn Hishâm Al-Ansârî, that a man is *kahl* after he has attained the limit of being a *shâbb*, which is variously fixed at 32, 40 and 51 years. The same authority gives the meaning of *kahl* as of *middle age*,

or *between that age and the period when his hair has become intermixed with hoariness*. It would thus appear that, according to the Arabic Glorious Qur’ân, ‘Îsâ did not die at thirty-three years of age, but lived to a sufficiently old age. (Commentary by M. M. Ali)

**6:85:** “And Zakariyyâ and Yahyâ and ‘Îsâ and Ilyâs; each one (of them) was of the righteous.”

This clearly shows that all of them mentioned in the above verse were on the same level!

**John 8:46:** “Can any of you prove me guilty of sin?”

This verse does not insinuate that Jesus is ‘**RIGHTEOUS**’, - what it reveals is that those to whom he was speaking to, - is that they needed to the ‘**prove**’ that he was guilty of sin. Jesus the Greek might have been a sinner, but they seem not to have any evidence!

**The next argument:**

“JESUS ONLY DID WHAT GOD TOLD HIM TO DO – Q 5:117 (JOHN 14:1, 10)” [Page 71]

**5:117:** “I said to them naught save as You did command me: Serve Allâh, my *Rabb* and your *Rabb*; and I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when You did cause me to die You was the Watcher over them. And You are Witness of all things.”

John 14:1, 10 (New International Version) <sup>1</sup>“Do not let your hearts be troubled. Trust in God; trust also in me. <sup>10</sup>Don’t you believe that I am in the Father, and that the Father is in me? The words I say to you are not just my own. Rather, it is the Father, living in me, who is doing his work.”

We do not think it would be advisable to comment on the above nonsensical words, as .....!

The best would be to quote these three verses so that the subject could become clear:

**5:116:** “And when Allâh will say: O ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, did you say to people, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allâh? He will say: Glory be to You! It was not for me to say what I had no right to (say). If I had said it, You (*i.e. Allâh*) would indeed have known it. You (*i.e. Allâh*) know what is in my mind, and I know not what is in Your (*i.e. Allâh’s*) mind. Surely You are the great Knower of the unseen.”

Let first quote the original Arabic verse of 5:117:

مَا قُلْتُ لَهُمْ إِلَّا مَا أَمَرْتَنِي بِهِ أَنْ أَعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ ۖ وَكُنْتُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا مَّا دُمْتُ فِيهِمْ ۖ فَلَمَّا تَوَفَّيْتَنِي كُنْتُ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ ۖ وَأَنْتَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ ﴿١١٧﴾

**5:117:** “I said to them naught save as You (*i.e. Allâh*) did command me: Serve Allâh, my *Rabb* and your *Rabb*; and I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, *but when You (i.e. Allâh) did cause me to die* You was the Watcher over them. And You (*i.e. Allâh*) are Witness of all things.”

**5:118:** “If You (*i.e. Allâh*) chastise them, surely they are Your (*i.e. Allâh’s*) servants; and if You protect them, surely You (*i.e. Allâh*) are the Mighty, the Wise.”

**5:119:** “Allâh will say: This is a day when their truth will profit the truthful ones. For them are Gardens wherein flow rivers abiding therein forever. Allâh is well pleased with them and they are well pleased with Allâh. That is the mighty achievement.”

**5:120:** “Allâh’s is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth and whatever is in them; and He is Possessor of power over all things.”

\*\*\*\*\*

In order for Christians, and those who do not like what the verse under discussion claims; let us quote Dr. Anis A. Shorosh on the phrase “I cause you to die.”:

## “JESUS DIED

“We come now to one of the most controversial subjects among Muslims and Christians in the entire theological debate. It is necessary to affirm that Surat al-Nisa (Women) 4:157, 158; Surat Maryam (Mary) 19:33; Surat al-Ma'idah (The Table Spread) 5:116, 117; Surat al-Baqarah (The Cow) 2:87; and Surat al-Imran (The Family of 'Imran) 3:55, all support the fact that Jesus truly died.

One of the most crucial statements comes from Surat al-Imran (The Family of 'Imran) 3:55:

(And remember) when Allah said: O Jesus! Lo! I am gathering thee and causing thee to ascend unto Me, and am cleansing thee of those who disbelieve and am setting those who follow thee above those who disbelieve until the Day of Resurrection. Then unto Me ye will (all) return, and I shall judge between you as to that wherein ye used to differ.

إِذْ قَالَ اللَّهُ يٰعِيسَىٰ إِنِّي مُتَوَفِّيكَ وَرَافِعُكَ إِلَيَّ وَمُطَهِّرُكَ مِنَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا وَجَاعِلُ الَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوكَ فَوْقَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا إِلَىٰ يَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ ۗ ثُمَّ إِلَيَّ مَرْجِعُكُمْ فَأَحْكُمُ بَيْنَكُمْ فِيمَا كُنْتُمْ فِيهِ تَخْتَلِفُونَ ﴿٥٥﴾

This phrase in the Arabic language, “Inni mutawaf-feeeka,” is translated as “I am gathering thee.” Some say the word does not indicate death, while others affirm that Christ did actually die. As an Arab, I have never known of any other meaning than death for this expression, within or without the Quran.

The many versions of this phrase by imminent Muslim scholars make its meaning confusing. Some say it refers only to sleep. Al Muthanna relates, “I was told by Ishaq that ‘Inni mutawaffeeeka’ means a death of sleep and God took him in his sleep.” [’18. Iskander Jadeed, *The Cross in the Gospel and Quran* (Rikon, Switzerland: The Good Way, n.d.), 5.]<sup>55</sup>

No Muslim scholar will deny that John the Baptist was born, died, and will be raised up. Here is the Quranic passage in Surat Maryam (Mary) 19:15:

<sup>55</sup>: This is an original footnote.



**Peace on him the day he was born, and the day he dieth and the day he shall be raised alive!**

وَسَلِّمْ عَلَيْهِ يَوْمَ وُلِدَ وَيَوْمَ يَمُوتُ وَيَوْمَ يُبْعَثُ حَيًّا ﴿١٥﴾

However, practically the same wording is given about Jesus in Surah Maryam (Mary) 19:32-34:

And (hath made me) dutiful toward her who bore me, and hath not made me arrogant, unblest. Peace on me the day I was born, and the day I die, and the day I shall be raised alive!

Such was Jesus, son of Mary, (this is) a statement of the truth concerning which they doubt.

وَبِرًّا بِيَوْمِ وُلِدْتِي وَلَمْ تَجْعَلْنِي جَبَّارًا شَقِيًّا ﴿٣٢﴾  
 وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَيَّ يَوْمَ وُلِدْتُ وَيَوْمَ أَمُوتُ وَيَوْمَ أُبْعَثُ حَيًّا ﴿٣٣﴾  
 ذَلِكَ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ ۚ قَوْلَ الْحَقِّ الَّذِي فِيهِ يَمْتَرُونَ ﴿٣٤﴾

Surat al-Ma'idah (The Table Spread) 5:117 says,

**I spake unto them only that which Thou commandedst me, (saying):  
 Worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord. I was a witness of them while I  
 dwelt among them, and when Thou tookest me Thou wast the Watcher over  
 them. Thou art Witness over all things.**

مَا قُلْتُ لَهُمْ إِلَّا مَا أَمَرْتَنِي بِهِ أَنْ أَعْبُدُوا اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبَّكُمْ ۚ وَكُنْتُ عَلَيْهِمْ شَهِيدًا مَّا دُمْتُ فِيهِمْ ۗ  
 فَلَمَّا تَوَفَّيْتَنِي كُنْتُ أَنْتَ الرَّقِيبَ عَلَيْهِمْ ۚ وَأَنْتَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ شَهِيدٌ ﴿١١٧﴾

Al Muthanna says, quoting Abd Allah Ibn Salih, Muawiheh, and Ali Ibn Abbas, that “Inni mutawaffeeka” means “I cause you to die.” [’19 Murdoch 20]<sup>56</sup>

56 : This is an original footnote.

