#### THE REPLY TO THE CHRISTIAN MISSIONARIES' BOOK CALLED:

الهداية

## AL HIDAYAH- RIGHT GUIDANCE FOR MUSLIM FRIENDS

Published by: Evangelical Press, P.O.Box 72, Bellville. 7530. Cape Town

#### DID JESUS CHRIST DIE ON THE CROSS ON BEHALF OF SINNERS?

Let us as Muslims analyse if it is the truth that is meant what the name 'AL HIDAYAH - RIGHT GUIDANCE FOR MUSLIM FRIENDS' suggests as used by the Missionaries. One must understand that if the word 'RIGHT' means what is stated, that does not mean that it is also the <u>truth</u>!

The Christian argument begins under the heading:

#### "AL HIDAYAH\*: RIGHT GUIDANCE FOR MUSLIM FRIENDS

DID JESUS CHRIST DIE ON THE CROSS ON BEHALF OF SINNERS?

\*The term 'AL HIDAYAH' means 'The Guidance'; however, Muslims generally assumes that 'Guidance' ought to be *true information*, this assumption emanates from the understanding Muslims have about the Qur'ân! Nevertheless, Christians do not worry about the truth generally. They are indoctrinated in order to accept any nonsensical theories irrespective if they are capable to distinguish between truth and falsehood. Take for example their statement: "...JESUS CHRIST DIE ON THE CROSS ON BEHALF OF SINNERS..." this concept is absurd and illogical! Yet, this is a fundamental belief of Christianity!\*

In lectures and literature, dear Muslim friends, your answer is, No. The clear answer of the holy Bible is, Yes. It declares, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (Kalámu'llah); and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures"; [The holy Injíl (the Gospel), 1 Corinthians 15. 3, 4] This was the message preached by ALL the Apostles (Hawárí) of Christ (see v. 11) and this is our message today. From the beginning to the end of the Bible we see that men came to God by means of a qurbán (sacrifice). This was true of Habíl (Abel), Ibráhím (Abraham), Músá (Moses), Dá'úd (David) and many others." (AL HIDAYAH: RIGHT GUIDANCE FOR MUSLIM FRIENDS - DID JESUS CHRIST DIE ON THE CROSS ON BEHALF OF SINNERS, page 2).

The above statement is infested with lies.

(1) Let us analyse the phrase: "In lectures and literature, dear Muslim friends, your answer is, No." Would it be rational for a sane human being to come to a different conclusion? Look again to the question: "DID JESUS CHRIST DIE ON THE CROSS ON BEHALF OF SINNERS?" Never mind whoever the Greek person called Jesus was, would it be justifiable for any person to die on behalf of another person's sins? Does it become possible for a just Creator to remove the evil doings of an evil person and punish a just person for what he has not done? We have witnessed in South Africa for over three hundred and fifty years, how evil activities were carried out under the pretence that JESUS CHRIST died for their sins, so that the evil Christians invaders did whatever they wanted to do with the indigenous people of South Africa, and Africa as well as the indigenous peoples all over the world! In the twenty-first century the world witnessed how the American, British, Australian, and the European Christians killed millions of Muslims in Iraq and Afghanistan under the pretence that JESUS CHRIST died for their sins forces can do whatever they wanted to do with innocent Muslims' properties, wealth and natural resources!!!

(2) Let us analyse the second phrase: "The clear answer of the holy Bible is, Yes." Let us examine if it is true that the Bible is 'holy'? 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*]. [\* 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.]

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 the undeniable facts that the

Bible was constructed from evil men's own ideas!!! We now need to quote the <u>evidence</u> that the Old Testament only dates from 916 A.D and not before from authentic Church sources!

The truthful information about the 916 AD Hebrew text is as follows:

"There are no very ancient MSS. [MSS = Manuscripts] of the Hebrew Bible, and of such as have come down to us, all belong to the same family or recension. The earliest dated Hebrew manuscript known was written in 916 A.D.: another, undated, which has recently been bought by the Trustees of the British Museum, is probably a little older. Many were destroyed in the Middle Ages, and others were buried through the pious, if mistaken, reverence of the Jews. That other recensions\* were at one time in existence is shown by the variations in the ancient versions, especially the Septuagint, by means of which we are able in some cases to reconstruct the original which they represent" [*Our emphases*]. [Holy Bible of James, King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland 1896, p. 5.] [\*The word recension means: 'a literary text that has been given a critical revision']

The information by the creators of the first Bible in the world, viz: The Catholic Church about the language Jesus spoke is as follows:

According to the Catholic Bible (1959), the language of Jesus is said to be <u>Aramaic</u>, which was the spoken language in Galilee at that time.<sup>1</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].<sup>2</sup>

The evidence produced by the oldest Church in the world, the creators of the first Bible nullifies those words of Aramaic in the New Testament as deception!

The Qur'ân clearly states:

Chapter 14 verse 4: "We<sup>3</sup> (i.e. Allâh) sent not an apostle except (to teach) in the language of his (own) people, in order to make (things) clear to them. Now Allâh leaves straying those whom He pleases and guides whom He pleases: and He is Exalted in power, full of wisdom."

