www.Allah.com

www.Muhammad.com

|

Ahmed Deedat own Revealing the Truth

The Ultimatum manual

|

Ahmed Deedat, Kairanvi, Zakir Naik, Yusuf Estes **(though Zakir and Estes are wrong to market Ibn Abdel Wahab innovated creed of the upper 6th direction for the Creator instead the pure Koran and Hadith creed by the Prophet from the 9 books of Hadith which negates their false assumption, also we just released it in 2777 hadith in Arabic and draft in 79 languages – I ask Allah forgiveness)** are leading the Great Debate

or

Revealing the Truth of Islam to Christians

Izhar al Haq

|

Sheikh Ahmed Deedat decided to study English Bibles all various editions even Arabic versions,

he made a comparative study charts of the Gospels, he found in himself the full ability to work

for Islamic Call and to respond to missionaries, so Sheikh decided to leave all other business.

In Pakistan he found the book (Izhar Al Haq; revealing the truth) by Rahmatullah M.R. Kairanvi

of Agra, India (1854), so Sheikh practised what he learned from this book in responding to missionaries,

visiting them in their homes every Sunday. He then moved to the city of Durban, south Africa and

faced many missionaries and established

|

Islamic Propagation Centre International

<http://www.ipci.co.za/>

|

<http://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=Islamic+Propagation+Centre+International>

|

<http://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=ahmed+deedat+%2B+indonesia>

|

<http://www.youtube.com/results?search_query=ahmed+deedat>

|

<http://www.ahmed-deedat.net/wps/modules.php?name=myBooks2>

|

<http://www.iipctube.com/categories/66/Ahmad-Deedat>

|

Revealing the Truth debate

on 345 Proofs (196 ARGUMENTS plus 149 Additions to the Bible)

Covering 38 Bibles and books each is believed to be genuine and

authentic by almost all the Christians

|

Between

Rev. C.C.P. Fonder, Head of Global Christian Mission

|

And the Winner

|

M.R. Kairanvi, The Scholar of Agra, India 1854

|

The first English translation from Urdu by anonymous Blessed Mujawir in Medina

|

The second and last English revision by Anne Khadiejah & Ahmad Darwish

while living in Muhammad Ali Clay house, Chicago, IL, USA

|

Written originally in Persian and translated into Arabic by Prof. Abdusabour Shaheen,

Dar al Uloom, Cairo University, Cairo, Egypt.

|

See also

The Articles of the Bishop of Uramiah

"Muhammad in the Old & New Testaments"

Prof. Rev. David Benjamin Keldani, B.D. 1904

Published by the Court of Doha, Qatar

|

Referenced in this Dialogue the Old and New Testaments verses

are quoted from King James by American Bible Society.

|

The Koran (Quran) verses are quoted from the contemporary Koran

by the Darwish of Allah.com

|

The Arabic word "Allah" is a proper noun of the Creator

The Arabic word "Islam" means in English own ubmission" to Allah

|

1 Bible outlines:

|

THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE

|

"They are but names given by you and your fathers.

Allah has not sent down an authority for them.

They follow conjectures and their soul own Desire, although

the guidance of their Lord has come to them." [Koran 53:23]

|

The books of the Bible are divided by the Christians

and the Jews into two main parts: The Old Testament and

the New Testament.

|

The books of the Old Testament are claimed to have been

received through the Prophets who were prior to the Prophet

Jesus, the Messiah.

|

The books of the New Testament are believed to have been written

through inspiration after Jesus.

|

All the books of the Old and the New Testaments together are

called the Bible. Bible is a Greek word which means "book".

Both the Testaments are further subdivided into two parts. The

first part of the Old Testament is believed to be authentic by

almost all the ancient Christians, while the authenticity of the

other part is held to be doubtful and controversial.

|

2 THE FIRST DIVISION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

|

This collection comprises of 38 books:

|

1 GENESIS

|

The Book of Genesis describes the creation of the earth and

the skies and gives an historical account of the Prophets Adam,

Noah, Abraham, Isaac and Joseph. The book ends with the death

of the Prophet Joseph. This is also called the book of Creation.

|

2 EXODUS

|

Exodus is mainly a description of the life of the Prophet

Moses. It includes the teachings of Moses, his altercations with

Pharaoh, Pharaoh own drowning in the sea and the oral

communication of God with Moses. It ends with the Israelites"

camping in the desert of Sinai. It is called Exodus because it

describes the event of the Israelites" exodus from Egypt.

|

3 Leviticus

|

Is a collection of the injunctions and laws given to the Israelites

during their wanderings in the desert of Sinai. It has 27 chapters.

|

4 NUMBERS

|

5 The Book of Numbers includes events of the census of the

Israelites, their history before their departure to Canaan and the

injunctions of the Prophet Moses revealed to him by the bank of

the river Jordan. It contains 36 chapters.

|

6 DEUTERONOMY

|

The Book of Deuteronomy is a collection of those events and

injunctions which took place from after the period of the Book of

Numbers to the death of Moses. It contains 34 chapters.

|

The collection of these five books together is called the

Pentateuch or Torah. This is a Hebrew word meaning "the law

The word is also occasionally used to mean the Old Testament m

general.

|

7 THE BOOK OF JOSHUA

|

The Book of Joshua is ascribed to the Prophet Joshua son of

Nun who was the reliable servant and minister of Moses. He was

made the Prophet of Israelites after the death of Moses. He made

war on the Amalekites and was victorious over them. This book

describes his life up to the time of his death. It contains 24

chapters.

|

8 THE BOOK OF JUDGES

|

The Book of Judges covers the period after the death of

Joshua. This period is called the period of the Judges, because,

due to their transgression and wickedness God set cruel, foreign

kings over them to punish them until they returned to God and

repented their sins. Then some leaders were raised up among

them and came to their rescue. These Israelite leaders were

known as the Judges. It has 21 chapters.

|

9 THE BOOK OF RUTH

|

The Book of Ruth describes events in the life of a woman of

Moab called Ruth. She was the mother of Obed the grandfather

of the Prophet David. She migrated to Bethlehem and married

Boaz. They bore a child Obed. His son was Jesse who was the

father of the Prophet David. It has only 4 chapters.

|

10 THE FIRST BOOK OF SAMUEL

|

The First Book of Samuel concerns the Prophet Samuel who

was the last of the Judges of Israelites. Samuel was made king of

the Israelites in his period. It also includes the killing of

Goliath

by David and other incidents up until the death of Samuel. It has

|

11 THE SECOND BOOK OF SAMUEL

|

The Second Book of Samuel describes the events after the

death of Saul. It includes the kingship of David and his war

against the sons of Saul. It has 24 chapters.

|

12 THE FIRST BOOK OF KINGS

|

The First Book of Kings begins with the old age of David

an includes the event of his death, the reign of the Prophet

Solomon, his death and the lives of his sons up until the death of

Ahab. The Prophet Elijah own description is also included. It has 22

chapters.

|

13 THE SECOND BOOK OF KINGS

|

The Second Book of Kings includes the events from the

death of Ahab to the reign of Zedikiah. The Prophets Elijah and

Josiah are also mentioned. It has 25 chapters.

|

14 CHRONICLES I

|

Chronicles I comprises genealogies from Adam to Solomon.

It also includes short historical accounts leading up until the

time of David and gives details of David own reign over the

Israelites. It contains 36 chapters.

|

15 CHRONICLES II

|

Chronicles II describes Solomon own rule in detail and also

gives a short account of various Kings after Solomon up until the

reign of Zedikiah. The invasion of Nebuchadnezzar is also

covered at the end.

|

16 THE FIRST BOOK OF EZRA

|

Ezra I describes the reconstruction of Jerusalem by Cyrus the

King of Persia after the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar. It also

mentions the exile of Ezra and the return of the Israelites from

Babylon to their homeland. It contains 10 chapters.

|

17 THE SECOND BOOK OF EZRA

|

Ezra II is also called the Book of Nehemiah. Nehemiah was a

cupbearer of Artaxerxes the King of Persia. When he learnt about

the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, he sought the

king own permission and came to Jerusalem. He reconstructed it

with the help of Ezra. This book describes all these events and

the names of those who helped in rebuilding Jerusalem. These

events took place in 445 BC. It contains 13 chapters.

|

18 THE BOOK OF JOB

|

The Book of Job is said to be by the Prophet Job whose

patience and forbearance are also acknowledged and praised by

the Holy Koran. He was born in Uz, a city to the east of the

Dead Sea. The book mainly consists of conversations between

Job and his three friends Eliphaz the Temanite, Bildad the

Shubite, Zopher the Na"amathite who insist that the calamities of

Job are the result of his sins while Job refutes this. This book is

held to be of great literary merit. It contains 42 chapters.

|

19 THE BOOK OF PSALMS

|

The Book of Psalms is the corrupt form of the book of which

the Holy Koran says, "We have given the Zaboor to Dawood."

The book is a collection of 150 Psalms, or songs of praise, to

God.

|

20 THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

|

The Book of Proverbs is a collection of the exhortations and

proverbs of the Prophet Solomon. The Christians claim that this

book was compiled by Solomon himself. Kings I says: "And he

spoke three thousand proverbs." (4: 32). It contains 31 chapters.

|

21 THE BOOK OF ECCLESIASTES

|

The Book of Ecclesiastes is also called the "Book of the

Preacher". It is said that the name of one of the sons of David

was "the Preacher". It begins with these words: "The words of

the Preacher, the son of David." (1: 1). The book is a collection

of exhortations and advises.

|

22 THE BOOK OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON

|

The Book of the Song of Solomon is said to be a collection of

songs which were composed by Solomon of which the Book of

Kings says: "He spoke three thousand Proverbs and his songs

were a thousand and five." It has eight chapters.

|

23 THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

|

The Book of Isaiah is ascribed to the Prophet Isaiah, son of

Amoz, who was adviser to Hezekiah, the king of Judah, in the

8th century BC. When Sennacherib, the king of Assyria, invaded

Jerusalem, Isaiah was of great help to Hezekiah, the king of

Judah. This book is a collection of his visions and predictions of

future events. These predictions according to the Christians were

made by Isaiah in the reigns of the kings Azariah, Jotham and

Hezekiah. It has 66 chapters. This book contains many passages

of great literary merit.

|

24 THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

|

Jeremiah was an apostle and pupil of the Prophet Isaiah. God

made him a prophet in the days of Joshua or Zedikiah. He was

sent to the Israelites to prevent them from their perversion. He

preached to the Israelites but they did not listen to him. God

revealed to him that the Israelites would soon be subjected to a

punishment from God in the form of an invasion by

Nebuchadnezzar. Jeremiah warned them of this and advised them

to surrender but they mocked him. In the end Jerusalem was

totally destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. The Prophet Jeremiah

migrated to Egypt. According to some scholars the Holy Koran

refers to this incident in Surah 2: 259. It has 56 chapters.

|

25 THE BOOK OF LAMENTATIONS

|

The Book of Lamentations is a collection of songs of

mourning which are said to have been compiled by the Prophet

Jeremiah after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.

It has only 5 chapters.

|

26 THE BOOK OF EZEKIEL

|

The Book of Ezekiel is claimed to be by the Prophet Ezekiel,

the son of Buzi. He was a descendant of Levi, the son of Jacob.

He fought bravely against Nebuchadnezzar. This book is said to

be a collection of his revelations which consists of predictions,

exhortations and warnings to the people about God own Judgement

on them and about the coming fall and destruction of Jerusalem.

|

27 THE BOOK OF DANIEL

|

The Prophet Daniel was among the wise people who were

exiled from Judah and were taken into captivity by

Nebuchadnezzar. The interpretation of some dreams of the king

were made clear by him through revelations, and the king made

him the governor of Babylon. It also includes the dreams of the

Prophet Daniel regarding the future of the Israelites. These

dreams also contain a prophecy about the advent of Jesus, the

Messiah. It has twelve chapters.

|

28 THE BOOK OF HOSEA

|

Hosea was one of the prophets of the Israelites. He is said to

have lived in the period of Jotham, Azariah and Hezekiah, the

kings of Judah. This book is said to have been revealed to him

during the period of their reigns. The book mostly consists of his

admonitions to the Israelites against their perversion. His

revelations are mostly in the form of proverbs or in symbolic

language. It consists of 14 chapters.

|

29 THE BOOK OF JOEL

|

The Torah (Pentateuch) claims that Joel was a prophet of

God. This book which has only three chapters consists of his

revelations and includes injunctions about fasting and warnings

against the evil deeds of the Israelites.

|

30 THE BOOK OF AMOS

|

Amos is also said to be a prophet. In the beginning he was a

shepherd in the city of Tekoa. He was made prophet by God in c.