These differences of opinion and contradictions among Muslim scholars ignore the plain truth that is in the New Testament Gospels. There are no contradictions in the Gospels. Every Gospel writer tells in great detail of the death of Christ, His resurrection, and His ascension.” (**Islam Revealed** by Dr. Anis A. Shorrosh pages 96-99)

\*\*\*\*\*

Let us first explain the following verse: The meaning of the words “And when Allâh will say: O ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, did you say to people, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allâh?” This discussion will still take place on the Day of Judgment! The question that will be asked to him is that: “did you say to people, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allâh?” this seems to mean that Allâh is not going to put this question to the apostate Protestants that really appeared to have set their doctrines only in the ninetieth century AD (see the 1881 New Testament of the Protestants), but to the original creators of Christianity! No doubt they take Mary as the mother of God and made under a vote Jesus also a God! We have to continually remind and state that Jesus is not ‘Îsâ (with whom Allâh is pleased); and Jesus must have been a Greek person. The words “He (i.e. ‘Îsâ) will say: Glory be to You (i.e. Allâh)! It was not for me (i.e. ‘Îsâ) to say what I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) had no right to (say). If I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) had said it, You (i.e. Allâh) would indeed have known it. You (i.e. Allâh) know what is in my (i.e. ‘Îsâ) mind, and I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) know not what is in Your (i.e. Allâh’s) mind. Surely You are the great Knower of the unseen” these words any Christian will agree cannot be the words of Jesus! The fact that the Missionary stated: “JESUS ONLY DID WHAT GOD TOLD HIM TO DO” is a blatant lie!!!

**5:116:** “And when Allâh will say: O, son of Maryam, did you say to people, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allâh? He (i.e. ‘Îsâ) will say: Glory be to You! It was not for me (i.e. ‘Îsâ) to say what I had no right to (say). If I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) had said it, You (i.e. Allâh) would indeed have known it. You (i.e. Allâh) know what is in my (i.e. ‘Îsâ) mind, and I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) know not what is in Your (i.e. Allâh’s) mind. Surely You are the great Knower of the unseen.”

The verse upon which the Missionary argued needs also to be clarified:

**5:117:** “I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) said to them naught save as You (i.e. *Allâh*) did command me (i.e. ‘Îsâ): Serve Allâh, my (i.e. ‘Îsâ) *Rabb* and your *Rabb*; and I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) was a witness of them so long as I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) was among them, *but when You (i.e. Allâh) did cause me (i.e. ‘Îsâ) to die* You (i.e. *Allâh*) was the Watcher over them. And You (i.e. *Allâh*) are Witness of all things.”

The first part of the verse makes clear that ‘Îsâ the messenger of Allâh never gave a message as contained in the New Testament! Then the words “...and I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) was a witness of them so long as I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) was among them, *but when You (i.e. Allâh) did cause me (i.e. ‘Îsâ) to die* You (i.e. *Allâh*) was the Watcher over them...” and according to the well detail exposition given by the Missionary Dr. Anis A. Shorrosh on the phrase “I cause you to die” makes it abundantly clear that at this point in time nabî ‘Îsâ is dead!!! For those who believe that ‘Îsâ is Jesus the Son of God, then they must concur with the Missionary Dr. Anis A. Shorrosh that at this point in time Jesus the Son of God is dead!!! In any case he was only a mortal like all of us!!!! Finito!!!

**The next arguments are under the heading:**

“THE DEATH OF JESUS:

PEOPLE PLOTTED AGAINST JESUS – Q 3:54 (John 12:10)” [Page 71]

**3:54:** “And (the Jews) planned and Allâh (also) planned. And Allâh is the best of planners.”

Referring to the verse which the Missionary Dr. Anis A. Shorrosh informed us to ponder over; assures us that *no one will succeed to kill ‘Îsâ by any unnatural manner:*

**3:55:** “When Allâh said: O ‘Îsâ, *I (i.e. Allâh) will cause you to die* and exalt you in My (i.e. Allâh) presence and clear you of those who disbelieve and make those who follow you above those who disbelieve to the day of Resurrection. Then to Me (i.e. Allâh) is your (i.e. ‘Îsâ) return, so I (i.e. Allâh) shall decide between you concerning that wherein you differ.”

We thank the Missionary Dr. Anis A. Shorrosh in helping us to bring Christians to their senses!!! It was for the above reason that the: ‘PEOPLE PLOTTED AGAINST JESUS’ did not succeed!!!

We shall quote not only John 12:10 but from verse 9-11 in order that everyone may understand:

**John 12:9-11 (New International Version):** “<sup>9</sup>Meanwhile a large crowd of Jews found out that Jesus was there and came, not only because of him but also to see Lazarus, whom he had raised from the dead. <sup>10</sup>So the chief priests made plans to kill Lazarus as well, <sup>11</sup>for on account of him many of the Jews were going over to Jesus and putting their faith in him.”

Should the words: “...whom he had raised from the dead...” of the fabricated New Testament been the truth, and then there would have been no reason for the crucifixion!!! No sane person who could witness the raising of a dead person back to life, irrespective who is performing the miracle will ever go against such a person who performed the impossible!!!

#### **The next argument:**

“GOD CAN DO ANYTHING HE WANTS TO – EVEN ALLOW JESUS TO DIE – Q 5:17 (Luke 1:37)” [Page 71]

**5:17:** “They indeed disbelieve who say: Surely, Allâh — He is the Masîh, son of Maryam. Say; Who then could control anything as against Allâh when He wished to destroy the Masîh, son of Maryam, and his mother and all those on the earth? And Allâh’s is the kingdom of the *samâwât*<sup>57</sup> and the

---

57 : The word *Samâ’* (singular) means according to the Arabic-English Lexicon by E. W. Lane: “the higher, or highest, or uppermost, part of anything....Er-Râghib says that the *Samâ’* as opposed to the *’ard* is fem., and sometimes masc. ...” According to the *Tâj al-’Arûs* it is also the: “*Canopy of the earth.*” Hence, *As-samâwât* (plural) ought to include the known and the unknown parts which comprise the English word universe. It means more than just the heavens. The word ‘heaven’ is also regarded as a place where God and the angels live. This is rejected in Islâm, as Allâh does not occupy a place. The English word ‘universe’ which means the entire universe including the earth, cannot be applicable in this instance. The reason for this is that the words *wal’ard* (and the earth) [in most cases] indicates that the earth is excluded from the word *As-samâwât*. It could be that the Arabic word may have some other meanings. The words *wal’ard* may have been used as one can examine or

earth and what is between them. He creates what He pleases. And Allâh is Possessor of power over all things.”

The verse does not say that Allâh “...CAN DO ANYTHING HE WANTS TO...” hence the claim nonsensical!!! The author is now eating pork<sup>58</sup>, which affects the mind even more!

**Luke 1:37 (New International Version):** <sup>37</sup>“For nothing is impossible with God.””

The above verse was concocted by the fabricators of the New Testament! Does it also mean that God eats drinks and ‘farts in musical fashion’? [Isaiah 16-11]

#### **The next argument:**

“JESUS INTERCEDES WITH GOD ACCORDING TO GOD’S WILL – Q 2:255 (1 TIMOTHY 2:5; HEBREWS 7:25; ROMANS 8:27, 34)” [Page 73]

**2:255:** “Allâh — there is no deity but He (i.e. Allâh), the Ever-living, the Self-subsisting by Whom (i.e. Allâh) all subsist. Slumber overtakes Him (i.e. Allâh) not, nor sleeps. To Him (i.e. Allâh) belongs whatever is in the *samâwât* and whatever is in the earth. Who is he that can intercede with Him (i.e. Allâh) but by His (i.e. Allâh’s) permission? He (i.e. Allâh) knows what is before them and what is behind them. And they (including ‘Îsâ) encompass nothing of His knowledge except what He (i.e. Allâh) pleases. His (i.e. Allâh) knowledge extends over the *samâwât* and the earth, and the preservation of them both tires Him (i.e. Allâh) not. And He (i.e. Allâh) is the Most High, the Great.”

---

understand some of the secrets or rather the order of some of the earth’s components. Most of the universe excluding the earth cannot be examined right now or right from the time the verse was revealed. *As-samâwât* could also refer to the many solar systems. [Please note that the English word ‘heavens’ is not the equivalent of *samâwât* - according to the English dictionary one ought to understand the ‘heavens’ to mean the abodes of God and the angels, although it also means: “the firmament surrounding the earth”].

<sup>58</sup> **Pork:** flesh of swine, - best scavenger; eats its own excreta as well as other animals, body nourished by same-filthiest of all animals — flesh scientifically proven to be unhealthy and dangerous for humans to consume, as ‘it is second had shit’, - damages the brain and intestines.