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>: C.B. - 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.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> : C.B., p. 30.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Western critics of the Qur'ân frequently point to the allegedly "incoherent" references to God - often in one and the same phrase as "He", "God", "We" or "I", with the corresponding changes of the pronoun from "His" to "Ours" or "My", or from "Him" to "Us" or "Me". They seem to be unaware of the fact that these changes are not accidental, and not even what one might describe as "poetic licence", but are obviously deliberate, a linguistic device meant to stress the idea that God is not a "person" and cannot, therefore, be really circumscribed by the pronouns applicable to finite beings.

Imam Ghazzali explains beautifully the concept of God in his book, "The Revival of the Religious Sciences" Vol 1-page 130: "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

What a shameful state of affairs; how could a sober sane truthful person call a book with such a historical background as '**holy**'???

(2) Let us analyse the third phrase: "It declares, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (Kalámu'llah); and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures"; [The holy Injil (the Gospel), 1 Corinthians 15. 3, 4] This was the message preached by ALL the Apostles (Hawárí) of Christ (see v. 11) and this is our message today." Firstly, the third phrase includes another book as part of "holy Bible" which is extremely confusing as it calls '1 Corinthians' as part of the: "The holy Injil (the Gospel)", which means that we must now clarify the status of 'the Gospel' as the Arabic term  $Injil^4$  which is used in the Qur'ân is not referring to any of the four Gospels or any Gospel as such. The fact that '1 Corinthians'<sup>5</sup> is a letter written by Paul who also lied, has nothing to do with nabi ' sâ (with whom Allâh is pleased), it was written long after the departure of nabi ' sâ (with whom Allâh is pleased) from Palestine. Let us return to the first phrase: "It declares, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures"; to use Arabic terminology does not make a statement the truth! The claim implies that a Greek person by the name: 'Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures' is being referred? Let us quote the actual statement in the so-called 'Scriptures':

1 Corinthians 15:3-4 states:

15:3-4: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received: that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures<sup>a</sup>; and that he was buried; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures;<sup>b</sup>"

The King James Version of the Bible then refers one to Isaiah <sup>a</sup>53:5-12:

53:5-12: "But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed. All we like sheep have gone astray; we have turned every one to his own way; and Jehovah hath laid on him the iniquity of us all. He was oppressed, yet when he was afflicted he opened not his mouth; as a lamb that is led to the slaughter, and as a sheep that before its shearers is dumb, so he opened not his mouth. By oppression and judgment he was taken away;

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!"

<sup>4 :</sup> The Arabic word *Al-Injîl* is a term that should not be translated; the term's description ought to be only derived from the verses of Al-Qur'ân itself. However, since the entire original message of *nabî*  $\cdot$  sâ (with whom Allâh is pleased) which he brought as a separate Book is lost forever, human beings has no capabilities nor any right to define his Book, except what was made known in Al-Qur'ân about it.  $\cdot$  It could have been written between 5( and 56 AD

<sup>5 :</sup> It could have been written between 54 and 56 AD. <sup>6</sup> *Kalámu'lla* is an Arabic word. Are these Christian missionaries saying that Jesus spoke Arabic? It seems they must be either insane or drunk with too much Holy Communion because they claim he spoke, Greek then Hebrew then Aramaic and now Arabic.

and as for his generation, who [among them] considered that he was cut off out of the land of the living for the transgression of my people to whom the stroke [was due]? And they made his grave with the wicked, and with a rich man in his death; although he had done no violence, neither was any deceit in his mouth. Yet it pleased Jehovah to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see [his] seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of Jehovah shall prosper in his hand. He shall see of the travail of his soul, [and] shall be satisfied: by the knowledge of himself shall my righteous servant justify many; and he shall bear their iniquities. Therefore will I divide him a portion with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the strong; because he poured out his soul unto death, and was numbered with the transgressors: yet he bare the sin of many, and made intercession for the transgressors."

The King James Version of the Bible then refers one to Psalms <sup>b</sup>16:8-10:

16:8-10: "I have set Jehovah always before me: Because he is at my right hand, I shall not be moved. Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; My flesh also shall dwell in safety. For thou wilt not leave my soul to Sheol; Neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption."

The King James Version of the Bible then refers one to Hosea 6:2:

6:2: "After two days will he revive us: on the third day he will raise us up, and we shall live before him."

The above quotations supposed to be from the '*Kalámu'llah*' which means the *words of Allâh*? Any stupid fool can by now clearly understand that a letter written during the years 54 and 56 AD long after the departure of nabî ' sâ by one, who also lied, cannot be relied upon as the truth! Furthermore, the books to which Paul supposed to have referred is also not sources which any truthful person can rely upon as the truth; simply because it is not a divine source, although it is called the holy Bible. What makes it even worse is the fact that JESUS or CHRIST do not appear in any of the Old Testament's books that were referred to!!!

Let us analyse the last part of the false claim which states: "This was the message preached by ALL the Apostles (Hawárí) of Christ (see v. 11) and this is our message today." First the verse 11 to which we are referred, states: 1 Corinthians 15:11: "Whether then [it be] I or they, so we preach, and so ye believed<sup>7</sup>." No doubt one may believe whatever one likes to believe, even if one wants to believe that it is the truth that the cow jumps over the moon, and a ghost can have intercourse with a woman and make her pregnant what can we do, if one insists that it is the truth!!! Nevertheless, the status of the book in which 1 Corinthians appears needs clarification.