783 BC. The nine chapters of this book are said to have been

revealed to him in the reign of King Azariah. This book

comprises his admonitions to the Israelites on account of their

evil deeds. The book also predicts the invasion of Jerusalem by

the king of Assyria as a punishment from God, which is

mentioned in Genesis (29: 15)

|

31 THE BOOK OF OBADIAH

|

This small scripture consists of only 21 verses and includes a

dream of Obadiah the Prophet. There are some predictions

regarding the defeat of Adom, the enemy of Judah.

|

32 THE BOOK OF JONAH

|

This book is said to have been revealed to the Prophet Jonah.

He was sent to the people of Nineveh. The story given by Torah

is a little different from the one known by the Muslims.

|

33 THE BOOK OF MICAH

|

This book is said to be from the Prophet Micah, the

Morashite, who was a prophet in the period of the king Hezekiah

c. 900 BC. He warned the Israelites of God own wrath on account

of their perversion. The king, Hezekiah, acknowledged his

prophethood and abstained from evil deeds. (Kgs. 32: 26)

|

34 THE BOOK OF NAHUM

|

Nahum is also regarded as a Prophet by the Torah. Very little

is known about his life. This book of 3 chapters describes a

dream of Nahum which includes predictions of the downfall of

the City of Nineveh.

|

35 THE BOOK OF HABAKKUK

|

Habakkuk is also claimed to be a Prophet by the Torah. We

are not definite about his period. The Torah seems to put him in

the period before Nebuchadnezzar own invasion of Jerusalem. This

book mentions one of his dreams which admonishes the Israelites

on their evil deeds and predicts the destruction of Jerusalem by

Nebuchadnezzar. It has 3 chapters.

|

36 THE BOOK OF ZEPHANIAH

|

Zephaniah is also supposed to be a Prophet who was

ordained by God to prophet-hood in the period of Josiah, the son

of Amon, king of Judah. This script of 3 chapters warns the

people of Israel against the invasion of Jerusalem by

Nebuchadnezzar.

|

37 THE BOOK OF HAGGAI

|

This script of 2 chapters is attributed to the Prophet Haggai

who lived in the time of Darius, the king of Persia, in 500 BC

after the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar. He urged the Israelites to

rebuild Jerusalem and warned those who obstructed them.

|

38 THE BOOK OF ZECHARIAH

|

Zechariah was also a Prophet. It should be noted here that

this Zechariah is not the one who has been mentioned in the Holy

Quran. He is said to be a companion of the Prophet Haggai at

the time of the rebuilding of Jerusalem. This book consists

mostly of dreams which include prophecies regarding the future

of the Israelites and the coming of the Prophet Jesus It has

|

39 THE BOOK OF MALACHI

|

The Book of Malachi is ascribed to the Prophet Malachi. He

is the last Prophet of the Old Testament. The book has 4 chapters

and describes the thanklessness of the Israelites. The Prophet

Malachi lived about 420 years before the Prophet Jesus, the

Messiah

|

These thirty eight books are believed to be genuine and

authentic by almost all the Christians. The Samaritans, however,

a sect of the Jews, believed in only seven of them, i.e. the five

books of Moses and the book of Joshua son of Nun and the

Book of Judges. Their name refers to the city of Samaria in

Palestine. They differ from the Jews in two points, the

acknowledged number of the Books and what constitutes a place

of worship.

|

3 THE SECOND DIVISION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

|

There are nine books in this part. The authenticity of these

books has been a point of great controversy among Christians.

The Protestant faith, for instance, does not acknowledge the

divine origin of these books, and they have discarded them from

their Bible. They do not form part of the King James version of

the Bible. The collection of these nine books and five other books

together are called the Apocrypha.

|

1 THE BOOK OF ESTHER

|

Esther was a Jewish woman who was among the captives

from Jerusalem in Babylon. Ahasuerus, the king of Persia, was

unhappy with his first wife and he married Esther. Aman, a

minister of the king, had some differences with Mardochaeus, the

father of Queen Esther. He plotted to destroy the Jews. Esther

convinced the king to combat this plot and saved the Jews. This

book describes this event in 10 chapters.

|

2 THE BOOK OF BARUCH

|

Baruch was a disciple and scribe of the prophet Jeremiah

(Jer. 32: 13 - 36, 36: 4 - 32, 43: 3 - 16, 45: 1 - 3) The

Protestant Bible does not include this book.

|

3 PART OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL

|

4 THE BOOK OF TOBIAS

|

Tobias was a Jew who had been taken to Assyria in the

period of exile. The book describes a dangerous journey made by

him and his son. It also includes the event of his marriage with a

strange woman Sarah. This book is has great literary merit.

|

5 THE BOOK OF JUDITH

|

This book is ascribed to a very brave Jewish woman named

Judith. She saved and delivered her people from the oppression

of the king of Assyria. It also includes the story of her love.

|

6 WISDOM OF SOLOMON

|

This book is ascribed to the Prophet Solomon. It contains

wise sayings of the Prophet and is similar in many ways to the

Book of Proverbs.

|

7 ECCLESIASTICUS

|

This is a collection of preachings and exhortations. It is

attributed to Masiah, a preacher in c. 200 BC. This book is also

of great literary merit.

|

8 THE FIRST BOOK OF MACCABEES

|

This book describes the rebellion of the tribe of the

Maccabees.

|

9 THE SECOND BOOK OF MACCABEES

|

This book describes the history of a short period of time and

contains some unbelievable or corrupt reports.

|

4 THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

|

THE FIRST DIVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

|

There are twenty books in the first part of the New

Testament. These twenty books are believed to be genuine and

authentic by the Christians.

|

1 THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

|

This is not the Matthew who was one of the Twelve Disciples of

the Prophet Jesus. This book is considered to be the oldest of

the Gospels. The book begins with the genealogy of the Prophet

Jesus and describes his life and teachings up until his ascension

to the heavens.

|

2 THE GOSPEL OF MARK

|

Mark was a pupil of Peter, the Disciple of the Prophet Jesus.

This gospel begins with the prophecies made by previous

Prophets regarding the coming of the Prophet Jesus. It describes

the life of Jesus up until his ascension to heaven. It consists of

16 chapters.

|

3 THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

|

Luke was a physician and was a companion of Paul and

travelled with him on his journeys (Col. 4: 14 Acts 16) He died

in 70 AD. His gospel begins with the birth of the Prophet John

"the Baptist" (whose name in Koran is Yahya) and covers the life

of Jesus up until his ascension to heaven. It has 24 chapters.

|

4 THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

|

This book also begins with the birth of John the Baptist and

describes the events from the birth of the Prophet John to the

ascension of the Prophet Jesus. It consists of 21 chapters.

It should be noted here that John the son of Zebedee, the

disciple of Jesus is certainly not the author of this book. Some of

the Christians claim that the author of this book may be John the

Elder but this claim too is not supported by any historical

evidence.

|

These four books are also called the four Evangels.

Sometimes the word Evangel is also used for all the books of the

new Testament. The word is of Greek origin and means good

tidings and teaching.

|

5 THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES

|

It is said that this script was written by Luke to Theopheus. It

includes the acts and achievements of the disciples of the Prophet

|

Jesus after his ascension. It particularly describes the journeys

of Paul until his arrival in Rome in 22 AD. It has 28 chapters.

|

6 EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE ROMANS

|

This is a letter written by Paul to some of his Roman

followers. Paul was a Jew and an enemy of the followers of

Jesus in the beginning. Some time after the ascension of Jesus to

heaven he suddenly appeared and claimed to have received

instructions from Jesus.

|

7 FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS

|

This is Paul own first letter to the Corinthians and it consists

mostly of teachings and injunctions regarding unity among the

Christians. At that time they were involved in various disputes.

Chapter 7 includes some injunctions concerning matrimonial

relations. In chapter 8 the evils of paganism and the Christians"

attitude towards a pagan society are discussed. The last few

chapters include a discussion on atonement and the Hereafter

Chapter 16 describes the blessings of alms-giving and donations

for Christianity.

|

8 SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS

|

This letter was also written to the Corinthians by Paul and

contains 16 chapters. These chapters include religious

instructions, guidance, and suggestions regarding the discipline

of the Church. From chapter 10 to the end Paul speaks of his

ministerial ourneys.

|

9 EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE GALATIANS

|

Galatia was a province of Rome in the north of Asia Minor.

This letter was written to the churches of Galatia in early 57 AD.

Paul had heard that the people of Galatia were being influenced

by another religion. In this letter he tries to prevent them from

conversion.

|

10 EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE EPHESIANS

|

Ephesus was an important trading city of Asia Minor. There

was a great house of worship there to the goddess Diana. Paul

turned it into a great centre of Christianity in three years of

great effort. (Acts 1(): 19) In this letter he gives some moral

instructions to the people.

|

11 EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE PHILIPPIANS

|

This letter of Paul is addressed to the people of Philippi, a

city of Macedonia. This is the first city in Europe where Paul

preached Christianity. He was arrested there. This letter includes

his moral teachings and exhortations for unity among the

Christians.

|

12 EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE COLOSSIANS

|

This letter of Paul is addressed to the People of Colossae, a

city of Asia Minor. Paul is encouraging them to remain Christians

and calls upon them to abstain from evil deeds.

|

13 FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE THESSALONIANS

|

This letter of Paul was written to the people of Thessalonica,

a city of the province of Macedonia which is a part of Greece

today. He discusses, in this letter, the principles which bring

about God own pleasure. It also speaks of other subjects. It has 5

chapters.

|

14 SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE THESSALONIANS

|

This letter, containing only 3 chapters, offers Paul own

encouragement to the Thessalonians on their good deeds and

some instructions regarding their general behaviour.

|

15 FIRST EPISTLE OF PAUL TO TIMOTHY

|

Timothy was a pupil and disciple of Paul. (Acts 14: 17, 16:

1-3) Paul had great trust and admiration for him (Cor. 16: 10 and

Phil. 2: 19). The letter contains descriptions regarding rituals

and ethics.

|

16 SECOND EPISTLE OF PAUL TO TIMOTHY

|

This second letter to Timothy speaks of certain people who

had converted to other religions and also includes instructions to

Timothy about preaching and also some predictions for the last

ages. It has 4 chapters.

|

17 EPISTLE OF PAUL TO TITUS

|

Titus was also a companion of Paul on some of his journeys

(Cal. 2 : 1). Paul had great love for him (Cor. 2 : 13). Paul left

him in Crete so that he could preach there. This letter has 3

chapters and gives preaching instructions and details of the

prerequisites of bishops.

|

18 EPISTLE OF PAUL TO PHILEMON

|

Philemon was also a companion of Paul and had travelled

with him. The letter was written by Paul when he sent Onesimus

to Philemon (Phil. 1: 10)

|

19 FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

|

Peter was one of the closest apostles of Jesus. The study of

the New Testament shows that Paul had some differences with

him in later years. The letter was addressed to the Christians who

were scattered throughout the northern part of Asia Minor i.e. the

people of Poutus, Galatia, Cappadocia and Bithynia. The main

purpose of the letter was to encourage the readers who were

facing persecution and suffering for their faith.

|

20 FIRST LETTER OF JOHN

|

SECOND DIVISION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

|

In this division of the new Testament there are seven books.

The genuineness and divinity of these books is doubted and

debated by the Christians. Some lines from the first letter of John

are also not believed to be authentic.

|

21 THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE HEBREWS

|

The Jews are also called the Hebrews. The word has an

association with "Aber" a title given to the Prophet Jacob

Hebrews is also used for Christians. The letter was addressed to

a group of Christians who were on the way to abandoning the

Christian faith. The writer encourages them in their faith.

|

22 THE SECOND EPISTLE OF PETER

|

This letter from Peter is addressed to the early Christians. Its

main concern is to combat the work of false teachers and false

prophets. It also speaks of the final return of the Messiah.

|

23 THE SECOND EPISTLE OF JOHN

|

The second letter of John was written by John to the "dear

Lady and her children". According to the Christians the "Lady"

probably stands for the local church.

|

24 THE THIRD EPISTLE OF JOHN

|

This letter was addressed to Gaius, one of the pupils of John

and a church leader. The writer praises the reader for his help to

other Christians, and warns against a man called Diotrephes.

|

25 THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JAMES

|

This James is not the apostle James, the son of Zebedee and

brother of John. The writer is James, the son of Joseph the

carpenter. He is frequently mentioned in the Book of Acts. The

letter is a collection of practical instructions and emphasizes the

importance of actions guided by faith.

|

26 THE GENERAL EPISTLE OF JUDE

|

Jude is a brother of the James who was one of the 12

apostles. He is mentioned in John 14: 22. The letter was written

to warn against false teachers who claimed to be believers. Jude

is not the Judas who is said to have betrayed Jesus.

|

27 THE REVELATION

|

The Revelation of John is a collection of visions and

revelations written in symbolic language. Its main concern is to

give its readers hope and encouragement in their suffering for

their faith.

|

5 REVIEW OF THE BOOKS BY THE COUNCILS

|

1 It is important to note that in 325 a great conference of

Christian theologians and religious scholars was convened in the

city of Nicaea under the order of the Emperor Constantine to

examine and define the status of these books. After thorough

investigation it was decided that the Epistle of Jude was genuine

and believable. The rest of these books were declared doubtful.