This verse in no way states: “JESUS INTERCEDES WITH GOD ACCORDING TO GOD’S WILL”, even if one wants to argue that by inference it means so, the fact remains the verse makes no such claim! We had enough of the man-made Bible and there is no need to comment on its verses anymore:

### TRUTH REVEALED

We are now going to reveal as to why we cannot even try to use the New Testament or even the Old Testament! The facts are as follow:

The following claim made by the creators of Christianity is a devastating attack against the New Testament! In fact the consequence is such that no Christian of any denomination may claim that any statement in the New Testament comes from Jesus! To say: ‘Jesus said’ or even to say that ‘the words contained in the Red letter Bible are the words of Jesus’; is in fact a blatant lie!!! :-

According to the Virtues Catholic Bible (1959), the language of Jesus is said to be Aramaic, which was the spoken language in Galilee at that time.<sup>59</sup> If this is so then the Essenes could also have spoken Aramaic, as Jesus grew up amongst them in his boyhood years.<sup>60</sup> Already, one can see that much confusion exists about the mother tongue language of Jesus, since “...no contemporary literary remains of this dialect, [Aramaic remains] we cannot **determine precisely the dialect He (Jesus) spoke**” [our emphases and insertion].<sup>61</sup> At this point, we would emphasise that the fact that Jesus’ dialect of Aramaic is unknown, one can already realise the daunting task the Textual Critics face in completing the NT, which at this point in time remains a “vast and unfinished” task. In fact this is what they have said:

“Thus the task of New Testament textual criticism is vast and unfinished.”

[New Bible Dictionary First Edition, 1978, p. 1269]

The fable concerning the birth of Jesus Christ as contained in Mathew should be rejected as an irrational lie that was fabricated:

---

59 : J. P. O’Connell, et al. The Holy Family Bible Holy Family Edition of the Catholic Bible, from a Practical Dictionary of Biblical and General Catholic Information, Virtue and Company Limited: London, 1959, p. 30 - hereafter the following abbreviation will be used: C.B.

60 : See Peake 1962, p. 734:639h.

61 : C.B., p. 30.

“It is true that this Gospel was largely dependent upon an earlier Aramaic writing, which tradition assures us was composed by St. Matthew. **But this work of St. Matthew no longer exists**, and the Gospel which now bears the name of Matthew was written in Greek and based on the work of St. Mark.”<sup>62</sup> (*Our emphases*)

**Al-Qur’ân 2:42: “And mix not up truth with falsehood, nor hide the truth while you know.”**

\*\*\*\*\*

**The following are all submissions made by the most authoritative Christian authorities whom no one has the right to oppose!**

The following two submissions make it abundantly clear that whatever is contained in any book of the Bible irrespective what version it may be, is an absurd foolish evil fabrication:

*“Since no autograph of any book of the Bible has survived, textual criticism plays an important part in Bible study. The material on which textual critics of the Bible work includes not only manuscript copies of the books of the Bible in their original languages but also ancient translations into other languages and quotations of biblical passages by ancient authors.”* (New Bible Dictionary First Edition, 1978, p. 151 and in the 2<sup>nd</sup> edition 1988, page 140.) (*Our emphases*)

**“Bible, Manuscripts of the.** Copies of the biblical text, written by hand. The text of the Bible has been handed down to us through handwritten and printed copies of the original writings and through translations into various ancient and modern languages. **None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist, but there are many ancient copies of the originals”** [*Our emphases*].<sup>63</sup>

---

62 : Virtue’s Catholic Encyclopaedia. 1965. Volume one, page 141.

63 : C.B., p. 30.

The phrase “**None of the original manuscripts written by the inspired authors themselves (autographs) is known to exist, but there are many ancient copies of the originals**” brings out that the Bible was constructed from evil men’s own ideas!!! We do not need to quote the information that the Old Testament only dates from 916 A.D.!

A study of Textual Criticism is necessary to understand the significance and impact with the most recent information at hand, namely the Dead Sea Scrolls, had on Biblical history and understanding. The Catholics explained it as follows:

“The science that seeks to determine as **nearly** as possible the original biblical text as it was written by the authors themselves. This science applies to other literature besides the Bible, for example, to the Latin classics such as the works of Horace or Cicero, or to the plays of Shakespeare. In each case, all the available evidence is gathered to determine the history of the transmission of the text, and then compared **to establish what seems to be the original text**. There are two kinds of evidence which the textual critic uses in order to determine the text: external (documents) and internal (conjecture). As regards external evidence for both the Old and New Testaments, there are thousands of Hebrew and Greek manuscripts which have been preserved through the centuries. Besides, there are many copies of the old translations of the Bible, such as the **Greek Septuagint**, the **Latin Vulgate**, and the **Syriac Peshitto**. All these versions are important because they tell us about **the state of the biblical text at a time not long after the original text was written**. Hence the textual critic must master all these Languages in order to use these sources, and then by comparison of text and translations he strives to reach the original reading. Some parts of the Bible have been corrupted (i.e., the original reading has been lost) during the course of its history. **If the corruption occurred very early, it may be impossible for the textual critic to arrive at the original by use of documents**. Then he must resort to conjecture: taking into account the context, and various possibilities of error in the script, he strives to restore the text as he conceives it was originally written. For example: “Return, O Lord, you who



ride upon the clouds,” in Numbers 10:36 is a conjectural emendation of a corrupt Hebrew text. While the substantial integrity of biblical text has been preserved by the providence of God; **there is still a place for textual criticism**, as the Church recognizes. In the *Divino afflante Spiritu...* Pope Pius XII said that the art of textual criticism is “quite rightly employed in the case of the sacred books...to ensure that the sacred text be restored, as perfectly as possible, and be purified from the corruptions due to the carelessness of the copyists...” [*Our emphases*]<sup>64</sup>

In essence, Textual Criticism forms the basis of Biblical establishment and compilation. From the aforementioned, we deduce that the authors or Textual Critics mastered the languages of copies or at least translated copies of an unknown Bible. What pertinence can be embodied in the works of the Textual Critics if no knowledge about the original text exists? Is it possible to accredit constructive significance to a text, which is said to be **near** to the original without the latter being available? **Since when can a piece of work based on a copy of some book, which is claimed to be a copy of the lost original in translated form, project valid support in favour of the meaning of the original?** It is strange to refer to the term “corrupted” as “the original reading has been lost,” again imply that corruption became due to “carelessness of the copyists.” The corruption could only be due to the reproduction of verses, which were non-existent.

For example, in the N.I.V., a corrupted portion of the text in Numbers 10:36 can be identified: “*Return, O Lord, to the countless thousands of Israel.*” The authors of the N.I.V. provide no support that this verse was created through Textual Criticism. On the contrary this sentence was plagiarised from the translated copy, i.e. the text from which the verse was written down. The Catholics conceded that this conjectural emendation of this corrupt Hebrew text is unacceptable. However, it is not as the Pope stated, that textual criticism can restore a text which was corrupted due to the carelessness of the copyist; because he does not know what the contents of the original text was comprised of. Therefore, it is wrong to assume that it was copied wrongly. The Catholic Bible presents the verse as follows:

“...Return, O Lord, to the multitude of the host of Israel.”

---

64 : C.B., pp. 242-243.

Hence, we deduce that the original text is missing and that the copyists were careless in recording the verse.

The following information is a devastating blow to the Protestants, it makes them the newest religion in the world; dating in reality only from the nineteenth century; in any case they are apostates, is it not true? :-

**“1. A revision of the Greek text was the necessary foundation of our work; but it did not fall within our province to construct a continuous and complete Greek text. In many cases the English rendering was considered to represent correctly either of two competing readings in the Greek, and then the question of the text was usually not raised. A sufficiently laborious task remained in deciding between the rival claims of various readings which might properly affect the translation. When these were adjusted our deviations from the text presumed to underlie the Authorised Version had next to be indicated, in accordance with the fourth rule; but it proved inconvenient to record them in the margin. A better mode however of giving them publicity has been found, as the University Presses have undertaken to print them in connexion with complete Greek texts of the New Testament. In regard of the readings thus approved, it may be observed that the fourth rule, by requiring that ‘the text to be adopted’ should be ‘that for which the evidence is decidedly preponderating,’ was in effect an instruction to follow the authority of documentary evidence without deference to any printed text of modern times, and therefore to employ the resources of criticism for estimating the value of evidence. Textual criticism, as applied to the Greek New Testament, forms a special study of much intricacy and difficulty, and even now leaves room for considerable variety of opinion among competent critics. Different schools of criticism have been represented among us, and have together contributed to the final result. In the early part of the work every**

various reading requiring consideration was discussed and *voted on by the Company*.<sup>65</sup> (*Our emphases*)

**It is not even necessary to expose the fact that the NIV Bible has fewer verses than the 1881 New Testament!**

After a *meticulous contemplation of the Christian's own submission*, one comes to realise that the reason as to why the Bible contains *extremely absurd lies* which the followers of the Bible term *miracles* is simply the result of *man-made concoctions* created by the pagans!!! Their lies cannot be supported by any truthful means!!!