<sup>7 :</sup> The myth concerning the word 'believe' and "FAITH" without proof. It is necessary to understand the meaning of the word 'faith' before an explanation is given as to how faith is progressively acquired. The word 'faith' according to The New Collins Concise Dictionary, 1985 edition means: '1. strong or unshakeable belief in something, esp. without proof. 2. a specific system of religious beliefs: the Jewish faith. 3. Christianity. trust in God and in his actions and promises. 4. a conviction of the truth of certain doctrines of religion. 5. complete confidence or trust in a person, remedy, etc.' [Our emphases]

The Qur'ân declares the Hawárí were truthful and sincere followers of Jesus:

Qur'ân 3:52: "When Jesus found unbelief on their part He said: "Who will be my helpers to (the work of) Allâh." said the disciples: "We are Allâh's helpers: we believe in Allâh, and do thou bear witness that we are Muslims."

Qur'ân 61:14: "O ye who believe! Be ye helpers of Allâh. As said Jesus the son of Mary to the disciples, "Who will be my helpers to (the work of) Allâh." said the disciples, "We are Allâh's helpers!" then a portion of the Children of Israel believed, and a portion disbelieved: but we gave power to those who believed, against their enemies, and they became the ones that prevailed."

The difference is stark: **The disciples of Jesus mentioned in the Qur'ân were true believers** but according to the man written **<u>Bible</u>** one was a <u>traitor</u> and another was told by Jesus that he was a <u>devil</u>!

(Kindly note Christian missionaries mislead the gullible non-Muslims that the word Allâh is not the name of God, which is another lie. Ask any Arab Christian by what name he calls God and he/she will say: ALLÂH! Even the Christians in Malta who are mostly Catholic use the name Allâh!)

Let us discuss the <u>NEW</u> Testament of the Christians which is the main source of their guidance. We will use a 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>8</sup> (*Our emphasis*)

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 <u>vote</u> for the contents of this new religion!!! Wonderful is it not that the so-called 'God's word' the Bible had to be voted to make it acceptable as true!

Is it really necessary to analyse the last part of the first paragraph which states:

"From the beginning to the end of the Bible we see that men came to God by means of a qurbán (sacrifice). This was true of Habíl (Abel), Ibráhím (Abraham), Músá (Moses), Dá'úd (David) and many others."

Is it really sensible to analyse the pagan system of human sacrifice which Christians accept? We do not think so!!! Muslims are rational people and do not accept anything without proof as is a command of the Arabic Glorious Qur'an: 2/111: "...Produce your proof if you are truthful." Only irrational people accept and believe nonsense.

The next paragraph begins under the heading:

### "Al 'Aqíqah

This principle of acceptance before God through sacrifice you acknowledge in the prayer of your 'Aqíqah sacrifice for a child. After shaving the child's head on the seventh day, you sacrifice for a boy two sheep or goats, and for a girl one, no bone of this sacrifice being broken. Part of your 'Aqíqah prayer is, "O God, this is a sacrifice for (my son, or my daughter – name being given): its blood for his blood, its flesh for his flesh, its bones for his bones, its skin for his skin, and its hair for his hair. O God, make it a ransom for my son from the fire, for as a hanif (sincere believer) I turn my face towards the One Who created the heaven and the earth, not being one of the believers in many gods". (Translation by S. M. Zwemer in "The Glory of the Cross", pp. 88, 89.)" (AL HIDAYAH: RIGHT GUIDANCE FOR MUSLIM FRIENDS - DID JESUS CHRIST DIE ON THE CROSS ON BEHALF OF SINNERS, page 2).

This quotation is a beautiful fable, but it finds no place in the Qur'ân. If Tom, Dick and Harry want to give charity by slaughtering sheep or goats they may do so! There is no such command in Al-Qur'ân!!! Please do not write lies like Paul your master. The mad type of sacrifice on the Cross finds no similarities or support in Al-Qur'ân nor could a sane person attach 'Glory' to it!!!

<sup>8 : &#</sup>x27;Preface' of 'The NEW TESTAMENT of OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST TRANSLADET 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.

The next paragraph contains some amusing habarah-kadapbarah<sup>9</sup> claims:

#### "Reliability of the Holy Bible

Your denial of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ means you deny the message of the Bible which contains the Taurát (Law of Moses), the Zabúr (Psalms of David) and the Injíl (the Gospel). In the Qur'án you are taught these holy Books were given by God –

Súrah as-Sajdah, v. 23, "We did give the Book to Músá" (the Law).

Súrah Baní-Isrá'íl, v. 55, "To Dá'úd We gave the Zabúr" (the Psalms).

Súrah al-Má'idah, v. 47, "We sent forth ' sá (sic) (Jesus) . . . and gave Him the Injíl" (the Gospel)

However, you also find that the Qur'án denies much which the Bible teaches, including the death of Christ (al Masíh) upon the cross. As a result, many Muslims say WITHOUT PROOF that the Bible must now be muharraf (corrupted). We know that in the business world false money can be in circulation; so in the religious world we can have false messages: but because there are some counterfeit coins will you refuse the genuine thing? Truly not! The holy Bible stands the test of reliability and we will give proof."

(AL HIDAYAH: RIGHT GUIDANCE FOR MUSLIM FRIENDS - DID JESUS CHRIST DIE ON THE CROSS ON BEHALF OF SINNERS, pages 2-3).