This was explicitly mentioned by Jerome in his introduction to

his book.

|

2 [St. Jerome was a Christian scholar who translated the Bible

into Latin, he was born in 340 A.C.]

|

3 Another council was held in 364 in Liodicia for the same

purpose. This conference of Christian scholars and theologians

not only confirmed the decision of the council of Nicaea

regarding the authenticity of the Epistle of Jude but also declared

that the following six books must also be added to the list of

genuine and believable books: The Book of Esther, The Epistle

of James, The Second Epistle of Peter, The Second and Third

Epistles of John, The Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews. This

conference pronounced their decision to the public. The book of

Revelations, however, remained out of the list of the

acknowledged books in both the councils.

|

4 In 397 another great conference was held called the Council

of Carthage. Augustine, the great Christian scholar, W;tS among

the one hundred and twenty six learned participants. The

members of this council confirmed the decisions of the two

prevlous Councils and also added the following books to the list

of the divine books: The Book of the Songs of Solomon, The

Book of Tobit, The Book of Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, The First

and Second Books of Maccabees.

|

5 At the same time the members of this council decided that the

book of Baruch was a part of the book of Jeremiah because

Baruch was the deputy of Jeremiah. Therefore they did not

include the name of this book separately in the list.

|

6 Three more conferences were held after this in Trullo,

Florence and Trent. The members of these meetings confirmed

the decision of the Council of Carthage. The last two councils,

however, wrote the name of the book of Baruch separately.

|

7 After these councils nearly all the books which had been

doubtful among Christians were included in the list of

acknowledged books.

|

6 THE BOOKS REJECTED BY THE PROTESTANTS

|

The status of these books remained unchanged until the

Protestant Refom1ation. The Protestants repudiated the decisions

of the councils and declared that the following books were

essentially to be rejected: The Book of Baruch, The Book of

Tobit, The Letter of Jude, The Song of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus,

The First and Second Books of Maccabees. They excluded these

books from the list of acknowledged books.

|

Moreover, the Protestants also rejected the decision of their

forbears regarding some chapters of the book of Esther. This

book consists of 16 chapters. They decided that the first nine

chapters and three verses from chapter 10 were essentially to be

rejected They based their decision on the following six reasons:

|

1 These works were considered to be false even in the

original Hebrew and Chaldaean languages which were no longer

available.

2 The Jews did not acknowledge them as revealed books.

3 All the Christians have not acknowledged them as

believable.

4 Jerome said that these books were not reliable and were

insufficient to prove and support the doctrines of the faith.

5 Klaus has openly said that these books were recited but not

in every place.

6 Eusebius specifically said in chapter 22 of his fourth book

that these books have been tampered with, and changed. In

particular the Second Book of Maccabees.

|

Reasons: Numbers 1, 2, and 6 are particularly to be noted by the

readers as self-sufficient evidence of the dishonesty and perjury

of the earlier Christians. Books which had been lost in the

original and which only existed in translation were erroneously

acknowledged by thousands of theologians as divine revelation

This state of affairs leads a non-Christian reader to distrust the

unanimous decisions of Christian scholars of both the Catholic

and the Protestant persuasions. The followers of Catholic faith

still believe in these books in blind pursuance of their forebears.

|

7 THE ABSENCE OF CERTAINTY IN THE BIBLE

|

1 It is a prerequisite of believing in a certain book as divinely

revealed that it is proved through infallible arguments that the

book in question was revealed through a prophet and that it has

been conveyed to us precisely in the same order without any

change through an uninterrupted chain of narrators. It is not at

all sufficient to attribute a book to a certain prophet on the

basis of suppositions and conjectures. Unsupported assertions made

by one or a few sects of people should not be, and cannot be,

accepted in this connection.

|

2 We have already seen how Catholic and Protestant scholars

differ on the question of the authenticity of certain of these

books. There are yet more books of the Bible which have been

rejected by Christians.

|

3 They include the Book of Revelation, the Book of Genesis, the

Book of Ascension, the Book of Mysteries, the Book of Testament

and the Book of Confession which are all ascribed to the Prophet

Moses.

|

Similarly a fourth Book of Ezra is claimed to be from the Prophet

Ezra and a book concerning Isaiah own ascension and revelation are

ascribed to him.

|

4 In addition to the known book of Jeremiah, there is another

book attributed to him. There are numerous sayings which are

claimed to be from the Prophet Habakkuk. There are many songs which

are said to be from the Prophet Solomon. There are more than 70

books, other than the present ones, of the new Testament, which

are ascribed to Jesus, Mary, the apostles and their disciples.

|

5 The Christians of this age have claimed that these books are

false and are forgeries. The Greek Church, Catholic church and

the Protestant Church are unanimous on this point. Similarly the

Greek Church claims that the third book of Ezra is a part of the

Old Testament and believes it to have been written by the Prophet

Ezra, while the Protestant and Catholic Churches have declared it

false and fabricated. We have already seen the controversy of the

Catholics and Protestants regarding the books of Baruch, Tobit,

Jude, the Song of Solomon, Ecclesiasticus and both the books of

Maccabees. A part of the book of Esther is believable to the

Catholics but essentially rejected by the Protestants.

|

6 In this kind of situation it seems absurd and beyond the

bounds of reason to accept and acknowledge a book simply for

the reason that it has been ascribed to a prophet by a group of

scholars without concrete support. Many times we have

demanded renowned Christian scholars to produce the names of

the whole chain of narrators right from the author of the book to

prove their claim but they were unable to do so. At a public

debate held in India, one of the famous missionaries confessed to

the truth that the absence of authoritative support for those books

was due to the distress and calamities of the Christians in the

first three hundred and thirteen years of their history. We

ourselves examined and probed into their books and took great pains

to find any such authorities but our findings did not lead beyond

conjecture and presumption. Our impartial search in the sources

of their books showed that most of their assertions are based on

nothing but presumptions.

|

7 It has already been said that presumption and conjecture are

of no avail in this matter. It would be quite justified on our part

if we refused to believe in these books until we had been given

some arguments and authorities to prove their genuineness and

authenticity. However, for the sake of truth, we still go forward

to discuss and examine the authority of these books in this

chapter. It is quite unnecessary to discuss the authority of each

and every book of the Bible and we intend to examine only some

of them.

|

8 THE PRESENT PENTATEUCH IS NOT THE BOOK OF MOSES.

|

The Pentateuch (Torah) included in the Old Testament is

claimed to be the collection of the revelations to the Prophet

Moses. We firmly claim that the books of Pentateuch do not

possess any authority or support to prove that they were in fact

evesled to Mose and that they were wrltten by him or through

him. We possess sound arguments to support our claim.

|

9 THE FIRST ARGUMENT:

|

1 The existence of the Torah, Pentateuch, is not historically

known before King Josiah [of Judah], the son of Amon. The script of

the Pentateuch which was found by a priest called Hilkiah 18 years

after Josiah own ascension to throne is not believable solely on the

grounds that it was found by a priest. Apart from this obvious

fact, this book had again disappeared before the invasion of

Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar [king of Babylon].

|

2 Not only the Pentateuch, but also all the books of the Old

Testament were destroyed in this historical calamity. History

does not evince any evidence of the existence of these books after

this invasion.

|

3 According to the Christians the Pentateuch was rewritten by

the Prophet Ezra.

|

4 This book along with all its copies were again destroyed and

burnt by Antiochus [I Maccabees 1:59] at the time of his invasion

of Jerusalem.

|

10 THE SECOND ARGUMENT:

|

1 It is an accepted notion of all Jewish and Christian scholars

that the First and Second books of Chronicles were written by

Ezra with the help of the Prophets Haggai and Zechariah, but we

note that the seventh and eighth chapters of this book consist of

descriptions of the descendants of Benjamin which are mutually

contradictory. These descriptions also contradict statements in the

Pentateuch, firstly in the names, and secondly in counting the

number of the descendants. In chapter 7:6 we read that Benjamin

had three sons and in chapter 8:1-3 we find that he had five

sons while the Pentateuch claims that he had ten sons [Genesis

46:21].

|

2 Both the Christian and the Jewish scholars are unanimous on

the point that the statement made by the First Book of Chronicles

is erroneous, and they have justified this error by saying that the

|

3 Prophet Ezra could not distinguish and separate the sons from

the grandsons, because the genealogical 1ables from which he had

quoted were defective and incomplete

|

4 It is true that the three prophets who wrote the Pentateuch)

were necessarily sincere followers of the Pentateuch. Now if we

assume that the Pentateuch of Moses was the same one written by

these Prophets, it seems quite illogical that they should deviate

and or make mistakes in the divine book, neither was it possible

that Ezra would have wrongly trusted an incomplete and defective

table of genealogy in a matter of such importance.

|

5 Had the Pentateuch written by Ezra been the same famous

Pentateuch, they would have not deviated from it. These

evidences lead us to believe that the present Pentateuch was

neither the one revealed to Moses and written down by him nor

the one written by Ezra by inspiration. In fact, it is a collection

of stories and traditions which were current among the Jews, and

written down by their scholars without a critical view to their

authorities.

|

6 Their claim that three prophets committed mistakes in copying

the names and number of the sons of Benjamin leads us to

another obvious conclusion that, according to the Christians, the

prophets are not protected from wrong action and can be involved

in committing major sins, similarly they can make mistakes in

writing or preaching the holy books.

|

11 THE THIRD ARGUMENT:

|

1 Any reader of the Bible making a comparison between

chapters 45 and 46 of the book of Ezekiel, and chapters 28 and

29 of the Book of Numbers, will find that they contradict each

other in religious doctrine. It is obvious that the Prophet Ezekiel

was the follower of the doctrines of the Pentateuch. If we

presume that Ezekiel had the present Pentateuch how could he

have acted upon those doctrines without deviating from it.

|

2 Similarly we find in various books of the Pentateuch the

statement that the sons will be accountable for the sins committed

by their fathers up until three generations. Contrary to this, the

Book of Ezekiel (18: 20) says, "Son shall not bear the iniquity of

the father, neither shall father bear the iniquity of the son: the

righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the

wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him."

|

3 This verse implies that no-one will be punished for the sin of

others. And this is the Truth. The Holy Koran has confirmed it.

It says:

|

"No bearer of burdens can bear the burden of another."

|

12 THE FOURTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 The study of the books of Psalms, Nehemiah, Jeremiah and

Ezekiel testifies to the fact that the style of writing in that age

was similar to the present style of Muslim authors; that is to say,

readers can easily distinguish between the personal observations

of the author and his quotations from other writers.

|

2 The Pentateuch in particular, is very different in style, and

we do not find even a single place to indicate that the author of

this book was Moses. On the contrary it leads us to believe that

the author of the books of the Pentateuch is someone else who was

making a collection of current stories and customs of the Jews.

However, in order to separate the statements which he thought

were the statements of God and Moses, he prefixed them with the

phrases, "God says" or " Moses said". The third person has been

used for Moses in every place. Had it been the book of Moses,

he would have used the first person for himself. At least there

would have been one place where we could find Moses speaking

in the first person. It would certainly have made the book more

respectable and trustworthy to its followers. It must be agreed

that a statement made in the first person by the author carries

more weight and value than his statement made by someone else

in the third person. Statements in the first person cannot be

refuted without powerful arguments, while statements in the third

person require to be proved true by the one who wishes to

attribute those statements to the author.

|

13 THE FIFTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 The present Pentateuch includes within its chapters some

statements which are historically impossible to attribute to Moses.

Some verses explicitly denote that the author of this book cannot

have existed prior to the Prophet David but must either be a

contemporary of David or later than him.

|

2 The Christian scholars have tried to justify the opinion that

these sentences were added later on by certain prophets. But this

is merely a false assumption which is not supported by any

argument. Moreover, no prophet of the Bible has ever mentioned

that he has added a sentence to a certain chapter of a certain bok

Now unless these chapters and sentences are not proved through

infallible arguments to have been added by a prophet they remain

the writings of someone other than the Prophet Moses.

|

14 THE SIXTH ARGUMENT:

|

The author of Khulasa Saiful-Muslimeen has quoted from

volume 10 of Penny Encyclopaedia (which we reproduce here

from Urdu) that Dr Alexander Gides, an acknowledged Christi;m

writer, has said in his introduction to the New Bible:

|

"I have come to know three things beyond doubt through

some convincing arguments:

|

1 The present Pentateuch is not the book of Moses.

2 This book was written either in Cana"an or Jerusalem. That is

to say, it was not written during the period when the Israelites

were living in the wilderness of the desert.