\*\*\*\*\*

**The next argument:**

“GOD SAID TO JESUS THAT HE WOULD MAKE HIM DIE – Q 3:55 (Mark 14:36)”  
[Page 72]

**3:55:** “When Allâh said: O ‘Îsâ, *I (i.e. Allâh) will cause you to die* and exalt you in My (i.e. Allâh) presence and clear you of those who disbelieve and make those who follow you above those who disbelieve to the day of Resurrection. Then to Me (i.e. Allâh) is your (i.e. ‘Îsâ) return, so I (i.e. Allâh) shall decide between you concerning that wherein you differ.”

The words: “When Allâh said: O ‘Îsâ, *I (i.e. Allâh) will cause you to die* and exalt you in My (i.e. Allâh) presence and clear you [of the lies imputed to you] of those who disbelieve and make those who follow you above those who disbelieve to the day of Resurrection” do not say what the foolish author is suggesting! It only means that ‘Îsâ will not die at the hands of anyone else except by Allâh’s natural means!!!

---

65 : The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ Translated out of the Greek: being the version set forth A.D. 1611 Compared with the most ancient Authorities and revised A.D. 1881. Printed for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge – Cambridge at the University\* Press 1881 Page xii.

**Mark 14 (New International Version)** <sup>36</sup>“Abba, Father,” he said, “Everything is possible for you. Take this cup from me. Yet not what I will, but what you will.”

Please stop making foolish jokes, the words does not come near to what you are so foolishly claiming: “GOD SAID TO JESUS THAT HE WOULD MAKE HIM DIE – Q 3:55 (Mark 14:36)”

**The next argument:**

“WHEN GOD MADE CHRIST DIE, GOD HIMSELF BECAME THE OVER-SEER - Q 5:117 (JOHN 17:14)” [Page 72]

The statement in itself is an ignorant claim!!! How the hell could *Jesus the Greek* have been “THE OVER-SEER” of everything, when he did not have any knowledge of the seasons? If Jesus the Greek was in power to be “THE OVER-SEER” of everything when did God take away the power from him? For God sake please use your intellect and leave the bottle for a while to get sober when analysing Q 5:117:

**5:117:** “I said to them naught save as You did command me: Serve Allâh, my *Rabb* and your *Rabb*; and I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when You did cause me to die You was the Watcher over them. And You are Witness of all things.”

Let us do the analysis of for you, as you are ‘*drunk with wine*’ and you seem not to have the capacity to understand! The words: “I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) said to them naught save as You (i.e. Allâh) did command me (i.e. ‘Îsâ)” this command was given during the time period when ‘Îsâ was alive! This fact can be verified from the words “Serve Allâh, my *Rabb* and your *Rabb*; and I was a witness of them ***so long as I was among them***”; however, “but when You (i.e. Allâh) did cause me (i.e. ‘Îsâ) to die, You (i.e. Allâh) was the Watcher over them. And You (i.e. Allâh) are Witness of all things.” If you only you could become a rational being then you will clearly see that at this point the verse reveals that ‘Îsâ is dead!!! This discussion of the verse will only take place on Judgment Day. The reason for the revelation of 5:117 is to inform everyone that ‘Îsâ has died a natural death and no CRUCI-FICTION took place!!!

The words of JOHN 17:14 have nothing to do with the subject as presented by you! In fact it is rather a nonsensical statement!

**The next argument:**

“JESUS WAS ONE OF THE MESSENGERS WHO WAS KILLED BY ISRAEL - Q 2:87; Q 5:70 (ACTS 7:52; LUKE 11:49)” [Page 72]

**2:87:** “And We indeed gave Mûsâ the Book and We sent messengers after him one after another; and We gave ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, clear arguments and strengthened him with the *rûh al-qudus* (divine revelation). Is it then that whenever there came to you a messenger with what your *nafs* (inner-self) desired not, you were arrogant? And some you gave the lie to and others you would slay.”

Your cockeyed understanding of the verse is absurd!!! Let us have a look at your next reference: [You are a real drunkard, as you don't want to give up the bottle- please call A.A]

**5:70:** “Certainly We made a covenant with the Children of Isrâ’îl and We sent to them messengers. Whenever a messenger came to them with that which their *nafs* (inner-self) desired not, some (of them) they called liars and some they (even) sought to kill.”

Is it ignorance or is it blatant disrespect for the truth? Any sane person ought to be able to understand that the verse in no way insinuates what you are trying to do!!! Please do that to your man made Bible as your forebears did, to revise and add and subtract, but don't try your luck with the only Divine Book in the World!

The **Arabic** Glorious Qur’ân has made it abundantly clear that Allâh will cause ‘Îsâ to die a natural death, and not by any other means!!! The rest of your argument we have dumped in the bin!

**The next argument:**

“THE JEWS KILLED JESUS AND OTHER PROPHETS - Q 2:91 (ACTS 2:36; 3:15; 4:10; 5:30)” [Page 72]

**2:91:** “And when it is said to *them*, Believe in that which Allâh has revealed, they say: We believe in that which was revealed to us. And they deny what is besides that, while it is the Truth verifying that which they have. Say: Why then did you kill Allâh’s prophets before (this) if you were believers?”

Reading the above verse without the context in mind, one would not be able to identify to whom the pronoun “*them*” is referring to. In verse 83 it is made clear that Allâh is referring to the ‘*Children of Isrâ’îl*’ and not the pig eating Jews! One must have knowledge that the Jews are the offspring of two pagan nations, the Greeks and Romans [also pig eaters] who raped the women of the Children of Isrâ’îl whose illegitimate children eventually became known as Jews! By virtue of this fact the Children of Isrâ’îl cannot be accused of killing ‘Îsâ, as during his period the Jews were mainly his enemies; yes, they tried their best, but they did not succeed in overpowering Allâh’s promise made to ‘Îsâ! In fact the verse has no relationship with what you are insinuating! The rest went into the bin!

**The next argument:**

“THE JEWS THEMSELVES DID NOT KILL OR CRUCIFY CHRIST - Q 4:157 (LUKE 23:24-25)” [Page 72]

**4:157:** “And for their saying: We have killed the Masîh, ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, the messenger of Allâh, and they killed him not, nor did they cause his death on the cross, but he was made to *appear* to them as such. And certainly those who differ therein are in doubt about it. They have no knowledge about it, but only follow a *conjecture*, and they killed him not for certain.”

Firstly, it is a lie to state: “THE JEWS KILLED JESUS AND OTHER PROPHETS...” and then to claim: “THE JEWS THEMSELVES DID NOT KILL OR CRUCIFY CHRIST...”!

Secondly, the cock and bull the Bible writers wrote about the crucifixion are contradicted by their own nonsense when they claim that he rose from the dead, what *rubbish!!!* You know where the rest of your argument went! And from there to the pig sty.

**The next argument:**

“THEIR KILLERS AND CHRIST’S KILLERS WEREN’T THE ACTUAL KILLERS BECAUSE GOD KILLED THEM - Q 8:17, BUT ALSO SEE Q 4:157, 158 (ACTS 2:23)”

[Page 72]

**8:17:** “So you (i.e. Muḥammad) slew them not but Allāh slew them, and you (i.e. Muḥammad) smote not when you (i.e. Muḥammad) did smite (the enemy), but Allāh smote (him), and that He might confer upon the believers a Benefit from Himself. Surely Allāh is Hearing, Knowing.”

Please be honest, were you under the influence of excessive holy communion when you selected the above verse for your nonsensical argument? Or maybe you were eating human dead flesh<sup>66</sup>? The above verse relates to the Holy Prophet Muḥammad’s battle at Badr! It has nothing to do with ‘Īsā! To try and link 4:157 and verse 158 to a supposed killing that never took place, is reaching the height of madness!!! You know what we do with the biblical argument and why!!!

**The next argument:**

“CHRIST WAS DEAD AND GOD RAISED HIM - Q 6:122 (ROMANS 6:4-11)” [Page 72]

**6:122:** “Is he (any person) who was dead, then We raised him to life and made for him a light by which he walks among the people, like him whose likeness is that of one in darkness whence he cannot come forth? Thus their doings are made fair seeming to the disbelievers.”