It is not true that we deny the message of the Bible; it is the historical facts produced by the main stream Church Authorities that forces us to reject the Bible as a Divine Source as been pointed out above!!! Furthermore, the absurd contents of the Bible further force us to reject its information as the Divine words of the Creator! Let us take just a <u>few examples</u> to prove our point:

"If any man come to me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be my disciple." (Luke 14:26)

"If ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart, to give glory unto my name, saith the LORD of hosts, I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings: yea, I have cursed them already, because ye do not lay it to heart. Behold, I will corrupt your seed, and spread dung upon your faces, even the dung of your solemn feasts; and one shall take you away with it." (<u>Mal 2:2-3</u>)

"And thou shalt eat it as barley cakes, and thou shalt bake it with dung that cometh out of man, in their sight. And the LORD said, Even thus shall the children of Israel eat their defiled bread among the Gentiles, whither I will drive them." (Ezekiel 4:12-13)

"But Rabshakeh said unto them, Hath my master sent me to thy master, and to thee, to speak these words? hath he not sent me to the men which sit on the wall, that they may eat their own dung, and drink their own piss with you?" (<u>II Kings 18:27</u>) (See also <u>Isaiah 36:12</u>)

<sup>9 :</sup> Meaning impossible to comprehend.

"Happy shall he be, that taketh and dasheth thy little ones against the stones." (<u>Psalms 137:9,</u> <u>KJV</u>)

"Happy the man who shall seize and smash your little ones against the rock!" (Psalms 137:9; New American Bible) (See also <u>Isaiah 13:16; Hosea 13-16</u>)

"If ye will not hear, and if ye will not lay it to heart, to give glory unto my name, saith the LORD of hosts, I will even send a curse upon you, and I will curse your blessings: yea, I have cursed them already, because ye do not lay it to heart. Behold, I will corrupt your seed, and spread dung upon your faces, even the dung of your solemn feasts; and one shall take you away with it." (Mal 2:2-3).

We do not have to give more examples as these will suffice!

The concept of human sacrifice is so ridiculously absurd that we Muslims who are truthful rational beings have no other option but to reject it outright! You have rightly pointed out: "However, you also find that the Qur'án denies much which the Bible teaches, including the death of Christ (al Masíh) upon the cross."

For the information of ignorant Christian Missionaries let us define the word **the Arabic word al Masíh** and Christ:

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

Let us analyse the reasons as to why the Qur'ân has to teach the contrary: Firstly, you must understand the truthful history of the Bible: The Old Testament 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*]. [New Bible Dictionary 1988, p. 904].

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 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." [New Bible Dictionary 1988, p. 413]

It would have been a shame if the Holy Prophet Mu<u>h</u>ammad (with whom Allâh 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."\* The journey took Jerome to Antioch: [\*Encyclopaedia Britannica, fourteenth edition, 1929, Vol. 13, p. 2]

"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..." [\*Encyclopaedia Britannica, fourteenth edition, 1929, Vol. 13, p. 2]

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 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." [Encyclopaedia Britannica, fourteenth edition, 1929, Vol. 2, op. Cit; pp 2-3]

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 the last prophet of the Children of Isrâ'îl. 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 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>10</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

<sup>10 :</sup> 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.

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. 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. (our emphasis).

[\* 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].

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!

What the author has not mentioned is the fact that the term 'Bible' is not a Divine term, it only means books.

This is what the first Church in Christianity has declared before people protested against the first Church in Christianity in 1553 AD: "The word Bible comes from a Greek plural biblia, which means "books"."<sup>11</sup> This name was not given by the Children of Isrâ'îl to the actual message came, which is now lost forever! One must keep in mind that as back as about 280 BC since the time of Septuagint which was a concoction created by the Greeks that caused the Children of Isrâ'îl whom people want to give the name of Essenes, departed from Palestine before they tried to reconstruct their Scriptures which must have been destroyed by the pagan Greeks, shows that the so-called Bible is not the same as what they tried to construct; their non-Biblical documents proves that today's Biblical information is not the same as that of the Dead Sea Scrolls!

To try and make as if the Books mentioned in the Qur'ân is the same as that of the Bible is madness in the extreme! Chapter 32, verse 23 and chapter 17, verse 55 and chapter 5, verse 47 does not refer to the present day Bibles. Those Books are no longer in existence; it is totally wrong to try and give meaning to the names of it!

Qur'ân 2:79: "Then woe to those who write the Book with their own hands, and then say: "This is from Allâh," to traffic with it for miserable price! - woe to them for what their hands do write, and for the gain they make thereby."

Qur'ân 3:78: "There is among them a section who distorts the Book with their tongues: (as they read) you would think it is a part of the Book, but it is no part of the Book; and they say, "That is from Allâh," but it is not from Allâh. It is they who tell a lie against Allâh, and (well) they know it!"