3 Most probably this book was written in the period of the

Prophet Solomon, that is, around one thousand years before

Christ, the period of the poet Homer. In short, its composition

can be proved to be about five hundred years after the death of

Moses.

|

15 THE SEVENTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 "There appears no appreciable difference between the mode

of expression of the Pentateuch and the idiom of the other books

of the Old Testament which were written after the release of the

IsraeliteS from the captivity of Babylon, while they are separated

by not less than nine hundred years from each other. Human

experience testifies to the fact that languages are influenced and

change rapidly with the passing of time.

|

2 For example, if we compare current English language with the

language of four hundred years ago we notice a considerable

difference in style, expression and idiom between the two

languages. By the absence of this difference in the language of

these books Luselen, a learned scholar, who had great command over

Hebrew language assumed that all these books were written in one

and the same period.

|

16 THE EIGHTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 We read in the book of Deuteronomy (27: 5) " And there

shalt thou build an altar unto the Lord, thy God, an altar of

stones. Thou shalt not lift up any iron tool upon them. And thou

shall write upon the stones all the work of this law very plainly,

|

2 This verse appears in Persian translation published in 1835 ln

these words:

|

3 "And write all the words of the Pentateuch (Torah) on the

stones very clearly."

|

4 In the Persian translation of 1845, it appears like this:

|

5 "Write the words of this Torah (Pentateuch) on the stones in

bright letters."

And the Book of Joshua says:

|

6 "Then Joshua built an altar unto the Lord God of Israel in

Mount Ebal, as Moses, the servant of the Lord commanded the

children of Israel." (8: 30,31)

And verse 32 of the same chapter contains:

|

7 "And he wrote there upon the stones a copy of the law of

Moses which he wrote in the presence of the children of Israel."

(Josh. 8: 32).

|

8 All these extracts sufficiently show that the laws of Moses or

the Pentateuch was just as much as could be written on the stones

of an altar.

|

9 Now if we presume that it is the present Pentateuch that is

referred to in the above verses this would be impossible.

|

17 THE NINTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 Norton, a missionary, said, "Writing was not in vogue in the

time of Moses," indicating that if writing was not in use in the

period of Moses, he could not be the author of the Pentateuch. If

the authentic books of history confirrn his statement this can be

a powerful ARGUMENT in this connection. This statement is also

supported by the book "English History" printed by Charles

Dallin Press, London in 1850. It says:

|

2 "The people of the past ages used to scribble on plates of

copper, wood and wax, with needles of iron and brass or pointed

bones. After this the Egyptians made use of the leaves of the

papyrus reed. It was not until the 8th century that paper was

made from cloth. The pen was invented in the seventh century

AD."

|

3 If this historian is acceptable to Christians, the claim made

by Norton is sufficiently confirmed.

|

18 THE TENTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 The present Pentateuch contains a large number of errors

while the words of the Prophet Moses must have been free of this

defect. Genesis 46: 15 says:

|

2 "These be the sons of Leah which she bore unto Jacob in

Padanaram with his daughter Dinah: all the souls of his sons and

daughters were thirty and three."

|

3 The figure 33 is wrong. The correct number is 34. The

famous commentator Horsely, also admitted this mistake. He

said:

|

4 "If you count the names, including Dinah, the total comes to

34 and Dinah must be included as is evident from the number of

the sons of Zilpha, because Sarah was one of the sixteen.

Similarly the Book of Deuteronomy 23: 2 contains this

statement:

|

5 "A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord;

even to his tenth generation shall not enter into the congregation

of the Lord."

|

6 This statement is also not correct. On the basis of this

statement the Prophet David and all his ancestors up to Perez

would be excluded from the congregation of the Lord because

Perez was an illegitimate son of Judah. This is quite evident from

the description in chapter 38 of the Book of Genesis. And the

Prophet David happens to be in his tenth generation according

to the genealogical descriptions of Jesus in the Gospels of

Matthew and Luke. Needless to say that the Prophet David was

the leader of the congregation of the Lord; and according to the

Psalms of David he was the first born of God.

|

19 ERRORS IN THE CACULATION OF THE ISRAELITES" NUMBER.

|

1 We read in the book of Numbers ( 1: 45 - 47 ) this statement:

"So were all those that were numbered of the Children of Israel

by the house of their fathers, from twenty years old and upward,

all that were able to go forth to war in Israel; even all they that

were numbered were six hundred thousand and three thousand and five

hundred and fifty. But the Levites after the tribe of their fathers

were not numbered among them."

|

2 These verses imply that the number of fighting people of the

Israelites was more than six hundred thousand. This number

excludes the men, women and children of the Levi Tribe and all

the women of the other tribes of the Israelites and all those men

who were under twenty years of age. If we include the number of

all the people of Israelites excluded from this enumeration, their

total should not be less than twenty-five hundred thousand. This

statement is wrong for five reasons.

|

20 THE FIRST REASON.

|

1 The total number of men and women of the Israelites was

seventy a. he time of their arrival in Egypt. This is evident from

Genesis 46: 27, Exodus 1: 5 and Deuteronomy 10: 22. The

greatest possible period of their stay in Egypt is 215 years. It

cannot be more.

|

2 It has been mentioned in the first chapter of the Book of

Exodus that the sons of the people of Israel were killed and their

daughters left to live, 80 years before their liberation from

Egypt.

|

3 Now keeping in mind their total number at their arrival in

Egypt, the duration of their stay in Egypt, and the killing of

their sons by the King, if we assume that after every twenty five

years they doubled in number and their sons were not killed at all,

even then their number would not reach twenty-five thousand in the

period of their stay in Egypt let alone twenty-five hundred

thousand! If we keep in view the killing of their sons, this number

becomes a physical impossibility.

|

21 THE SECOND REASON:

|

1 It must be far from the truth that their number increased from

seventy to twenty-five hundred thousand in such a short period,

while they were subjected to the worst kind of persecution and

hardships by the king of Egypt. In comparison, the Egyptians

who enjoyed all the comforts of life did not increase at that rate.

|

2 The Israelites lived a collective life in Egypt. If they are

believed to have been more than twenty-five hundred thousand it

would be a unique example in human history that a population of

this size is oppressed and persecuted and their sons killed before

their eyes without a sign of resistance and rebellion from them.

Even animals fight and resist to save their offspring.

|

22 THE THIRD REASON:

|

1 The Book of Exodus chapter 12:39 describes how the

Israelites had taken with them the cattle herds and flocks, and the

same book 5:19, also informs us that they crossed the river in a

single night; and that they used to travel every day 13:21, and

that Moses used to give them verbal orders to march 14:1.

|

23 THE FOURTH REASON:

|

1 If the number were correct it would necessitate that they had

a place for their camp large enough to accommodate twenty-five

hundred thousand of people along with their herds or cattle. The

fact is that the area surrounding Mount Sinai, and the area of the

twelve springs in Elim are not sufficiently large to have

accommodated the Israelites and their cattle.

|

24 THE FIFTH REASON:

|

1 We find the following statement in Deuteronomy 7:22.

"And the Lord, thy God will put out those nations before thee by

little and little: thou mayest not consume them at once, lest the

beasts of the field increase upon thee."

|

2 It is geographically true that Palestine extended nearly 200

miles in length and ninety miles in breadth. Now, if the number of

the Israelites was really twenty-five hundred thousand, and they

had captured Palestine after killing all its residents all at once,

how was it possible for the beasts to have overcome the number of

the Israelites, because had they been much less in number than

stated, even then, they would have been enough to populate such

a small area.

|

3 Ibn Khaldun, also refuted this number in his

"Introduction; Muqaddimma" saying that, according to the researches

made by the scholars, the gap between Israel and Moses is only

three generations. It is unbelievable that in a period of only

three generations they could increase to that number.

|

4 In view of the above ARGUMENTs, it is obvious tht "the People

of the Book" (The Christians and the Jews) do not possess any

ARGUMENTs to prove their claim that the books of the Pentateuch

were written or conveyed by the Prophet Moses.

|

5 It is, therefore, not binding upon us to believe in these books

until and unless they produce irrefutable ARGUMENTs to support

thetr clalm.

|

25 THE STATUS oF THE BOOK OF JOSHUA

|

1 We have already seen that the Pentateuch, which enjoys the

status of being a fundanlent;ll book of the Christian faith,

callnot

be proved to be authentic and believable. Let us now proceed to

find out the truth about the Book of Joshua, the next book in

importance.

|

2 First of all, the nallle of the author of this book is not

known with certainty, and the period of its composition is also

unknown.

|

3 The Christian scholars profess five different opinions:

|

1 Gerrard, Diodat Huet, Albert Patrick, Tomlin and Dr Gray

believe that it was written by the Prophet Joshua himself.

|

2 Dr Lightfoot claims that Phineas [grandson of Prophet Aaron]

is the author of this book.

|

3 Calvin says that it was written by Eleazer.

|

4 Moldehaur and Van Til believe it to have been written by

Samuel.

|

5 Henry claimed that it was written by the Prophet Jeremiah.

|

4 Readers should note the contradictory opinions of these

Christian scholars, especially keeping in mind the fact that Joshua

and Jeremiah are separated by a period of 850 years. The presence

of this great difference in opinion is, in itself, a strong

evidence that the book is not believed to be authentic by them.

Their opinions are generally based on their calculations supported

by some vague notions indicatingthat a certain person might be the

author of a certain book. If we make a comparison between

Joshua 15: 63 and Samuel 5: 6-8, it is quite clear that this book

was written before the seventh year of the ascension of the

Prophet David to the throne. Joshua 15: 63 says, "As for the

Jebusites the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the children of Israel

could not drive them out; but the Jebusites dwell with the children

of Judah at Jerusalem unto this day." The above statement may be

compared with the statement made by the Second Book of Samuel

which confirms that the Jebusites were living in Jerusalem up until

the seventh year of the ascension of David to throne (5:6-8), the

author of Joshua own statement said that the Jebusites dwelt in

Jerusalem "unto this day" meaning the seventh year of David own

ascension to throne. This clearly implies that the author belonged

to that period.

|

5 Similarly the same book includes this statement, "And they

drove not out the Canaanites that dwelt in Gezer, but the

Canaanites dwell among the Ephraimites unto this day."" We find

another statement in I Kings 9:16 that the Pharaoh had driven out

the Canaanites from Gezer in the time of Solomon. This leads to

the conclusion that the book was written before the time of

Solomon. G.T. Menley has therefore admitted that a comparison

of Josh. 15: 63 with 2 Samuel 5:7-9 and of Josh. 16:10, with I

Kings 9: 16 leads to the conclusion that this book was written

before Rehobo"aam. See 2-Samuel 1:18

|

6 In view of this evidence, it is logical to conclude that the

author of the book of Joshua must have lived after the Prophet

David.

|

26 THE STATUS OF THE BOOK OF JUDGES

|

1 The book of Judges is the third most respected book of the Old

Testament. Again we are faced by a great difference of opinion

regarding the author of the book and the possible period of its

compilation.

|

2 Some Christian writers claim it to be the book of Phineas,

while some other believe it to have been written by Hezekiah. In

neither of these cases can it be said to be a revealed book because

neither Phineas nor Hezekiah are Prophets. Hezekiah was the

King of Judah. (2 Kings 18 and Chr. 32)

|

3 Some other writers have asserted that this book was written by

Ezra. It may be noted that difference of time between Ezra and

Phineas is not less than nine hundred years.

|

4 This difference of opinion could not arise if the Christians

possessed any real evidence concerning it. According to the Jews

all these claims and assertions are wrong. They, on the basis of

conjecture, attribute it to Samuel. So there are six different

opinions about it.

|

27 THE BOOK OF RUTH

|

1 This book, too, is the subject of great differences of opinion.

Some Christians think that it was written by Hezekiah, in which

case it is not a revealed book. Some others hold the opinion that

the author of this book is Ezra. All other Christians and the Jews

attribute it to Samuel.

|

2 It is stated in the introduction to the Bible printed in

Strasbourg in 1819 that the book of Ruth is a collection of family

stories and the Book of Job is only a tale.

|

28 THE BOOK OF NEHEMIAH

|

1 The same kind of difference is present regarding the author

and the period of this book. The most popular opinion is that it

was written by Nehemiah. Athanasius, Epiphanius and

Chrysostome believe it to have been written by Ezra. Aecording

to popular opinion it cannot be accepted as a revealed book.

|

2 The first 26 verses of chapter 12 are different from the rest

of the book of Nehemiah since in the first eleven chapters Nehemiah

is referred to in the first person, while in this chapter the third

person is used for no apparent reason. Furthermore, we find

Drius, the King of Persia being mentioned in verse 22 of the

same chpter, when in fact he lived one hundred years after the

death of Nehemiah. The Christian commeIltators have to declare

this anomaly as a later addition. The Arabic translator of the

Bible has omitted it altogetl1er.

|

29 THE BOOK OF JOB

|

1 The history of the book of Job is even more obscure and

uncertain than the other books. There are about twenty-four

contradictory opinions regarding its name and period.