---

<sup>66</sup> Deut: 28-53; 57; 2 Kings 6-28,29

Let us humor this Missionary. In order for us to agree that this verse (Allâh forbids) refers to Christ (whoever he was), then the Missionary must first agree that Christ was a polytheist, in other words a stupid pagan! The rest went to the bin and from there...!

**The next argument:**

“THE DAY JESUS DIED WAS BLESSED - Q 19:33 (LUKE 2:10-14)”

[Page 72]

وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَيَّ يَوْمَ وُلِدْتُ وَيَوْمَ أَمُوتُ وَيَوْمَ أُبْعَثُ حَيًّا

**19:33:** “And peace (i.e. the peace of Allâh) on me (i.e. ‘Îsâ) the day I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) was born, and the day I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) die, and the day I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) am raised to life.”

What is the Missionary trying to do? Where did he find the words: “THE DAY JESUS DIED WAS BLESSED”? You know what we do next; we dump it in the bin!

**The next arguments under the heading:**

“JESUS BEING EXALTED:

JESUS IS THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAST DAYS – Q 43:61 (LUKE 21:25-28; 17:30)”

[page 72]

**43:57-67:** “And when the son of Maryam is mentioned as an example, lo! Your people raise a clamour thereat. And they say: Are our deities better, or is he? They set it forth to you only by way of disputation. Nay, they are a contentious people. He (i.e. ‘Îsâ) was naught but a servant on whom We (i.e. Allâh) bestowed favour and We (i.e. Allâh) made him (i.e. ‘Îsâ) an example for the Children of Isrâ’îl; And if We (i.e. Allâh) pleased, We (i.e. Allâh) could make among you *malâ’ikah* (i.e. transforming the forces of Allâh into mortal vicegerents) to be (Our) vicegerents in the land. And this (**revelation**) is surely knowledge of the Hour, so have no doubt about it and follow me. This is the right path. And let not the *shaitân* (i.e. evil



inclinations) hinder you; surely he (i.e. the *shaitân* which are your own evil inclinations) is your open enemy. And when ‘Îsâ came with clear *arguments*, he said: I have come to you indeed with wisdom, and to make clear to you some of that about which you differ. So keep your duty to Allâh and obey me. Surely Allâh is my *Rabb* and your *Rabb*, so serve Him. This is the right path. But parties among them differed, so woe to those who did wrong for the chastisement of a painful day! Wait they for aught but the Hour - that it should come on them all of a sudden, while they perceive not? Friends on that day will be foes one to another, except those who keep their duty.”

If one is truthful, rational, sober and sane and gives up being a drunkard and cannibal then there ought to be no problem understanding the message!!! The concoctions must go into the bin and then....

**The next argument:**

“THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAST DAYS IS GOD’S – Q 41:47; Q 43:61 (MATTHEW 24:36)” [Page 72]

**41:47:** “To Him (i.e. Allâh) is referred the knowledge of the Hour. And no fruit comes forth from its coverings, nor does a female bear or bring forth but with His (i.e. Allâh) knowledge. And on the day when He (i.e. Allâh) calls out to them: Where are My (i.e. Allâh) associates? They will say: We declare to You (i.e. Allâh), not one of us can bear witness.”

We have already quoted 43:61. Jesus the Greek of the fabricated New Testament had no knowledge of the seasons, (refer to fig tree in the Bible) how the devil could one claim: “JESUS IS THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAST DAYS”? The rest goes to the bin.

**The next argument:**

“THE KNOWLEDGE OF THE LAST IS GOD’S – Q 41:47; Q 43:61 (MATTHEW 24:36)” [Page 72]

**41:47:** “To Him is referred the knowledge of the Hour (to the end of time). And no fruit comes forth from its coverings, nor does a female bear or bring forth but with His knowledge. And on the day when He calls out to them: Where are My associates? They will say: We declare to You, not one of us can bear witness.”

**43:61:** “And this (revelation) is surely knowledge of the Hour (i.e. the departure of prophethood from the Children of Isrâ’îl), so have no doubt about it and follow me. This is the right path.”

If Jesus was also God then Matthew would never have contained a verse like “(MATTHEW 24:36)”!!!

**The next argument:**

“GOD AIDED JESUS WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT – Q 2:87; Q 2:252; Q 5:110 (1 Peter 1:2; Matthew 4:1; 12:18; Luke 4:18)” [Page 72]

**2:87** And We indeed gave Mûsâ the Book and We sent messengers after him one after another; and We gave ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, clear arguments and strengthened him with the *rûh il-qudus* (divine revelation). Is it then that whenever there came to you a messenger with what your *nafs* (inner-self) desired not, you were arrogant? And some you gave the lie to and others you would slay.

**2:253** “We have made some of these messengers to excel others. Among them are they to whom Allâh spoke, and some of them He exalted by (many) degrees of rank. And We gave clear arguments to ‘Îsâ son of Maryam, and strengthened him with the *rûh-ul-qudus*. And if Allâh had pleased, those after them would not have fought one with another after clear arguments had come to them, but they disagreed; so some of them believed and some of them denied. And if Allâh had pleased they would not have fought one with another, but Allâh does what He intends.”

One must remember that the following verse is not a decisive verse, it is an allegorical verse; **therefore none of the words should ever be taken literally!**

**5:110** “When Allâh will say: O ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, remember My favour to you and to your mother, when I strengthened you with the (My) Divine revelation; you spoke to people in the cradle and in old age, and when I taught you the Book and the Wisdom and the *Taurât* and the *Injîl*, and when you did determine out of clay (i.e. people who seemed to be doomed) a thing like it (i.e. knowledge) and it (i.e. the people to) became like a bird by My permission, then you did *tanfukhu* (advance) into (them a new state of mind) by My permission; and you did heal the blind (i.e. those who were blind to the truth) and the leprous (i.e. those who were inflicted with evil inclinations) by My permission; and when you did raise the dead (i.e. those of whom it was thought that they would never return to the path of truth) by My permission; and when I withheld the Children of Isrâ’îl from you when you came to them with clear arguments — but those of them who disbelieved said: This is nothing but clear enchantment.”

We are sorry; as it is futile to use the nonsensical reconstructed man-made Bible which conveys nothing but nonsense!!! Consequently, we will not even quote such verses!

**The next argument:**

“JOHN THE BAPTIST (YAHYA) TESTIFIED OF JESUS - Q 3:39 (JOHN 1:29-34)” [Page 72]

**3:39** “So the *Malâ’ikah* (the *medium* with which Allâh communicates and interacts with human beings) called to him (i.e. Zakariyyâ) as he stood praying in the sanctuary: Allâh gives you the good news of *Yahyâ*, verifying a word from Allâh, and honourable and chaste and a prophet from among the good ones.”

**Why do you love to misconstrue the Qur'an? Is it ingrained in you because you are a Christian missionary? Surely that must be the reason!**

**The next argument:**

“GOD PREFERRED JESUS ABOVE THE OTHER MESSENGERS – Q 2:253 (HEBREWS 1:1 – 3; MATTHEW 21:33 – 41) [Page 72]

**2:253** “We have made some of these messengers to excel others. Among them are they to whom Allâh spoke (i.e. in Mutashâbihât terms), and some of them He exalted by (many) degrees of rank. And We gave clear arguments to ‘Îsâ son of Maryam, and strengthened him with the *ruh-il-qudus* (Divine Revelation). And if Allâh had pleased, those after them would not have fought one with another after clear arguments had come to them, but they disagreed; so some of them believed and some of them denied. And if Allâh had pleased they would not have fought one with another, but Allâh does what He intends.”

**Where does it say that Allah preferred ‘Îsâ above the other messengers you lying rascal?**

**The next argument:**

“JESUS PRONOUNCED PEACE UPON HIMSELF – Q 19:33 (JOHN 13:13 – 17) [Page 72]

**19:33:** “And peace (i.e. the peace of Allâh) on me (i.e. ‘Îsâ) the day I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) was born, and the day I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) die, and the day I (i.e. ‘Îsâ) am raised to life.”

The Biblical verse is unrelated to which you refer you liar!

**The next argument:**

“JESUS INTERCEDES WITH GOD ACCORDING TO GOD’S WILL – Q 2:255 (TIMOTHY 2:5; HEBREWS 7:25; ROMANS 8:27, 34)” [Page 73]

**2:255** “Allâh — there is no deity but He, the Ever-living, the Self-subsisting by Whom all subsist. Slumber overtakes Him not, nor sleep. To Him belongs whatever is in the *samâwât* and whatever is in the earth. Who is he that can intercede with Him but by His permission? He knows what is before them and what is behind them. And they encompass nothing of His knowledge except what He pleases. His knowledge extends over the *samâwât* and the earth, and the preservation of them both tires Him not. And He is the Most High, the Great.”