The part which states: "However, you also find that the Qur'án denies much which the Bible teaches, including the death of Christ (al Masíh) upon the cross. As a result, many Muslims say WITHOUT PROOF that the Bible must now be muharraf (corrupted)" needs to be address:

Firstly, the most important point made in the above claim states: "...many Muslims say <u>WITHOUT PROOF</u> that the Bible must now be muharraf (corrupted)", the <u>Proof</u> factor is of utmost importance for our analysis! Take a careful look again at the words: "However, you also find that the Qur'án denies much which the Bible teaches, <u>including the death of Christ (al Masíh) upon the cross</u>." Think over the words that we have highlighted. Then go back to the first original claim which states: "It declares, "Christ died for our sins according to the Scriptures (Kalámu'llah); <u>and that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures</u>"; [The holy Injil (the Gospel), 1 Corinthians 15. 3, 4]" then apply the Christian argument to themselves in order to establish if there exists <u>Proof</u> for the claim or if it is <u>WITHOUT PROOF</u> which we are sure the Christians will not be in agreement if there is no <u>Proof</u> for their own claim!!! One has to know that Qur'ân itself states: "Say: Bring your proof if you are truthful".<sup>12</sup> So Muslims must also base all their

<sup>11 :</sup> 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. 27. 12 : Al-Qur'ân 2:111.

statements on proof! Therefore, we ask in humility give us the proof that: "...<u>and that He was buried, and that</u> <u>He rose again the third day according to the Scriptures</u>" what we want is the evidence that a person can be dead for three days and then rise to life again after three days? Any Scripture that cannot substantiate its claims with evidence needs to be in the dirt bin! Let us refer to the man-made Protestant book called the New Testament which actually dates from 1881 AD in order to establish if the words "<u>He was buried</u>" is really the truth?

Let us give the New Testament's view which actually dates from 1881 AD:

"Matthew 27:57-66: "And when even was come, there came a rich man from Arimathaea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple: this man went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded it to be given up. and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the tomb, and departed. And Mary Magdalene was there, and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulchre. Now on the morrow, which is [the day] after the Preparation, the chief priests and the Pharisees were gathered together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said while he was yet alive, After three days I rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest haply his disciples come and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: and the last error will be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, Ye have a guard: go, make it [as] sure as ye can. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, the guard being with them. (In the printed version it states: "...and setting a watch")."

This fable (similar to the famous Jack and the Bean Stalk) needs to be analysed properly:

The first word that needs to be understood correctly is *buried* so that we do not misunderstand one another: *Buried* is best defined as follows:

(1) To put something in a hole: transitive verb to dig a hole, put something in it, and replace the soil or other material removed."

(2) Inter dead body: transitive verb to put a dead body in a grave dug in the ground, or sometimes under water, usually as part of a religious ritual." (This meanings is from Microsoft Office 2007)

According to 'The Concise Oxford Dictionary 1946' 'burial n. Depositing under earth, burying, especially of dead body, funeral.'

(1) Consequently, the statement: "And when even was come, there came a rich man from Arimathaea, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple: this man went to Pilate, and asked for the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded it to be given up. and laid it in his own new tomb, which he had hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the tomb, and departed" do not really imply that Joseph <u>buried</u> the person called Jesus!

(2) The statement: "the chief priests and the Pharisees were gathered together unto Pilate, saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver (Jesus) said while he was yet alive, After three days I rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest haply his disciples come and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: and the *last error* will be worse than *the first*" cast serious doubt about what Joseph had done to the minds of the chief priests and the Pharisees! No sane person can understand that the chief priests and the Pharisees really understood that Jesus can "After three days I (*Jesus can*) rise again"; as there is no provable record in the history of human beings that it ever happened!!! Today, this thought is even more absurd and anyone believing this rubbish should be immediately certified mad!!!

Let us try and see from the rest of the fable what else could be uncovered:

**Matthew 28:1-20**: "Now late on the sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first [day] of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre<sup>13</sup>. And behold, there was a great earthquake; for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone, and sat upon it. His appearance was as lightning, and his raiment white as snow: and for fear of him the watchers did quake, and became as dead men. And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, who hath been crucified. He is not here; for he is risen, even as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord *lay*. And go quickly, and tell his disciples, He is risen from the dead; and lo, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you. And they departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to bring his disciples word. And behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and took hold of his feet, and worshipped him. Then saith Jesus unto them, Fear not: go tell my brethren that they depart into Galilee, and there shall they see me. Now while they were going, behold, some of the guard came into the city, and told unto the chief priests all the things that were come to pass. And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave much money unto the soldiers, saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and rid you of care. So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying

<sup>13 : &#</sup>x27;Burial chamber; a vault in which a corpse is buried.'

was spread abroad among the Jews, [and continueth] until this day. But the eleven disciples went into Galilee, unto the mountain where Jesus had appointed them. And when they saw him, they worshipped [him]; but some doubted. And Jesus came to them and spake unto them, saying, All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth. Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations, baptizing them into the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I commanded you: and lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world." (*Our emphasis*)

Let us analyse what is reported seeing that it is a known fact that this so-called Gospel of Matthew was not written by him; furthermore, the language which Jesus spoke<sup>14</sup> is lost forever, consequently, what is now in the **New Testament was only created in 1881AD!** Therefore, one ought not to be surprised to see the many discrepancies which we will encounter; the first point that need to understand states:

"And behold, there was a great earthquake; for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled away the stone, and sat upon it. His appearance was as lightning, and his raiment<sup>15</sup> white as snow: and for fear of him the watchers did quake, and became as dead men."