Maimonides, a celebrated scholar and Rabbi of the Jews, Michael

Leclerc, Semler, Hock, Isnak alld other Christians insist that Job

is a fictitious name and the book of Job is no more than a fiction.

Theodore has also condemned it. Luther, the leader of the

Protestant faith, holds it as purely a fictitious story.

|

2 The book has been attributed to various names on the basis of

conjecture. However if we assume that the book was written by

Elihu [son of Bar"achel the Buzite] or by a certain unknown person

who was a contemporary of Manasse, it is not acceptable as a

prophetic and revealed text.

|

30 THE PSALMS oF DAVID

|

1 The history of this book, too, is similar to the history of the

book of Job. We do not find any documentary evidence to show a

particular man to be its writer. The period of collection of all

the Psalms is also not known. Whether the names of the Psalms are

Prophetic or not is also unknown. The ancient Christians have

different opinions about it. The writers, Origen, Chrysostome and

Augustine believe it to have been written by the Prophet David

himself. On the other hand, writers like Hilary, Athanasius,

Jerome and Eusebius have strictly refuted this. Horne says:

|

2 "Undoubtedly the fomler statement is altogether wrong".

According to the opinion of the latter group, more than thirty

psalms are from unknown authors. Ten psalms from 9() to 99 are

supposed to be from Moses and seventy-one psalms are claimed to

be from David. Psalm 88 is attributed to Heman and to Ethan [both

were physicians], while Psalms 72 and 177 are said to be from

Solomon.

|

3 And three psalms are believed to be from Jeduthun and one

hundred and twenty psalms from Asaph, but some Christians

refute that Psalms 74 and 79 are written by him. Eleven psalms

[42 to 49 and 84,85 and 87] are supposed to have been written

by three sons of Kore.

|

4 Some writers even think that the author of these psalms was a

totally different person who attributed these psalms to the various

writers concerned, while yet others of the psalms were written by

another unknown person. Calmat says that only forty-five psalms

were written by David, while the rest are by other people.

|

5 The ancient Jewish scholars enumerate the following names as

the writers of the Psalms: the Prophets Adam, Abraham, Moses;

and Asaph, Heman, Jeduthun and the three sons of Kore.

David only having collected them together. According to them

David, himself, is not the author of any of the Psalms; he is just

the receiver of them:

|

6 Horne said that the judgement of modern Christian and Jewish

scholars is that this book was written by the following authors:

the Prophets Moses, David and Solomon; and Asaph, Heman,

Ethan, Jeduthun and the three sons of Kore.

|

7 The same contradiction and confusion is found regarding the

period of its compilation. Some scholars hold them to have been

written and compiled in the time of David; some believe that they

were collected by some friends of Hezekiah in his period; while

some others think that they were compiled in different periods.

Similar differences are also expressed about the names of the

Psalms. Some claim that they are revealed, while others think that

someone who was not a prophet had called them with these

names.

|

8 Psalm 72, verse 20 says, "The Prayers of David, the son of

Jesse are ended." This verse has been omitted in the Arabic

translations apparently with the purpose of supporting the opinion

of the first group that the whole Book of Psalms was written by

the Prophet David. On the other hand it is also possible that this

verse might have been added later to support the second group own

opinion that the Prophet David was not the author of this book. In

both cases the distortion of the text is proved either by omission

of this verse or by addition of it.

|

31 THE BOOK OF PROVERBS

|

1 The condition of this book, too, is not much different from the

books we have discussed so far. A few writers have claimed that

the author of this whole book is the Prophet Solomon himself.

This claim is false because of variations in linguistic idioms and

style, and repetition of several verses found in this book

|

2 Apart from this the first verses of chapters 30 and 31 also

refute this assumption.

|

3 Even if we accept that some part of this book could have been

written by Solomon which is possibly true for 29 chapters, these

were not collected or compiled in his period because there is no

doubt that several of them were collected by Hezekiah as is evident

from 25:1:

|

4 "These are also proverbs of Solomon, which the men of

Hezekiah, King of Judah, copied out. "

This was done 270 years after the death of Solomon.

|

5 Some writers are of the opinion that the first nine chapters of

the book were not written by Solomon. Chapters 30 and 31 are

attributed to Agur and Lemuel, as cited, but strangely the

commentators could neither find out who these two authors were

nor are they sure of their being prophets.

|

6 On the basis of their usual presumptions they hold that they

were prophets. However, this kind of conjecture is not acceptable

to an impartial reader.

|

7 Some of them think that Lemuel is the second name of Solomon,

but Henry and Scott state:

|

8 "Holden has rejected the assumption that Lemuel was another

name of Solomon, and he has proved that Lemuel was a separate

person. Perhaps he has got sufficient proof that the book of

Lemuel and the book of Agur are revealed books. Otherwise they

could have not been included in the canonical books."

|

9 Adam Clarke says in his commentary:

"This claim is not supported by any evidence that Lemuel was

Solomon. This chapter was written a long period after his death.

The idioms of the Chaldean language that are found in the

beginning of this book also refute this claim.

And he comments on chapter 31:

|

10 "Certainly this chapter could not have been written by

Solomon."

Verse 25 of this chapter says:

"there are also proverbs of Solomon which the men of

Hezekiah copied out."

|

11 Verse 30 in the Persian version of the Bible printed 1838

says: "The words Aglr, the son of Jakeh, even the Prophecy: the

man spoken unto Ithiel and Ucal."

And the Bible printed in the Persian language in 1845 contains

this: "The words of Acur, son of Jafa, were such that the man

spoke unto Ithiel, evn Ithiel and Ucal."

|

12 The majority of writers have admitted that the book was

compiled by many people including Hezekiah, Isaiah and perhaps

Ezra.

|

32 THE BOOK oF ECCLESIASTES

|

1 This book, too, has a history of serious differences. Some

writers have claimed that its author was Solomon. Rabbi Kammchi, a

famous Jewish scholar, said that it was written by Isaiah. The

scholars of the Talmud attribute it to Hezekiah while Grotius says

that this book was written by Zorobabel for his son, Ebihud. John,

a Christian scholar, and some Gerrnan scholars calculate it to have

been written after the release of the Israelites from Babylon.

|

33 THE BOOK OF THE SONG OF SOLOMON

|

1 The history of this book is even more obscure and uncertain.

Some of the writers attribute it to the Prophet Solomon or some

person belonging to his time. Dr Kennicot and some writers

coming after him had the opinion that the claim of its being

written by Solomon was historically wrong and that it was written

a long time after his death. Theodore, a missionary who lived in

the fifth century AD, strictly condemned this book and the Book of

Job, while Simon and Leclerc did not acknowledge it as a genuine

book. Whiston said that it was a foul song and should be

excluded from the holy books of the Old Testament. Some others

have made the same judgement about it. Semler holds it as a

forged and fabricated book. The Catholic, Ward, has pointed out

that Castilio declared it to be a vile song and decided that it

should be excluded from the books of the Old Testament.

|

34 THE BOOK OF DANIEL

|

1 The Greek Translation of Theodotion, the Latin translation and

all the translations of the Roman Catholics include the Song of

Three Children and chapters 13 and 14 of this book. The Roman

Catholic faith acknowledges this song and the two chapters, but

the Protestants disapprove of it and do not consider it genuine.

|

2 THE BOOK OF ESTHER

|

3 The name of the writer of this book as well as the time of its

compilation is unknown. Some Christian scholars believe that it

was written by scholars living in the period between Ezra and

Simon. A Jewish Scholar Philon [a contemporary of Paul] aims that

it was written by Jehoiachin, the son of Joshua [was the son of

Jehoakin] , who had come to Jerusalem after the release from

Babylon. St Augustine believed it to be a book of Ezra.

|

4 Some other writers attribute it to Murdoch and Esther. Other

details of this book will later be discussed in chapter 2 of

this book.

|

35 THE BOOK OF JEREMIAH

|

1 We are certain that chapter 52 of this book cannot be claimed

to have been written by Jeremiah. Similarly the eleventh verse of

chapter 1() cannot be attributed to Jeremiah. In the former case,

because verse 64 of chapter 51 of the Persian Version 1838

contains: "Thus far are the words of Jeremiah". While the Persian

Translation of 1839 AD says: "The words of Jeremiah ended

here."

|

2 In the latter case the reason is that verse 11 of chapter 10 is

in the Chaldean language, while the rest of the book is in Hebrew.

It is impossible to trace who inserted them in the text. The

commentators have made several conjectures regarding the

persons making this insertion. The compilers of Henry and Scott

remarked about this chapter:

|

3 "It appears that Ezra or some other person inserted it to

elucidate the predictions occurring in the previous chapter."

Horne says on page 194 of Vol. 4:

|

4 "This chapter was added after the death of Jeremiah and the

release from the captivity of Babylon, some of which we find

mentioned in this chapter too."

|

5 Further in this volume he says:

"Certainly the words of this Prophet are in the Hebrew

language but chapter 10:11 is in the Chaldean language." I

The Reverend Venema said:

"This verse is a later addition."

|

36 THE BOOK OF ISAIAH

|

1 A public debate was held between Karkaran, a religious leader

of the Roman Catholics, and Warren about this book. This

discussion was published in 1852 in Agra (India). Karkaran

writes in his third letter that Stapelin, a learned Gerrnan writer,

had said that chapter 40 and all the chapters up to chapter 66 of

the book of Isaiah were not written by Isaiah. This implies that

twenty-seven chapters of this book are not the writings of

Isaiah.

|

37 THE NEW TESTAMENT AND THE STATUS OF THE FOUR GOSPELS

|

THE GOSPELS OF MATTHEW, LUKE AND MARK.

|

1 All the ancient Christian writers and a great number of modern

writers are unanimous on the point that the Gospel of Matthew

was originally in the Hebrew language and has been completely

obscured due to distortions and alterations made by the Christians.

The present Gospel is merely a translation and is not supported by

any ARGUMENT or authority. Even the name of its translator is not

definitely known. There are only conjectures that possibly this or

that person might have translated it. This kind of ARGUMENT cannot

be acceptable to a non-Christian reader. The book cannot be

attributed to its author only on the basis of uncertain

calculations.

|

2 The Christian author of Meezan-ul-Haq could not produce any

authority regarding the author of this book. He only conjectured

and said that Matthew might possibly have written it in the Greek

language. In view of this fact this translation is not acceptable

and is liable to be rejected.

|

3 The Penny Encyclopedia says regarding the Gospel of

Matthew:

|

4 "This Gospel was written in the Hebrew language and in the

language which was in vogue between Syria and Chaldea in 41

AD Only the Greek translation is available. And the present

Hebrew version is only a translation of the same Greek version."

|

5 Thomas Ward, a Catholic writer, says in his book:

"Jerome explicitly stated in his letter that some ancient

scholars were suspicious about the last chapter of the Gospel of

Mark; and some of them had doubt about some verses of chapter

23 of the Gospel of Luke; and some other scholars were doubtful

about the first two chapters of this Gospel. These two chapters

have not been included by the Marchionites [who do not acknowledge

th old testament and believe in two gods, one of good and one of

evil] in their book."

|

6 Norton writes in his book printed in 1837 in Boston:

" This Gospel contains a passage running from verse nine to

the end of the last chapter which calls for research. It is

surprising that Griesbach has not put any sign of doubt about its

text, since he has presented numerous ARGUMENTs to prove that this

part was an addition by some later people."

|

7 Later in his book, giving some more ARGUMENTs, he said:

"This proves that the passage in question is doubtful,

especially if we keep in mind the habit of writers in that they

usually prefer to add to the text rather than to omit from it."

Griesbach is one of the most reliable scholars of the Protestant

faith.

|

38 THE INAUTHENTICITY OF THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

|

1 There is no authority for the claim that the Gospel of John is

the book of the Apostle John to whom it has been attributed. On

the contrary, there are several ARGUMENTs that strongly refute this

claim.

|

39 THE FIRST ARGUMENT:

|

1 Before and after the period of the Prophet Jesus, the style of

writing and the method of compiling books was similar to the style

of the present writers. Although this Gospel is John own it appears

that the writer of it is not John himself.

|

2 It is not possible to refute the obvious evidence which the

text itself offers unless strong ARGUMENTs are presented to negate

it.

|

40 THE SECOND ARGUMENT:

|

1 This Gospel contains this statement in 21:24:

"This is the disciple which testifieth of these things: and we

know that his testimony is true," describing the Apostle John.