Why do you keep on insinuating things that the Qur’ân does not say? Is it a fundamental principle of Christianity to misconstrue other people’s Divine Books? Your Biblical quotations you know what to do with it by now!

**The next argument:**

“GOD EXALTED JESUS – Q 2:253 (PHILIPPIANS 2:9)” [Page 73]

**2:253** “We have made some of these messengers to excel others. Among them are they to whom Allâh spoke, and some of them He exalted by (many) degrees of rank. And We gave clear arguments to ‘Îsâ son of Maryam, and strengthened him with the *rûh-ul-qudus*. And if Allâh had pleased, those after them would not have fought one with another after clear arguments had come to them, but they disagreed; so some of them believed and some of them denied. And if Allâh had pleased they would not have fought one with another, but Allâh does what He intends.”

Stop riding a dead donkey! Try the one Balaam had, which could at least speak to him. Numbers 22-27/30

**The next argument:**

“JESUS IS DISTINGUISHED IN THE WORLD – Q 3:45 (JOHN 5:22)” [Page 73]

**3:45** “When the *malâ’ikah* said: O Maryam, surely Allâh gives you good news with a word from Him (of one) whose name is the *Masîh*, ‘*Îsâ*, son of *Maryam*, worthy of regard in this world and the Hereafter, and of those who are drawn nigh (to Allâh).”

This principle applies to all the prophets of Allâh as it is stated time and again in the only Divine Book in the world! There is no need to even consider the Biblical verses, as it teaches that a dove could have a climax with a woman and have God’s son!

**The next argument:**

“JESUS IS NEAR TO GOD – Q 3:45 (JOHN 14: 7-9)” [Page 73]

**3:45** “When the *malâ’ikah* said: O Maryam, surely Allâh gives you good news with a word from Him (of one) whose name is the *Masîh*, ‘*Îsâ*, son of *Maryam*, worthy of regard in this world and the Hereafter, and of those who are drawn nigh (to Allâh)”

In Islam Allah does not occupy a place. He is not comprehensible, unlike the pagan ideology of the Christians.

**The next argument:**

“JESUS IS BLESSED – Q 43:61, SEE ALSO Q 43:85 (MATTHEW 21:9)” [Page 73]

**43:61** “And this (revelation) is surely knowledge of the Hour, so have no doubt about it and follow me. This is the right path.”

It is not ‘Îsâ that has the knowledge of the hour, but it is Allâh alone who has that knowledge of when it will take place. And to have no doubt of the hour means that have no doubt that it will take place when Allâh wills. Now ‘Îsâ and his people have the same knowledge!

**43:85** “And blessed is He Whose is the kingdom of the heavens and the earth and all between them; and with Him is the knowledge of the Hour, and to Him you will be returned.”

This verse has nothing to do with ‘Îsâ! Damned fool!

**The next argument:**

“GOD MADE JESUS BLESSED WHEREVER HE WENT- Q 19:31 (MARK 7:37)” [Page 73]

**19:31** “And He has made me blessed (i.e. that is guided) wherever I may be, and He has enjoined on me prayer and poor-rate so long as I live”

This verse refers to the fact that Allah guided ‘Îsâ and enjoined upon him to worship Allah and to purify those who needs guidance. This verse also clarifies that he was not taken out of this world and raised elsewhere.

**The next argument:**

“GOD MADE A COVENANT WITH HIS PROPHETS (INCLUDING JESUS) – Q 33:7 (LUKE 4:18, 43)” [Page 73]

**33:7** “And when We took a covenant from the prophets and from thee, and from Nûḥ and Ibrâhîm and Mûsâ and ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, and We took from them a solemn covenant”

The verse is crystal clear. All the prophets are equal and there is no difference amongst them.

**The next argument:**

“THE FOLLOWERS OF JESUS”

“GOD’S HELPERS ARE THOSE WHO HELP JESUS – Q 3:52; Q 61:14 (1 JOHN 2:23)”

[Page 73]

**3:52** “But when ‘Îsâ perceived disbelief on their part, he said: Who will be my helpers in Allâh’s way? The disciples said: We are Allâh’s helpers: we believe in Allâh, and bear thou witness that we are submitting ones.”

**61:14** “O you who believe, be helpers (in the cause) of Allâh, as ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, said to the disciples: Who are my helpers in the cause of Allâh? The disciples said: We are helpers (in the cause) of Allâh. So a party of the Children of Isrâ’îl believed and another party disbelieved; then We aided those who believed against their enemy, and they became predominant.”

Point number 1- If he was God then he would not need helpers. Point 2- The helpers of ‘Îsâ did not betray like the helpers of Jesus who ‘all left him and fled’ like cowards. But at least they were clever and understood that a ‘*son of a dove*’ could not save them least of all his own self!

**The next argument:**

“GOD SAID TO JESUS THAT HE WOULD MAKE HIS FOLLOWERS HIGHER THAN THE UNBELIEVERS UNTIL THE DAY OF JUDGEMENT – Q 3:55 (EPHESIANS 2 :6)”

[Page 73]

**3:55:** “When Allâh said: O ‘Îsâ, I will cause you to die and exalt you in My presence and clear you of those who disbelieve and make those who follow you above those who disbelieve to the day of Resurrection. Then to Me is your return, so I shall decide between you concerning that wherein you differ.”

Exalting means: that whoever follows the revelation of the prophets, [as all brought the same fundamental message] will surely be elevated people in the sight of Allâh;



unlike the followers of Jesus who deserted him in his hour of need to save their own hides.

**The next argument:**

“JESUS TOLD GOD THAT THE DISCIPLES WERE GOD’S SERVANTS, AND HE COULD CHOOSE TO TORTURE OR FORGIVE THEM – Q 5:118 (JOHN 17:6-11)” [Page 73]

**5:118:** “If You chastise them, surely they are Your servants; and if You protect them, surely You are the Mighty, the Wise.”

This verse refers to the time of Judgement day when Allâh will clear nabî ‘Îsâ from the false belief that the Christians have attributed to him; therefore after the denial that he never taught the Christians doctrines of trinity or son of God or Mother of God, it is now up to Allâh to punish the evil lying [like this author] Christians – that is the gist of verse 118 to which it refers.

**The next argument:**

“THE CHRISTIANS SAY THAT JESUS (MESSIAH) IS THE SON OF GOD (ALLAH) – Q 9:30 (JOHN 20:30-31)” [Page 73]

**9:30** “And the Jews say: Ezra is the son of Allâh; and the Christians say: The Masîḥ is the son of Allâh. These are the words of their mouths. They imitate the saying of those who disbelieved before. Allâh’s curse be on them! How they are turned away!”

This verse condemns the notion that Îsâ could ever have been the son of Allah.

**The next argument:**

“THE CHRISTIANS TOOK JESUS THE SON OF MARY AS LORD INSTEAD OF GOD – Q 9:30 (CORINTHIANS 8:6)” [Page 73]

**9:30** “And the Jews say: Ezra is the son of Allâh; and the Christians say: The Masîḥ is the son of Allâh. These are the words of their mouths. They imitate the saying of those who disbelieved before. Allâh’s curse be on them! How they are turned away!”

Stop trying to ride a dead donkey. It will take you nowhere. Borrow Balaam’s.

**The next argument:**

“JESUS AS THE FULFILLMENT:”

“JESUS CONFIRMED THE OLD TESTAMENT THAT WAS IN HIS HANDS- Q 3:50; Q 5:46 (LUKE 4:21; MATTHEW 5:18; 15: 1-6)” [Page 73]

**3:50** “And (I am) a verifier of that which is before me of the *Taurât*, and I allow you part of that which was forbidden to you; and I have come to you with a sign from your *Rabb*, so keep your duty to Allâh and obey me.”

Do you understand what is. ‘before me’- are you blind and are you even ignorant of the English language. Why do you misconstrue the verses? Where does it say ‘in his hands?’

**5:46** “And We sent after them in their footsteps ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, verifying that which was before him of the *Taurât*; and We gave him the *Injil* containing guidance and light, and verifying that which was before it of the *Taurât*, and a guidance and an admonition for the dutiful.”