(1) Does this mean that 'an angel' appears as a result of 'a great earthquake'? This question emanates from the statement: 'for an angel of the Lord descended from heaven' which means the 'great earthquake' had to take place for the 'angel' to appear! What is clear is that the 'great earthquake' did not interfere with 'the stone' as it took 'an angel' to 'rolled away the stone' in order to 'sat upon it' as reported! At least from this holy account we are informed that 'an angel' appears 'as lightning' and his clothing's colour is 'white as snow'; and those who were put on guard to watch the vault in which the corpse was put, 'quake, and became as dead men' when they saw the angel! Although it did nothing to Mary Magdalene and the other Mary! Please we would like the holy Missionaries to explain these points rationally to us Muslims so that we may also understand what it all means!

We are a little bit confused about the following:

(2) The holy New Testament of 1881 AD states: "Now late on the sabbath day, as it began to dawn toward the first [day] of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre" From this statement it is clear that both Mary Magdalene and the other Mary did not ask any question. Yet, it is stated: 'And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, who hath been crucified. He is not here; for he is risen, even as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord *lay*.' Please look at what is been said: 'where the Lord *lay*' and not where the Lord was *buried*! What we need to understand is what '*an angel*' is? From the holy New Testament of 1881 AD which stated: '...his raiment white as snow' this means

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> According to the Catholic Bible (1959), the language of Jesus is said to be <u>Aramaic</u>, which was the spoken language in Galilee at that time. 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 <u>we cannot determine precisely the dialect he (Jesus) spoke</u>" [our emphases]. 15 : 'Same as clothing' Encarta Dictionary: English (U.K.).

that the angel must have had a body in order it to be clothed or to have '...his raiment white as snow' on! Furthermore, the angel was seen-able by the pagan watchers or guards; which means angels are seen-able beings by Tom, Dick and Harry according to the Holy New Testament of 1881 AD!

The confusion still remains unresolved:

(3) Now we come to the enjoyable part of the fable: "And the angel answered and said unto the women, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, who hath been crucified. He is not here; for he is risen, even as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord *lay*. And go quickly, and tell his disciples, He is risen from the dead; and lo, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you. And they departed quickly from the tomb with fear and great joy, and ran to bring his disciples word. And behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail." The beautiful part of the fable is Jesus must have walked through the stone that was rolled in front of the vault in which the corpse was laid which even a great earthquake could not remove. This miracle needs some examination: We know that the Gospel of Matthew was not written by him hence the story stopped. We now must try and pickup the fable from another story teller, in order to establish if it is the truth that Jesus really rose

from the dead and walked through that big heavy stone.

(4) It appears that the author of the book called the Gospel of Matthew did not know so much as Mark who reported:

Mark 16:1-20: "And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the [mother] of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might come and anoint him. And very early on the first day of the week, they come to the tomb when the sun was risen. And they were saying among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb? and looking up, they see that the stone is rolled back: for it was exceeding great. And entering into the tomb, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, arrayed in a white robe; and they were amazed. And he saith unto them, Be not amazed: ye seek Jesus, the Nazarene, who hath been crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold, the place where they laid him! But go, tell his disciples and Peter, He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you. And they went out, and fled from the tomb; for trembling and astonishment had come upon them: and they said nothing to any one; for they were afraid. Now when he was risen early on the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, from whom he had cast out seven demons. She went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept. And they, when they heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, disbelieved. And after these things he was manifested in another form unto two of them, as they walked, on their way into the country. And they went away and told it unto the rest: neither believed they them. And afterward he was manifested unto the eleven themselves as they sat at meat; and he upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them that had seen him after he was risen. And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned. And these signs shall accompany them that believe: in my name shall they cast out demons; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover. So then the Lord Jesus, after he had spoken unto them, was received up into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of God. And they went forth, and preached everywhere, the Lord working with them, and confirming the word by the signs that followed. Amen."

There is some very important information that Mark has given the world about the so-called death of Jesus. The holy New Testament of 1881 AD states:

"*And the angel answered* and said unto the women, Fear not ye; for I know that ye seek Jesus, who hath been crucified. He is not here; for he is risen, even as he said. *Come, see the place where the Lord lay*."

Please look at what is been said: '*where the Lord lay*' and <u>not</u> *where the Lord was buried*! To understand the real truth about this statement, one needs Mark's account of the episode:

"And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the [mother] of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might come and anoint him."

The above **small-clearing-information-statement** tells a gigantic truth! Now ponder carefully over what has been thus far revealed about Jesus' so-called death on the Cross. Let us be very meticulous with what we reveal; hence we refer again to what is called the Scriptures (Kalámu'lláh):

#### 1 Corinthians 15:3-4 states:

**15:3-4**: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received: that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures<sup>a</sup>; *and that he was buried*; and that he hath been raised on the third day according to the scriptures;<sup>b</sup>" (*Our emphasis*)

It is as clear as daylight that Paul reported: "...that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures<sup>a</sup>; and that he was **buried**..." This means that Jesus is dead and human beings cannot revive him to life again!!! You ought to remember the definition that we gave about '**buried**'? Let us again give the definitions of the words that need to be understood correctly: - <u>dead</u> and <u>buried</u> -so that we do not misunderstand one another:

#### <u>Dead</u>: no longer alive, having passed from the living state to being no longer alive

**Buried** is best defined as follows:

(1) To put something in a hole: transitive verb to dig a hole, put something in it, and replace the soil or other material removed."