This denotes that the writer of this text is not John himself. It

leads us to guess that the writer has found some script written by

John and has described the contents in his own language making some

omissions and additions to the contents.

|

41 THE THIRD ARGUMENT:

|

1 In the second century AD when the authorities refused to

accept this Gospel as the book of John [the disciple],

Irenaeus - a disciple of Polycarp, the disciple of John - was

living.

|

2 He did not make any statement to negate those who refused to

accept the book and did not testify that he had heard Polycarp

saying that this Gospel was the book of John, the Apostle. Had it

been the book of John, Polycarp must have known it. It cannot be

the truth that he heard Polycarp saying many secret and profound

things which he related but did not hear a single word about a

matter of such importance.

|

3 And it is even more unbelievble that he had heard it and

forgot, since we know about him that he had great trust in verbal

statements and used to memorize them. This is evident from the

following statement of Eusebius regarding the opinion of Irenaeus

about verbal statements:

|

4 I listened to these words with great care by the grace of God,

and wrote them not only on paper, but also on my heart. For a

long time, I have made it my habit to keep reading them."

|

5 It is also unimaginable that he remembered it and did not

state

it for the fear of his enemies. This ARGUMENT also rescues us from

the blame of refusing the genuineness of this Gospel from

religious prejudice. We have seen that it was refused in the second

century AD and could not be defended by the ancient Christians.

Celsus, who was a pagan scholar of the second century AD,

fearlessly declared that the Christians had distorted their Gospels

three or four times or more. This change or distortion changed the

contents of the text.

|

6 Festus, the chief of the Manichaeans and a scholar publicly

announced in 4th century AD:

|

7 "It has been established that the books of the New Testament

are neither the books of the Christ, nor are they the books of his

apostles but unknown people have written them and attributed

them to the apostles and their friends."

|

42 THE FOURTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 The Catholic Herald, printed in 1844, includes the statement in

vol. 3 on page 205 that Stapelin said in his book that the Gospel

of John was undoubtedly written by a student of a school in

Alexandria. See how blatantly he claims it to be a book of a

student.

|

43 THE FIFTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 Bertshiender, a great scholar, said:

"The whole of this Gospel and all the Epistles of John

were definitely not written by him but by some other person in

the second century A.D."

|

44 THE SIXTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 Grotius, a famous scholar, admitted:

"There used to be twenty chapters in this Gospel. The

twenty-first chapter was added after the death of John, by the

church of Ephesus."

|

45 THE SEVENTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 The Allogin, a sect of the Christians in the second century AD,

disowned this Gospel and all the writings of John.

|

46 THE EIGHT ARGUMENT:

|

1 The first eleven verses of chapter 8 are not accepted by any of

the Christian writers and it will soon be shown that these verses

do not exist in the Syriac version.

If there were any authentic proof to support it most of the

Christian writers would have not made such statements. Therefore

the opinion of Bertshiender and Stapelin is undoubtedly true.

|

47 THE NINTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 Horne, in chapter two of vol. 4 of his commentary says:

"The information that has been conveyed to us by the

historians of the church regarding the period of the four Gospels

is defective and indefinite. It does not help us reach any

meaningful conclusion. The ancient theologians have confirmed

absurd statements and written them down. Subsequent people accepted

them just out of respect to them. These false statements thus were

communicated from one writer to another. A long period of time

has passed, and it has become very difficult to find out the

truth."

|

2 Further in the same volume he says:

"The first Gospel was written either in 37 A.D. or 38 A.D. or

in 43 A.D. or in 48 A.D. or in 61,62,63 and 64 A.D. The second

Gospel was written in 56 A.D. or at any time after it up until 65

A.D. and most possibly in 60 or 63 A.D. The third Gospel was

written in 53 or 63 or 64 A.D. The fourth Gospel was written in

68,69,70 or in 89 or 98 A.D."

|

3 following statement of Eusebius regarding the opinion of

Irenaeus about verbal statements:

|

4 I listened to these words with great care by the grace of God,

and wrote them not only on paper, but also on my heart. For a

long time, I have made it my habit to keep reading them."

|

5 It is also unimaginable that he remembered it and did not state

it for the fear of his enemies. This ARGUMENT also rescues us from

the blame of refusing the genuineness of this Gospel from

religious prejudice. We have seen that it was refused in the second

century AD and could not be defended by the ancient Christians.

|

6 Celsus, who was a pagan scholar of the second century AD,

fearlessly declared that the Christians had distorted their Gospels

three or four times or more. This change or distortion changed the

contents of the text.

|

7 Festus, the chief of the Manichaeans44 and a scholar publicly

announced in 4th century AD:

|

8 "It has been established that the books of the New Testament

are neither the books of the Christ, nor are they the books of his

apostles but unknown people have written them and attributed

them to the apostles and their friends."

|

48 THE FOURTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 The Catholic Herald, printed in 1844, includes the statement in

vol. 3 on page 205 that Stapelin said in his book that the Gospel

ofJohn was undoubtedly written by a student of a school in

Alexandria. See how blatantly he claims it to be a book of a

student.

|

49 THE FIFTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 Bertshiender, a great scholar, said:

"The whole of this Gospel and all the Epistles of John

were definitely not written by him but by some other person in

the second century A.D."

|

50 THE SIXTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 Grotius, a famous scholar, admitted:

"There used to be twenty chapters in this Gospel. The

twenty-first chapter was added after the death of John, by the

church of Ephesus."

|

51 THE SEVENTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 The Allogin, a sect of the Christians in the second century AD,

disowned this Gospel and all the writings of John.

|

52 THE EIGHT ARGUMENT:

|

1 The first eleven verses of chapter 8 are not accepted by any of

the Christian writers and it will soon be shown that these verses

do not exist in the Syriac version.

|

2 If there were any authentic proof to support it most of the

Christian writers would have not made such statements. Therefore

the opinion of Bertshiender and Stapelin is undoubtedly true.

|

53 THE NINTH ARGUMENT:

|

1 Horne, in chapter two of vol. 4 of his commentary says:

"The information that has been conveyed to us by the

historians of the church regarding the period of the four Gospels

is defective and indefinite. It does not help us reach any

meaningful conclusion. The ancient theologians have confirmed

absurd statements and written them down. Subsequent people accepted

them just out of respect to them. These false statements thus were

communicated from one writer to another. A long period of time

has passed, and it has become very difficult to find out the

truth."

|

2 Further in the same volume he says:

"The first Gospel was written either in 37 A.D. or 38 A.D. or

in 43 A.D. or in 48 A.D. or in 61,62,63 and 64 A.D. The second

Gospel was written in 56 A.D. or at any time after it up until 65

A.D. and most possibly in 60 or 63 A.D. The third Gospel was

written in 53 or 63 or 64 A.D. The fourth Gospel was written in

68,69,70 or in 89 or 98 A.D."

|

54 THE EPISTLES AND THE REVELATION

|

1 The Epistle to the Hebrews, the Second Epistle of Peter, the

Second and the Third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jacob, the

Epistle of Jude and several verses of the First Epistle of John are

wrongly attributed to the apostles. These books were generally

supposed to be doubtful up until 363 AD and continue to be

considered false and unacceptable to the majority of Christian

writers up until this day. The verses of the first Epistle of John

have been omitted in Syrian versions.

|

2 The Arabian churches have rejected the second Epistle of

Peter, both the Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the

Revelation. Similarly the churches of Syria have rejected them

from the beginning of their history.

|

3 Horne says in the second volume of his commentary (1822)

on pages 206 and 207:)

|

4 "The following Epistles and verses have not been included in

the Syrian version and the same was the case with Arabian

churches: the second Epistle of Peter, the Epistle of Jude, both

the epistles of John, the Revelation, the verses from 2-11 of

chapter 8 in the gospel of John, and chapter 5 verse 7 of the first

Epistle of John. The translator of the Syrian version omitted these

verses because he did not believe them to be genuine. Ward confirms

this in his book (1841) on page 37: " Rogers, a great scholar of

the Protestant faith has mentioned the name of a number of

Protestant scholars who declared the following books as false and

excluded them from the holy scriptures: the Epistle to the Hebrews,

the Epistle of Jacob, the second and the third Epistles of John,

and the Revelation."

|

5 Dr Bliss, a learned scholar of the Protestant faith stated:

"All the books up until the period of Eusebius are found

acceptable," and he insists on the point that:

|

6 "The Epistle of Jacob, the second Epistle of Peter and the

second and third Epistles of John are not the writings of the

Apostles. The Epistle to the Hebrews remained rejected for a long

period, similarly the Syrian church did not acknowledge the

second Epistle of Peter, the second and third Epistles of John, thc

Epistle to Jude and the Revelation."

|

7 Lardner said in vol. 4 of his commentary on page 175:

|

"Cyrillus and the Church of Jerusalem did not acknowledge

the book of Revelation in their period. Apart from this, the name

of this book does not even occur in the list of Canonical books

which he wrote."

|

8 On page 323 of the same volume he further said:

|

"Revelation was not the part of the Syrian version.

Barhebroeus and Jacob did not include this book for comments in

their commentary. Abedjessu omitted the second Epistle of Peter,

the second and third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude and the

Revelation from his list. All other Syrians have the same opinion

about these books."

|

9 The Catholic Herald (1844) contains the following statement

on page 206 of vol. 7: "Rose has written on page 161 of his book

that many Protestant scholars consider the book of Revelation non-

believable. Professor Ewald has produced powerful ARGUMENTs to

prove that the Gospel of John and the Epistles of John and the

Revelations of John cannot be the writings of the same person.

|

10 Eusebius makes the following statement in chapter 25 of vol.

7 of his history:

"Dionysius says that some ancient writers excluded the book

of Revelation from the Holy Scriptures and have completelv

refuted it. He said that this book is meaningless and a great

example of ignorance. Any association of this book with John or

with a righteous man or with any Christian is wrong. In fact, this

book was attributed to John by a heretic Cerinthus. I wish I had

the powers of excluding it from the Holy Scriptures. As far as my

own opinion is concerned, I believe it to be from someone who

was inspired. But what I cannot easily believe is that the writer

was any of the apostles, or that he was the son of Zebedee or

brother of Jacob."

|

11 On the contrary the idiom of the text and its style strongly

indicate that the writer cannot have been the Apostle John who is

mentioned in the Book of Acts because his presence in Asia Minor

is not known. This John is totally a different man who is an

Asian. There are two graves in the city of Ephesus, both bearing

the inscription of John. The contents and the style of this book

indicate that John, the Evangelist, is not the writer of this book.

Since the text of the Gospel and the Epistles is as refined as the

style of the Greeks. Contrary to this the book of Revelation

contains a text very different in style from the Greeks, full of

uncommon expressions.

|

12 Besides this the Evangelists have a common practice in that

they do not disclose their names in the Gospels nor in the

Epistles, but describe themselves in the first person or in the

third person, while the writer of this book has mentioned his own

name. In the revelation of Jesus in chapter I he says: "The

revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him to show unto his

servants things which must shortly come to pass; and he sent and

signified it by his Angel unto his servant John."

|

13 He also writes in chapter 4:

"John to the seven churches which are in Asia." In chapter 9 he

says: "1, John, who am your brother, and companion in tribulation

and in this kingdom, and patience of Jesus Christ." Again in 22:8

he says: " I John saw these things and heard them."

|

14 He mentions his name in all the above verses contrary to the

general practice of the Evangelists. The explanation that the

writer has disclosed his name against his normal practice in order

to introduce himself cannot be acceptable because if this had been

his object he would have used specific words together with his name

defining his intention. For example, he could have written John,

the son of Zebedee or brother of James. He only uses some

general words like " your brother ", companion in patience etc.

which do not serve the purpose of his introduction

|

15 Eusebius also says in chapter 3 of vol. 3 of his book:

"The first Epistle of Peter is genuine, but his second Epistle

should never be included in the Holy Scripture. Fourteen Epistles

of Paul are, however, read. The Epistle to the Hebrews has been

excluded by some people."

|

16 He further elaborates in chapter 25 of the same book:

"It has been a point of debate whether the Epistles to James,

and Jude, the second Epistle of Peter, and the Epistles of John I

and 11 were written by the Evangelists or some other writers of the

same names. It should be understood that the Acts of Paul, the

Revelation of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas and the book entitled,

"The Institution of the Disciples" are rejected books and this can

be proved. The Revelation should also be included in this list."

|

17 Eusebius also quotes a statement of Origen concerning the

Epistle to the Hebrews in chapter 25 of vol. 6 of his book:

"It is a popular notion among the people that this Epistle

(Hebrews) was written by Clement of Rome (150-22()) and some

people think that it was written by Luke."

|

18 The Irish missionary Lyon (178) and Hippolitus (220) and

Nouclus, the missionary of Rome (251), refused to accept the

genuineness of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Turtullien, the bishop

of Carthage (d. 200) says that this Epistle belongs to Barnabas.