Every prophet came basically with the same message; therefore the verification is the repetition of the same thing that was lost at the time of nabî ‘Îsâ. These verses say that the message that was previously sent **which was lost** was now verified by the present messenger. It was verified by repeating the same message.

**The next argument:**

“THE NAMES OF JESUS:”

“CHRIST IS JESUS’ TITLE – Q 4:157, 171 (JOHN 4:25)” [Page 75]

**4:157** “And for their saying: We have killed the Masîh, ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, the messenger of Allâh, and they killed him not, nor did they cause his death on the cross, but he was made to appear to them as such. And certainly those who differ therein are in doubt about it. They have no knowledge about it, but only follow a conjecture, and they killed him not for certain”

According to the Arabic Qur’ân the word Masîh means ‘*one who travels a lot as a devotee*’, in other words in the service of Allah, and nothing more. That is not a name, but a description.

**4:171** “O People of the Book exceed not the limits in your *dîn* (i.e. the way of life as prescribed by Allâh) nor speak anything about Allâh, but the truth. The Masîh, ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, is only a messenger of Allâh and His word [*Kalimah*] (i.e. Allâh’s Divine Revelation) which He communicated to Maryam and a mercy from Him. So believe in Allâh and His messengers. And say not, Three. Desist, it is better for you. Allâh is only one Deity. Far be it from His glory to have a son. To Him belongs whatever is in the *samâwât* and whatever is in the earth. And sufficient is Allâh as having charge of affairs.”

Why do you insinuate things that do not exist? Are you now making whiskey from pig shit?

**The next argument:**

“HIS NAME IS MESSIAH, JESUS, SON OF MARY – Q 3:45 (MATTHEW 1:21)”

**3:45** “When the *malâ’ikah* said: O Maryam, surely Allâh gives you good news with a word from Him (of one) whose name is the Masîḥ (i.e. *one who travels a lot as a devotee*), ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, worthy of regard in this world and the Hereafter, and of those who are drawn nigh (to Allâh)”

Please- the dead donkey begins to stink now!

**The next argument:**

“JESUS IS A SPRIT FROM GOD – Q 4:171 (LUKE 1:35)”

**4:171** “O People of the Book exceed not the limits in your *dîn* (i.e. the way of life as prescribed by Allâh) nor speak anything about Allâh, but the truth. The Masîḥ, ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, is only a messenger of Allâh and His word [*Kalimah*] (i.e. Allâh’s Divine Revelation) which He communicated to Maryam and a mercy from Him. So believe in Allâh and His messengers. And say not, Three. Desist, it is better for you. Allâh is only one Deity. Far be it from His glory to have a son. To Him belongs whatever is in the *samâwât* and whatever is in the earth. And sufficient is Allâh as having charge of affairs.”

My dear blind man, where do you see ‘spirit’, my blind man? O yes! In the Vodka!

**The next arguement:**

“JESUS IS A MERCY FROM GOD – Q 19:21 (ACTS 2:23)” [Page 75]

**19:21** “He said: So (it will be). Your *Rabb* says: It is easy to Me; and that We may make him a sign to men and a mercy from Us. And it is a matter decreed.”

The word ‘mercy’ in the Qur’ân means that Allâh sends a messenger with guidance which becomes a mercy to the people if obeyed. Not the Holy Communion in glasses that is given to the congregation in the Church!

**The next argument:**

“JESUS WAS A MIRACLE TO ALL MEN – Q 21:91 (LUKE 2: 8-20)” [Page 75]

**21:91** “And she who guarded her chastity, so We *nafakh* (advance) *into her* of Our divine revelation, and made her and her son a sign for the nations.”

What miracle are you talking about? Sorry, I remember now. The dove and ...

**The next argument:**

CHRIST WAS A WITNESS OVER THE PEOPLE WHILE WITH THEM – Q 5:117 (JOHN 17:12-13)” [Page 75]

**5:117** “I (‘Îsâ) said to them naught save as You did command me: Serve Allâh, my *Rabb* and your *Rabb*; and I was a witness of them so long as I was among them, but when You did cause me to die You was the Watcher over them. And You are Witness of all things.”

This verse clearly says that while ‘Îsâ was alive he did not witness any worship of a trinity, or son of God, or mother of God, and also did not see the people drinking ‘blood’ in the church. When he was dead how could he be a witness?

**The next argument:**

“JESUS AS A PROPHET:”

“GOD AIDED JESUS WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT – Q 2:87, 253; Q 5:110 (1 PETER 1:2; MATTHEW 4:1, 12; LUKE 4:18)” [Page 75]

**2:87** “And We indeed gave Mûsâ the Book and We sent messengers after him one after another; and We gave ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, clear arguments and strengthened him with the *rûh al-qudus* (divine revelation). Is it then that whenever there came to you a messenger with what your *nafs* (inner-self) desired not, you were arrogant? And some you gave the lie to and others you would slay.”

**5:110** “When Allâh will say: O ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, remember My favour to you and to your mother, when I strengthened you with the (My) Divine revelation; you spoke to people in the cradle and in old age, and when I taught you the Book and the Wisdom and the *Taurât* and the *Injîl*, and when you did determine out of clay (i.e. people who seemed to be doomed) a thing like it (i.e. knowledge) and it (i.e. the people to) became like a bird by My permission, then you did *tanfukhu* (advance) into (them a new state of mind) by My permission; and you did heal the blind (i.e. those who were blind to the truth) and the leprous (i.e. those who were inflicted with evil inclinations) by My permission; and when you did raise the dead (i.e. those of whom it was thought that they would never return to the path of truth) by My permission; and when I withheld the Children of Isrâ’îl from you when you came to them with clear arguments — but those of them who disbelieved said: This is nothing but clear enchantment.”

**Kindly explain where does this pagan term ‘spirit’ appear in the Qur’ân? Are you now drinking fermented pig shit with wine now?**

THE ARGUMENT

“GOD CAUSED JESUS TO FOLLOW IN THE LINAGE OF JEWISH PROPHETS – Q 5:46 (MATTHEW 21:33-41)” [Page 75]

**5:46** “And We sent after them in their footsteps ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, verifying that which was before him of the *Taurât*; and We gave him the *Injîl* containing guidance and light, and verifying that which was before it of the *Taurât*, and a guidance and an admonition for the dutiful.”

Please stop drinking! There were never Jewish prophets! That is a misnomer. **All the prophets prior to nabî ‘Îsâ were from the Banî Isrâ’îl.** Get that into your alcoholic brains. We have already explained the consequence of the evil pagan Greeks and the evil pagan Romans, who were the cause that the Jews came into existence. We have also explained that the verifying is only a repetition brought by nabî ‘Îsâ because the *Taurât* was long destroyed before nabî ‘Îsâ. No doubt that nabî ‘Îsâ was of the lineage of nabî Ibrâhîm, who both had parents.

### The next argument

“JESUS WAS A PROPHET – Q 2:91 (LUKE 4:18)” [Page 75]

**2:91** “And when it is said to them, Believe in that which Allâh has revealed, they say: We believe in that which was revealed to us. And they deny what is besides that, while it is the Truth verifying that which they have. Say: Why then did you kill Allâh’s prophets before (this) if you were believers?”

This verse under no circumstances implies that any human being has killed nabî ‘Îsâ. This fact was clarified in chapter 3, verse 55! This man makes Jesus the Greek - a God, son of God, a Prophet, a son of a dove and what more I don’t know.

### The next argument

“JESUS TOLD THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL THAT A PROPHET WAS COMING TO THEM WHOSE NAME WAS PRAISED – Q 61:6 (JOHN 14:16; 17)” [Page 75]

**61:6** “And when ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, said: O Children of Isrâ’îl, surely I am the messenger of Allâh to you, verifying that which is before me of the Taurât and giving the good news of a Messenger who will come after me, his name being Aḥmad. But when he came to them with clear arguments, they said: This is clear enchantment.”

Firstly, the verse makes clear that nabî ‘Îsâ was nothing but a messenger of Allâh; “...verifying that which is before me of the Taurât...” does not mean that the Book which was the Taurât existed. Secondly, nabî ‘Îsâ who was only a mortal messenger of Allâh had to reveal what Allâh told him of that final messenger whose name is Aḥmad. No doubt, the root word *Ḥamd* does mean praised, which refers to both names of the Holy Prophet Muḥammad, and why was he the praised one – because he brought the finalised message to mankind, that will forever remain with humankind till the end of time!

If you give up drinking, become sober and stop consuming pork then perhaps you may understand this.