(2) Inter dead body: transitive verb to put a dead body in a grave dug in the ground, or sometimes under water, usually as part of a religious ritual." (This meaning is from Microsoft Office 2007). According to 'The

Concise Oxford Dictionary 1946' 'burial n. Depositing under earth, burying, especially of dead body, funeral.'

If these definitions are the truth then the words which states: '...Mary Magdalene, and Mary the [mother] of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might come and anoint him...' cannot also be the truth!!! Nevertheless, let us refer again to the phrase which states: 'Come, see the place where the Lord lay', what are the meanings of the word '*lay*'? It could be: *Lay* could mean: 'put down'; 'place'; 'rest'; 'put'; 'arrange'; 'leave'; 'set'; 'position'; "1. set something down: 'Transitive verb to put something down, often carefully, in a horizontal position' 2. put in resting position: 'transitive verb to place somebody or something in a position of rest' 3. Bury somebody: 'transitive verb to bury somebody or something in the ground' '• They laid him in the family plot." Yes, we are a bit confused! The truth can only be defined by those who were present when the acts were committed! If Jesus was buried or that it meant that he was in the ground as he was dead; then "... Mary Magdalene, and Mary the [mother] of James, and Salome, bought spices, that they might come and anoint him...' came to perform something that made no sense whatsoever! There is something very wrong which we will have to uncover!!! If ... yes, if ... as this is not what was and still is not known to be factual, but let us assume that Jesus was really dead and rose on the third day, then he could not be killed again and that he could not eat food as he used to do, as he was before his death, if he has risen from the dead. We must keep in mind that we are examining the story by using **PROOF** or **EVIDENCE** which must not be 'WITHOUT PROOF' we cannot just believe these fables if we have no PROOF or EVIDENCE to substantiate what we are claiming or anyone else; it must be based on known facts so that we are not accused of analysing the subject 'WITHOUT PROOF'! We agree it is difficult but not impossible to base our arguments on EVIDENCE!

Let see what Luke has to say:

Luke 24:1-53: "But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came unto the tomb, bringing the spices which they had prepared. And they found the stone rolled away from the tomb. And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus. And it came to pass, while they were perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in dazzling apparel: and as they were affrighted and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead? He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee, saying that the Son of man must be delivered up into the hands of sinful men, and be crucified, and the third day rise again. And they remembered his words, and returned from the tomb, and told all these things to the eleven, and to all the rest. Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the [mother] of James: and the other women with them told these things unto the apostles. And these words appeared in their sight as idle talk; and they disbelieved them. But Peter arose, and ran unto the tomb; and stooping and looking in, he seeth the linen cloths by themselves; and he departed to his home, wondering at that which was come to pass. And behold, two of them were going that

very day to a village named Emmaus, which was threescore furlongs from Jerusalem. And they communed with each other of all these things which had happened. And it came to pass, while they communed and questioned together, that Jesus himself drew near, and went with them. But their eyes were holden that they should not know him. And he said unto them, What communications are these that ye have one with another, as ye walk? And they stood still, looking sad. And one of them, named Cleopas, answering said unto him, Dost thou alone sojourn in Jerusalem and not know the things which are come to pass there in these days? And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, The things concerning Jesus the Nazarene, who was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him up to be condemned to death, and crucified him. But we hoped that it was he who should redeem Israel. Yea and besides all this, it is now the third day since these things came to pass. Moreover certain women of our company amazed us, having been early at the tomb; and when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, who said that he was alive. And certain of them that were with us went to the tomb, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they saw not. And he said unto them, O foolish men, and slow of heart to believe in all that the prophets have spoken! Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things, and to enter into his glory? And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets, he interpreted to them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself. And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they were going: and he made as though he would go further. And they constrained him, saying, Abide with us; for it is toward evening, and the day is now far spent. And he went in to abide with them. And it came to pass, when he had sat down with them to meat, he took the bread and blessed; and breaking [it] he gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight. And they said one to another, Was not our heart burning within us, while he spake to us in the way, while he opened to us the scriptures? And they rose up that very hour, and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them, saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon. And they rehearsed the things [that happened] in the way, and how he was known of them in the breaking of the bread. And as they spake these things, he himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace [be] unto you. But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit. And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and wherefore do questionings arise in your heart? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having. And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet. And while they still disbelieved for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here anything to eat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish. And he took it, and ate before them. And he said unto them. These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me. Then opened he their mind, that they might understand the scriptures; and he said unto them, Thus it is written, that the Christ should suffer, and rise again from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name unto all the nations, beginning from Jerusalem. Ye are witnesses of these things. And behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high. And he led them out until [they were] over against Bethany: and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them. And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven. And they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually in the temple, blessing God."

Luke begins the fable as stated:

"But on the first day of the week, at early dawn, they came unto the tomb, bringing the spices which they had prepared."