Caius, the Presbyter of Rome (d. 251) counted thirteen Epistles of

Paul and did not count this Epistle. Cyprien, the bishop of

Carthage (248), does not make any mention of this Epistle. The

Monophysite churches still refuse to acknowledge the second

Epistle of Peter and the second and third Epistles of John.

|

19 Scaliger disowns the Epistle to the Hebrews by saying that

whoever was the author of this Epistle had wasted his time.

Eusebius, in chapter 23 of vol. 2 of his book says:

"Generally this Epistle is supposed to be false and several

ancient writers have mentioned this. Our opinion about the Epistle

of Jude is not different but many churches still act according to

it."

|

20 The History of the Bible (1850) contains this statement:

"Grotius says that this Epistle, that is, the Epistle of Jude was

written by Jude Oskolf (Archbishop) the 15th Oskolf of Jerusalem

living in the period of the Emperor Hadrian."

|

21 Eusebius has stated in his history vol. 6, chapter 25:

" Origen said in vol. 5 of his commentary on the Gospel of

John that Paul did not write anything to the churches, and if he

wrote to any church it was not more than a few lines."

|

22 According to Origen, all the Epistles which are attributed to

Paul, were not written by him. They are hypothetically attributed

to him. Perhaps a few lines of Paul might also be present in these

Epistles.

|

23 Keeping all these statements in mind, we are led to believe

the truth of the following statement made by Festus:

"The author of the New Testament is neither Jesus Christ nor

his apostles, but a certain man of unknown identity has written

them and attributed them to the Evangelists."

|

24 The truth of this statement has been proved beyond doubt. We

have already shown earlier in this book that these six Epistles and

the Book of Revelation were not believed in and remained rejected

up until 363; and they were not acknowledged even by the council

of Nicaea in 325. Then in 364 the members of the council of

Liodesia acknowledged the six Epistles. The Book of Revelation

remained excluded even in this meeting but later on in 397 was

acknowledged by the Council of Carthage.

|

25 The decision of the two councils about these books cannot be

considered as an ARGUMENT for obvious reasons. Firstly all the

councils had acknowledged the Book of Jude. The Council of

Liodesia then accepted the ten verses of chapter 10 from the Book

of Esther, and the six chapters subsequent to chapter 10. The

Song of Solomon, Tobit, Baruch, Ecclesiastes and Maccabees

were acknowledged by the council of Carthage, while all the

subsequent councils confirmed the decision of the above three

councils.

|

26 Now, if the decisions of these councils were founded on

authenticated ARGUMENTs, which they most certainly were not, then

the Protestants would have accepted them, but on the other hand,

if their decisions were arbitrary, as was in fact the case, it was

necessary for the Protestants to reject all of these books. We are

very much surprised to note that they accepted the Councils"

decision regarding the six Epistles as well as the Book of

Revelation but rejected it concerning the other books, especially

the book of Judith which had been unanimously acknowledged by

all the councils. This decision is again arbitrary and without

justification.

|

27 Their only proffered reason, that the original versions of

these books had been lost, cannot be accepted because Jerome

confirmed the fact that he found the original versions of Jude and

Tobit in the Chaldean language and the original book of

Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew, and these books have been translated

from the original versions. On this basis, the Protestants should

at least accept these books and they should in fact reject the

Gospel of Matthew since the original of that book was lost.

|

28 The statement of Horne, already quoted previously, proves the

fact that the ancient Christians were not very particular about

looking into the authenticity of their traditions. They used to

accept and write all kinds of mythical and fabulous stories and

traditions which were followed and acted upon by the people of

subsequent times. In view of this, the most acceptable conclusion

is that the scholars of these councils must have heard some of

these traditions, which, after having been rejected for centuries,

were acknowledged by them without any authentication)

|

29 Because the holy scriptures are treated by the Christians in

the same way as ordinary books of law and civil administration,

they continually changed and altered the texts to suit their needs.

A few examples of this will be sufficient to establish our claim.

|

30 The Greek translation was consistently acknowledged as the

authoritative text from the time of the Apostles to the 1 5th

century. The Hebrew versions were believed to have been distorted

and the Greek translation was considered the accurate version.

Subsequently the position of these books was altogether changed.

The distorted version was acknowledged as accurate and the

accurate one as distorted.

|

31 The Book of Daniel in the Greek version was genuine in the

eyes of the early scholars, but after Origen declared that it was

incorrect, they rejected it and replaced it with the version of

Theodotion.

|

32 The Epistle of Aristias remained on the list of the Holy

Scriptures but in the seventeenth century some objections were

raised against it and suddenly it turned into a false document in

the eyes of a]l the Protestant scholars.

|

33 The Latin version is believed genuine by all the Catholics

while it is considered distorted and unbelievable by the

Protestants.

|

34 The small book of Genesis remained genuine and believable

up until the 15th century while the same book was declared false

and rejected in thel6th century.

|

35 The third Book of Ezra is still acknowledged by the Greek

church but has been rejected by both the Catholics and the

Protestants. Similarly the Song of Solomon was considered

genuine and a part of the Holy Scriptures and can still be found in

the Codex Elexandrine, yet it is now rejected.

|

36 The gradual realization of the distortions present in a number

of their holy books is bound to lead the Christians, sooner or

later, to admit to the truth of the fact that the great part of the

Judeo-Christian scriptures have undergone great changes and

distortions.

|

37 We have shown that the Christians do not possess any

authentic records or acceptable ARGUMENTs for the authenticity of

the books of either the Old Testament or the New T estament.

|

55 CONTRADICTIONS AND ERRORS IN THE BIBLICAL TEXT

|

"Had it the Holy Koran) been from other than God,

they would surely have found therein

much discrepancy." (Koran 4:82)

|

The texts of all the Judaeo-Christian scriptures contain sur-

prisingly numerous contradictions and errors that are easily

spotted by a serious reader of the Bible. This section is devoted

to pointing out some of these contradictionsl in numerical order.

The errors found in these texts will be discussed separately in

the following section.

|

1 Contradiction No. 1

|

Any serious reader making a comparison between chapters

45 and 46 of the book of Ezekiel, and chapters 28 and 29 of the

book of Numbers will notice great contradiction in the

doctrines2 mentioned therein.

|

2 Contradiction No. 2

|

A comparison between chapter 13 of the Book of Joshua and

chapter 2 of Deuteronomy concerning the inheritance of the

children of Gad discloses a plain contradiction. One of the two

statements has to be wrong.

|

3 Contradiction No. 3

|

I Chronicles chapters 7 and 8 concerning the descendants of

Benjamin makes a statement which contradicts chapter 46 of

Genesis. The Judaeo-Christian scholars have had to admit that

the statement made by Chronicles is erroneous. This will be dis-

cussed later.

|

4 Contradiction No. 4

|

There is great discrepancy in the description of genealogical

names in I Chronicles 8:29-35 and 9:35-44. This contradiction

was noticed by Adam Clarke who says in volume 2 of his com-

mentary:

|

The Jewish scholars claim that Ezra had found two

books which contained these sentences with the

contradicting names and since he could not prefer one to

the other, he included both of them.

|

5 Contradiction No. 5

|

In 2 Samuel 24:9, it says:

|

And Joab gave up the number of the people unto the

king: and there were in Israel eight hundred thousand

valiant men that drew the sword and the men of Judah

were five hundred thousand men.

|

On the other hand, we find in I Chronicles 21:5:

|

And Joab gave the sum of the number of the people

unto David. And all they of Israel were a thousand thou-

sand and an hundred thousand men that drew sword: and

Judah was four hundred and threescore and ten thousand

men that drew sword.

|

The discrepancy in these statements amounts to a great con-

tradiction in the number of people. There is a difference of three

hundred thousand in the number of the Israelites while the dif-

ferenCe in the number of the People of Judah is thirty thousand.

|

6 Contradiction No. 6

|

We read in 2 Samuel 24:13:

|

So Gadl came to David, and told him, and said unto

him Shall seven years of famine come unto thee in thy

land?

|

However we read in 1 Chr. 21:12:

|

Either three years famine or....

The contradiction is quite obvious, since the former state-

ment speaks of seven years of famine while the latter statement

mentions only three years of famine referring to the same occa-

sion. The commentators of the Bible have admitted that the for-

mer statement is erroneous.

|

7 Contradiction No. 7

|

In 2 Kings 8:26 we find this statement:

|

Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he

began to reign; and he reigned one year in Jerusalem.

|

In contrast with the above statement we read in 2 Chr. 22:2:

|

Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he

began to reign...

|

This contradiction speaks for itself. The latter statement is

obviously wrong and the commentators on the Bible have

admitted this to be the case. It has to be wrong because the age

of Ahaziah own father, Jehoram, at the time of his death was 40

years and Ahaziah began reigning just after the death of his

father as is known from the previous chapter. In this case if we

did not negate the latter statement it would mean that the son

was two years older than his father.

|

8 Contradiction No. 8

|

In 2 Kings 24:8 it is stated that:

Jehoiachin was eighteen years old when he began to

reign...

|

This statement is contradicted by 2 Chr. 36:9 which says:

|

Jehoiachin was eight years old when he began to

reign...

|

The contradiction is more than obvious. The second state-

ment is erroneous as will be shown later in this book. This has

been admitted by Bible commentators.

|

9 Contradiction No. 9

|

There is an obvious contradiction between the statements of

2 Samuel 23:8l

|

["These be the names of the mighty men whom David had: The

Tachomonite that

sat in the seat, chief among the captains; the same was Adino the

Eznite: he lift up

his spear against eight hundred, whom he slew at one time."]

|

and 1 Chronicle 11:112

|

["And this is the number of the mighty men whom David had,

Jashobeam, an

Hachmonite, the chief of the captains: he lifted up his spear

against three hundred

slam by him at one time."]

|

Both are talking of the mighty men of David. Adam Clarke,

making comments on the former statements of 2 Samuel, has

quoted Dr Kennicot as saying that the verse in question contains

three great distortions. This requires no further comment.

|

10 Contradiction No. 10

|

It is stated in 2 Samuel 5 and 6 that David brought the Ark to

Jerusalem after defeating the Philistines, while chapters 13 and

14 of 1 Chronicles, describing the same event, make David

bring the Ark before the defeat of Philistines.

One of the two statements must be wrong.

|

11 Contradiction No. 11

|

In Genesis 6:19,20 and 7:8,9 we read:

|

And of every living thing of all flesh, two of every

sort shalt thou bring into the Ark, to keep them alive

with thee; they shall be male and female.

Of fowls after their kind and of cattle after their

kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after its kind,

two of every sort shall come unto thee.

|

But as we proceed a little further to the next chapter of this book

we suddenly come to this statement.

|

Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by

sevens, the male and his female, and of beasts that are

not clean by two, the male and the female.

|

When we proceed to the next verse it says: "Of fowls also of the

air by sevens..."

|

The contradiction speaks for itself.

|

12 Contradiction No. 12

|

It is understood from the Book of Numbers 31:7

|

["And they warred against the Midianites, as the Lord cornmanded

Moses- and

they slew all the males." 31:7]

|

that the Israelites killed all the men of Midian during the

lifetime of Moses,l and only their young girls were allowed to live

in se tude. This statement contradicts the description given in

Judges 6

|

["And the hand of Midian prevailed against Israel." Judges 6: 2

"And Israel was greatly impoverished because of the Midianites."