### **The next argument**

“JESUS’ RELATIONSHIP WITH GOD:”

“GOD IS NOT CHRIST THE SON OF MARY – Q 5:17, 72 (1 CORINTHIANS 8:6)” [Page 75]

**5:17** “They indeed disbelieve who say: Surely, Allâh — He is the Masîh, son of Maryam. Say; Who then could control anything as against Allâh when He wished to destroy the Masîh, son of Maryam, and his mother and all those on the earth? And Allâh’s is the kingdom of the samâwât and the earth and what is between them. He creates what He pleases. And Allâh is Possessor of power over all things.”

**5:72** “Certainly they disbelieve who say: Allâh, He is the Masîh, son of Maryam. And the Masîh said: O Children of Isrâ’îl, serve Allâh, my *Rabb* and your *Rabb*. Surely whoever associates (others) with Allâh, Allâh has forbidden to him the Garden and his abode is the Fire. And for the wrongdoers there will be no helpers.”

How nice of you to admit by quoting chapter 5:17, making it clear that those who claim that Allâh is also at the same time called the son of God, when nabî ‘Îsâ was only a devotee (Masîh) travelling and spreading the word of his Master as commanded by Allâh. Thank you, that you indirectly admit that the so-called “Jesus” (the Greek) did not control anything of his own accord. And Allâh alone has the right to destroy the Masîh, son of Maryam.

Again we thank you for quoting 5:72, which means that you are indirectly submitting that the so called son of God was nothing but a mere mortal and those who place him on par with Allâh are nothing but disbelievers, sinners, evil transgressors and drunkards.

### **The next argument**



“JESUS IS A SPIRIT FROM GOD – Q 4:171 (LUKE 1:35)” [Page 75]

**4:171** “O People of the Book exceed not the limits in your *dīn* (i.e. the way of life as prescribed by Allāh) nor speak anything about Allāh, but the truth. The Masīḥ, ‘Īsā, son of Maryam, is only a messenger of Allāh and His word [*Kalimah*] (i.e. Allāh’s Divine Revelation) which He communicated to Maryam and a mercy from Him. So believe in Allāh and His messengers. And say not, Three. Desist, it is better for you. Allāh is only one Deity. Far be it from His glory to have a son. To Him belongs whatever is in the *samāwāt* and whatever is in the earth. And sufficient is Allāh as having charge of affairs.”

For God’s sake please do not give pagan meanings to Qur’ānic terms! The word *Rūḥ* does not mean what pagans call ‘*spirit*’ it means **Divine Revelation**.

### **The next arguement**

“GOD ASKED JESUS IF HE HAD TOLD PEOPLE TO REGARD HIMSELF AND MARY AS TWO GODS IN PLACE OF GOD – Q 5:116 (JOHN 10:30; 17:21; MATTHEW 17:5)” [Page 75]

**5:116:** “And when Allāh will say: O ‘Īsā, son of Maryam, did you say to people, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allāh? He will say: Glory be to You! It was not for me to say what I had no right to (say). If I had said it, You (*i.e. Allāh*) would indeed have known it. You (*i.e. Allāh*) know what is in my mind, and I know not what is in Your (*i.e. Allāh’s*) mind. Surely You are the great Knower of the unseen.”

We are sorry to say that according to the Bible “Jesus the Greek” wanted to make *fishermen* of his people which require no intelligence as a simple bait will catch any fish just like missionaries catch the ignorant! And the reason for making this deduction is simply because of what your Bible states in John 10:30. How the “devil”, can one equate chapter 5:116 which relates to a discussion on the Day of Judgment with the Bible which contains nothing but illogical arguments. Can’t you see that the Biblical verses have no relationship?

**The next argument:**

“JESUS ANSWERED THAT HE NEVER SAID ANYTHING HE HAD NO RIGHT TO SAY – Q 5:116 (JOHN 14:10)” [Page 75]

**5:116:** “And when Allâh will say: O ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, did you say to people, Take me and my mother for two gods besides Allâh? He will say: Glory be to You! It was not for me to say what I had no right to (say). If I had said it, You (*i.e. Allâh*) would indeed have known it. You (*i.e. Allâh*) know what is in my mind, and I know not what is in Your (*i.e. Allâh's*) mind. Surely You are the great Knower of the unseen.”

Please it seems that you have no knowledge that human beings can't ride dead animals. Only Doves can perform miracles. You know that very well!

**The next argument:**

“GOD COMMANDED JESUS TO HONOR HIS MOTHER – Q 19:32 (JOHN 19:26)” [Page 75]

**19:32** And to be kind to my mother; and He has not made me insolent, unblessed.

Are you not ashamed to quote this beautiful Qur'anic characteristic of nabî ‘Îsâ which the Bible lacks to reveal!

**The next argument:**

“JESUS BEING SINLESS:”

“JESUS IS SINLESS – Q 19:19 (HEBREWS 7:26; CORINTIANS 5:21; JOHN 8:46)” [No page number as it is cut off]

**19:19** “He said: I am only bearer of a message of your *Rabb*: That I will give you a Ghulâman zakiyyan.”

A clever fool always tries to hide his ignorance, but it seems to us that you do not care to expose your ignorance and madness. We have elsewhere in this document explained “Ghulâman zakiyyan”.

**The next argument:**

“JESUS AS THE WORD:”

JESUS IS THE SAYING OF THE TRUTH – Q 19:34 (1 JOHN 5:7-12; 2:21; 1:1; 2 JOHN 1)” [No page number as it is cut off]

**19:34** “Such is ‘Îsâ son of Maryam — a statement of truth about which they dispute.”

This statement presents nothing but clarifying that ‘Îsâ son of Maryam brought nothing but the truth as all servants of Allâh has brought. Then why do you Christians dispute this point?

**The next argument:**

“JESUS IS THE WORD FROM GOD – Q 4:171 (JOHN 1:1-3)” [No page number as it is cut off]

**4:171** “O People of the Book exceed not the limits in your *dîn* (i.e. the way of life as prescribed by Allâh) nor speak anything about Allâh, but the truth. The Masîh, ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, is only a messenger of Allâh and His word [*Kalimah*] (i.e. Allâh’s Divine Revelation) which He communicated to Maryam and a mercy from Him. So believe in Allâh and His messengers. And say not, Three. Desist, it is better for you. Allâh is only one Deity. Far be it from His glory to have a son. To Him belongs whatever is in the *samâwât* and whatever is in the earth. And sufficient is Allâh as having charge of affairs.”

A ‘word’ is part of a communication; a person can never be the ‘word’ in a decisive sense!

**The next argument:**

“GOD SPOKE/ CAST HIS WORD TO MARY – Q 4:171 (LUKE 1:35; JOHN 1:14)” [No page number as it is cut off]

**4:171** “**O** People of the Book exceed not the limits in your *dîn* (i.e. the way of life as prescribed by Allâh) nor speak anything about Allâh, but the truth. The Masîh, ‘Îsâ, son of Maryam, is only a messenger of Allâh and His word (i.e. the Divine Revelation) *which* He communicated to Maryam and a mercy from Him. So believe in Allâh and His messengers. And say not, Three. Desist, it is better for you. Allâh is only one Deity. Far be it from His glory to have a son. To Him belongs whatever is in the *samâwât* and whatever is in the earth. And sufficient is Allâh as having charge of affairs.

**We have made it abundantly clear by repeating and quoting the same verse under your different arguments about it, simply because you do not understand or do not want to understand the truth the Qur’an conveys. We hope that our endeavour will open your mind that you may by the grace of the Almighty Creator one day be able to see the truth. Our sincere advice to you: Give up believing that a Dove can have sex with a woman and having a God baby. Stop worshipping baby and man gods, and ghosts.**

**“God has got no length and breath as these are attributes of a body which is an originated thing. Its Creator existed from before it. So how would He enter in a body, as He existed by Himself before all originated things and there was nobody along with Him? He is an All Knowing, Almighty, Willing Creator. These attributes are impossible for a body. He exists by Himself without the substances of a body. He is not like any worldly thing, rather He is ever living, everlasting, and nothing is like Him. Where is the similarity of the Creator with the created, the Fashioner with the fashioned? Hence it is impossible that anything can ever resemble Him!” [Imam Ghazzali. “The Revival of the Religious Sciences” Vol- 1-page 130]**

**I seek the assistance of Allâh the Beneficent Creator the Merciful Bounty Giver.**

**Say: He, Allâh, is One. Allâh is He on Whom all depend. He begets not, nor is He begotten; and none is like Him. [Chapter 112: vs. 1-4.]**