In other words one can understand that certain knowledge guided them to prepare the spices beforehand as they must have known something which everyone did not know! There is something that prevented Luke to name them from the beginning! However, he did name them as follows: "Now they were Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the [mother] of James; and the other women with them told these things unto the apostles." We have witnessed that from Matthew to Luke more persons were mentioned which reveals that Matthew did not know what Mark knew, nor did Mark know what Luke knew this is the EVIDENCE presented by the Gospel writers which makes a mockery of the truth! However, the following statement further unveils some truth about the subject: "The things concerning Jesus the Nazarene, who was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people: and how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him up to be condemned to death, and crucified him." This statement a sane rational truthful person cannot find fault with - in contrast with the false claim that Jesus was the Son of God!!! What is clearly emerging from the statements is that Mary Magdalene, and Joanna, and Mary the [mother] of James: and the other women are in denial that Jesus died on the Cross! The following words support the reason for the women to be in *denial* as they have brought 'the spices which they had prepared' in order to 'anoint him'! Nevertheless, what is more striking is what is reported to have been said by Jesus: "And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and wherefore do questionings arise in your heart? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having. And when he had said this, he showed them his hands and his feet. And while they still disbelieved for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here anything to eat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish. And he took it, and ate before them." These words which are in no contradiction with known facts hit the nail on its head!!! These statements of facts bring out some of the pertinent points to prove that he was never dead!!! Look at them carefully: (1) "See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself" (2) "...handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having". (3) "And while they still disbelieved for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here anything to eat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish." Discard the words "...for joy, and wondered" as that really makes no sense! (4) "And he took it, and ate before them."

There are no better convincing methods than these five points to prove that he was never dead!!! These facts substantiate the reasons as to why the women came with *'the spices which they had prepared'* in order to *'anoint him'*! We ask in all sincerity please my Christian Missionaries do not be in denial after being corrected and guided with the truth and clear **EVIDENCE** from your own 1881 New Testament that the man that was supposed to have been crucified was not dead on the cross nor was he dead when he was taken down and was laid carefully in the vault by Joseph! Even the Qur'ân support these facts in the following words:

Qur'ân 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."

Qur'ân 5:75: "The Masî<u>h</u>, son of Maryam, was only a messenger; messengers before him had indeed passed away. And his mother was a truthful woman. <u>They both used to eat food</u>. See how We make the messages clear to them! Then behold how they are turned away!"

Qur'ân 5:72-8: "They do blaspheme who say: "(Allâh) is Christ the son of Mary." but said Christ: "O Children of Israel! Worship Allâh, my Rabb\*\* and your Rabb." Whoever joins other gods with Allâh,- Allâh will forbid him the garden, and the fire will be his abode. There will for the wrong-doers be no one to help. They do blaspheme who say: Allâh is one of three in a Trinity: for there is no god except one Allâh. If they desist not from their word (of blasphemy), verily a grievous penalty will befall the blasphemers among them. Why turn they not to Allâh, and seek His forgiveness? For Allâh is Oft- forgiving, Most Merciful. Christ the son of Mary was no more than an apostle; many were the apostles that passed away before him. His mother was a woman of truth. They had both to eat their (daily) food. See how Allâh doth make His Signs Clear to them; yet see in what ways they are deluded away from the truth! Say: "Will ye worship, besides Allâh, something which hath no power either to harm or benefit you? But Allah,- He it is that heareth and knoweth all things." Say: "O people of the Book! exceed not in your Religion the bounds (of what is proper), trespassing beyond the truth, nor follow the vain desires of people who went wrong in times gone by,- who misled many, and strayed (themselves) from the even way. Curses were pronounced on those among the Children of Israel who rejected Faith, by the tongue of David and of Jesus the son of Mary: because they disobeyed and persisted in excesse."

(\*\* 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. (i.e. Allâh is the Evolver)! Refer to Al-Qur'ân chapter 87 vs. 1-3.)

Qur'ân 5:116-117: "And Behold! Allâh will say: "O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, worship me and my mother as gods in derogation of Allâh?" Jesus will say: "Glory to Thee! Never could I say <u>what I had no right</u> (to say). Had I said such a thing, Thou wouldst indeed have known it. Thou knowest what is in my heart, Thou I know not what is in Thine. For Thou knowest in full all that is hidden. "Never said I to them aught except what Thou didst command me to say, to wit, 'worship Allah, My Rabb and your Rabb; and I was a witness over them whilst I dwelt amongst them; when Thou didst cause me to die Thou wast the Watcher over them, and Thou art a witness to all things."

## THERE IS NOTHING MORE TO BE SAID EXCEPT THAT THE MISSIONARIES SHOULD STOP LYING AND MISLEADING THEMSELVES AND OTHERS.

14:21: "They will all be marshalled before Allâh together: then will the weak say to those who were arrogant, "For us, we but followed you; can ye then avail us to all against the wrath of Allâh." They will reply, "If we had received the guidance of Allâh, we should have given it to you: to us it makes no difference (now) whether we rage, or bear (these torments) with patience: for ourselves there is no way of escape."

14:18: "The parable of those who reject their Rabb is that their works are as ashes, on which the wind blows furiously on a tempestuous Day: no power have they over aught that they have earned: that is the straying far, far (from the goal)."

# For a free emailed copy of this document kindly email request to: ymoosa786@hotmail.com

# 19 August 2011 Prepared by: Mr. Sulaiman Ebrahim Cape Town

Posted to Evangelical Press, P.O.Box 72, Bellville. 7530. Cape Town on the 21 August 2012

This reply was posted to them in September 2012, but no reply was received from them to date! (23 Oct. 2012)