Judges 6:6]

|

from which it is understood that in the time of Judges the

Midianites were so strong and powerful that they dominated the

Israelites while historically the time difference between the two

periods is not more than one hundred years.

|

Having been totally wiped out, how could the Midianites

have been sufficiently strong and powerful to keep the Israelites

under their domination for seven years within the short period

of only one hundred years?2

|

13 Contradiction No. 13

|

Exodus 9:6 states:

|

And the Lord did that thing on the morrow, and all

the cattle of Egypt died: but of the cattle of the children

of Israel died not one.

|

This implies that all the cattle of Egypt had died but it is con-

tradicted by another statement of the same chapter of the same

book which says:

|

He that feared the word of the Lord among the ser-

vants of Pharaoh made his servants and his cattle flee

into the houses:

And he that regarded not the word of the Lord left

|

his serants and his cattle in the field.[Exodus 9:20,21]

|

The discrepancy in the above statements needs no comment.

|

14 Contradiction No. 14

|

Genesis 8:4,5 contains this statement:

|

And the Ark rested in the seventh month, on the sev-

enteenth day of the month, upon the mountains of

Ararat.

|

And the waters decreased continually until the tenth

month: in the tenth month, on the first day of the month,

were the tops of the mountains seen.

|

This statement contains a serious contradiction of facts, since

the Ark could have not rested on the mountain in the seventh

month as described in the first verse if the tops of the mountains

could not be seen until the first day of the tenth month as

described by the next verse.

|

15 Contradictions No. 15 - 26

|

A comparison between 2 Samuel 8 and l Chronicles 18, dis-

closes a great number of discrepancies and contradictions in the

original version in the Hebrew language, although the transla-

tors have tried to rectify some of them.

|

You can reproduce some of them in parallel columns

using the commentary of Adam Clarke on Samuel.

|

As can be seen there are numerous contradictions in these

two chapters.

|

16 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

17 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

18 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

19 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

20 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

21 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

22 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

23 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

24 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

25 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

|

26 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

27 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

28 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

29 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

30 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

31 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

32 2 Samuel vs. Chronicles

|

33 Contradiction NO. 33

|

1 Kings 4:26 contains this statement:

|

And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for

his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen.

|

This statement is clearly contradicted by 2 Chronicles 9:25,

which says:

|

And Solomon had four thousand stalls for horses and

chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen;

|

Urdu and Persian translations have the same number but the

Arabic translator has changed four thousand to forty thousand.

Adam Clarke, the commentator, having pointed out the contro-

versies of various translations and commentaries, has said, that

in view of the various discrepancies, it would be better to admit

that the numbers (in the Book of Kings) have been changed and

distorted.

|

34 Contradiction No. 34

|

Comparison of 1 Kings 7:24 and 2 Chronicles 4:2-3 also dis-

closes a contradiction in the statement of facts.

In both texts a natatorium (molten sea) made by Solomon is

mentioned. The text of the Book of Kings is this:

|

And under the brim of it round about there were

knops compassing it, ten in a cubit, compassing the sea

round about: the knops were cast in two rows, when it

was cast.

|

The text of Chronicles contains this description:

|

Also he made a molten sea of ten cubits from brim to

brim, round in compass...

And under it was the similitude of oxen, which did

compass it round about: ten in a cubit, compassing the

sea round about. Two rows of oxen were cast, when it

was cast.

|

This is what it says in the Urdu and English versions while

the Arabic translation of 1865 describes neither knops nor oxen

but totally different things, a kind of cucumber. Knop! Ox! or

Cucumber! Can you find any relation between these totally dif-

ferent things?

|

Adam Clarke, making comments on the text of Chronicles,

points out that the opinion of great scholars was to accept the

text of the Book of Kings, and it was possible that the word

"bakrem" might have been used in place of "bakem". "Bakrem"

signifies a knop and "bakem" an ox. To be short, the commenta-

tor has admitted the presence of human manipulation in the text

of Chronicles. The compilers of Henry and Scott are forced to

say that this difference in the text was due to a change in the

alphabets.

|

35 Contradiction No. 35

|

2 Kings 16:2 says:

|

Twenty years old was Ahaz when he began to reign,

and reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem...

|

We find another statement in the same book in 18:2 regarding

his son Hezekiah:

|

Twenty and five years old was he when he began to

reign; and he reigned twenty and nine years in

Jerusalem.

|

This later statement means that Hezekiah must have been

born when his father Ahaz was only eleven years old which is

physically impossible.l Obviously one of the two texts is wrong.

The commentators have admitted that the former statement is

wrong. Commenting on chapter 16 the compilers of Henry and

Scott say that apparently thirty has been written instead of

twenty and have advised people to refer to 18:2 of the same

book.

|

36 Contradiction No. 36

|

2 Chronicles 28:1 says:

|

Ahaz was twenty years old when he began to reign,

and he reigned sixteen years in Jerusalem:

|

Chapter 29 of the same book starts with these words:

|

Hezekiah (the son of Ahaz) began to reign when he

was five and twenty years old...

|

Here too (as in No. 35) one of the two texts has to be wrong

and apparently it is the first text that is erroneous.

|

37 Contradiction No. 37

|

A comparison between 2 Samuel 12:31 and 1 Chronicles

20:3, presents another obvious contradiction between the two

texts. Horne has also noted this difference and has suggested

that the text of the 1 Chronicles should be changed to accord

with the text of the Book of Samuel. He says, "The text of

Samuel is correct, therefore the text of Chronicles may accord-

ingly be altered."

|

What is to be noted from this example is the despotic and

arbitrary attitude of the Christian theologians towards their holy

scriptures. The more surprising fact in this regard is that this

suggestion was followed by the Arabic translator in 1844 in the

opposite direction to this suggestion. That is to say, he altered

the text of the Samuel to accord with the text of Chronicles and

not the other way round as was suggested by Horne.

|

The readers of this book should not be shocked by this. They

will soon be coming to frequent distortions of this nature - a

usual practice of the Christians.

|

38 Contradiction No. 38

|

We read in 1 Kings 15:33:

|

In the third year of Asa king of Judah began Baasha

the son of Abijah to reign all over Israel in Tirzah,

twenty and four years.

|

Contrary to this 2 Chronicles 16:1 says:

|

In the sixth and thirtieth year of the reign of Asa

Baasha, King of Israel came up against Judah...

|

The contradiction between the texts is more than clear. One

of the two texts must be wrong because according to the first

text Baasha died" in the twenty-sixth year of Asa own reign so that

in the thirty-sixth year of Asa own reign he has been dead for ten

years. Obviously Baasha cannot invade Judah ten years after

his death.

|

The compilers of Henry and Scott, commenting on the text

of Chronicles have said, "Asher, a great Christian scholar, has

said, "This twenty-sixth year is not the year of Asa own reign, but

this is the year of the division of the kingdom which was in the

period of Jeroboam."

|

The Christian scholars, however, have admitted that the text

of Chronicles is erroneous - either the number thirty-six has

been replaced by twenty-six or the phrase "the division of the

kingdom" is to be put in place of Asa.

|

39 Contradiction No. 39

|

The text of 2 Chronicles 15:19 is this:

|

And there was no war unto the five and thirtieth year

of Asa.

|

This text is again contradicting the text of 1 Kings 15:33 as

has been shown in the previous ARGUMENT under Contradiction

No. 38.

|

40 Contradiction No. 40

|

The number of Solomon own officers looking after the work is

described as three thousand and three hundred in 1 Kings 5:16

whereas in 2 Chronicles 2:2 this number is mentioned as three

thousand and six hundred The Greek translators have altered

this number making it six hundred.

|

41 Contradiction NO. 41

|

The text of 1 Kings 7:26 giving the description of the

"molten sea" made by Solomon says, "It contained two thou-

sand baths", while the text of 2 Chronicles 4:5 claims, "It

received and held three thousand baths".

|

The Persian translation, 1838, speaks of the capacity of two

thousand "idols". The Persian translation, 1845, contains, "Two

thousand vessels," And the Persian translation, 1838, contains,

"three thousand idols". The inconsistencies and discrepancies

of these various texts speak for themselves.

|

42 Contradiction NO. 42

|

When chapter 2 of the Book of Ezra is compared with chap-

ter 7 of Nehemiah, several discrepancies and contradictions in

the texts can be seen. Apart from textual differences, there are

errors in number of the Israelites.

|

In the two chapters there are twenty numerical contradictions

and many others where names are concerned. You can notice

the errors concerning the numbers of the liberated

Israelites.

|

The following is the contradictory wording from both:

|

6 The children Pahath- 11 The children of Pahath

Moab... two thousand eight Moab...two thousand eight

hundred and twelve. hundred and eighteen.

8 The children of Zattu, nine 13 The chilren of Zattu,

hundred forty and five. eight hundred forty and five.

12 The children of Azgad, a 17 The children of Azad

thousand two hundred twenty two thousand three hundred

and two. twenty and two.

15 The children of Adin, four 20 The children of Adin, six

hundred fifty and four. hundred fifty and five.

19 The chlldren of Hashum, 22 The children of Hashum

two hundred twenty and three. three hundred twenty and

28 The children of Beth-el eight.

and Ai, two hundred twenty 32 The men of Beth-el and Ai,

and three. an hundred twenty and three.

|

Both texts agree on the total number of the Israelites who

came to Jerusalem after the release from captivity in Babylon.

These chapters claim that they were forty-two thousand three

hundred and sixty. But if we add them ourselves, we do not

obtain this number neither from Ezra or from Nehemiah. The

total according to Ezra comes to twenty nine thousand eight

hundred and eighteen, while in Nehemiah it adds up to thirty-

one thousand and eighty-nine.

|

Nor is this total number correct according to the historians.

Joseph (Eusephius) says in the first chapter of vol. 2 of his his-

tory:

|

The Israelites that came from Babylon count to

forty-two thousand, four hundred and sixty-two.

|

The compiler of Henry and Scott own commentary have said under

the comments on the text of Ezra:

|

A great difference has been caused between this

chapter and chapter 7 of Nehemiah by the copyists. At

the time of their rendering into English, the corrections

were made through the available copies. Wherever the

copies could not be found, the Greek translation was

preferred over the Hebrew.

|

It may be noted how the texts of the Holy Scripture are so

easily distorted in the name of correction, and how texts that

remained acknowledged for centuries vanish altogether from the

books. Meanwhile the books still remain full of errors and con-

tradictions.

|

In fact, participation of human element in these books has

been present from their very origin. The copyists are unjustifi-

ably blamed for making errors. Even today a comparative read-

ing of these two chapters will reveal more than twenty errors

and contradictions.

|

43 Contradiction No. 43

|

We find this statement in 2 Chronicles concerning the name

of the mother of King Abijah:

|

His mother own name also was Michaiah, the daughter

of Uriel of Gibeah. (13:2)

|

Contrary to this we find another statement in the same book to

the effect that:

|

He took Maachah the daughter of Absalom; which

bare him Abijah... (11:20)

|

Again this latter statement is contradicted by the book of 2

Samuel 14:27 which says that Absalom had only one daughter

named Tamar.

|

44 Contradiction No. 44

|

It is understood from the Book of Joshua chapter 10 that the

Israelites took over Jerusalem after killing the king, while 15:63

of the same book denies the capture of Jerusalem by the

Israelites.2

|

45 Contradiction No. 45

|

2 Samuel 24:1 says:

|

And again the anger of the LORD was kindled

against Israel, and he moved David against them to say,

Go, number Israel and Judah.

|

This statement is plainly contradicted by I Chronicles 21:1

where it says that this thought was provoked by Satan. Since,

according to the Christians, God is not the Creator of evil, this

turns into a very serious contradiction.

|

CONTRADICTIONS IN THE GENEALOGY

OF JESUS NO. 46-51

|

A comparative reading of the genealogy of Jesus according

to the Gospel of Matthew and the genealogy according to Luke

reveals a number of contradictions:

|

46 Contradiction No. 46

|

Matthew describes Joseph as son of Jacob 1:16, while Luke says

Joseph son of Heli 3:23

|

47 Contradiction No. 47

|

According to Matthew 1:6, Jesus was a descendant of Solomon,

the son of David, while Luke 3:31 puts him into the line of Nathan,

the son of David.

|

48 Contradiction No. 48

|

Matthew claims that the ancestors of Jesus right from David

to the exile of the Israelites were all kings of great repute,

while Luke says that except David and Nathan none of them was king.

They were not even known as prominent personalities of their

time.

|

49 Contradiction No. 49

|

From Matthew 1:12 we learn that Salathiel was the son of

Jeconias while Luke 3:27 informs us that he was the son of Neri.

|

50 Contradiction No. 50

|

We read in Matthew 1:13 that "Zorobabel begat Abiud," while

Luke 3:27 says, "which was the son of Rhesa which was the son of

Zorobabel." It will be more surprising or rather very interesting

for the reader to know that I Chronicles mentions all the names

of the sons of Zorobabel, and neither Rhesa nor Abiud appear.

It appears that both names are false.

|

51 Contradiction No. 51

|

According to Matthew there are twenty-six generations from

David to Jesus, while according to Luke there are forty. As the

period of time between David and Jesus is one thousand years,

the gap from one generation to another according to Matthew is

forty years and according to Luke twenty-five years. This con-

tradiction is so clear that it requires no comment. It has been a

cause of great embarrassment to the Christian theologians and

scholars from the very inception of these two Gospels.

|

A group of great scholars like Eichhorn, Kaiser, Heins, De

Wett, Winner Fritsche and others have plainly admitted that

these two Gospels do really contain contradictions of an unjusti-

fiable nature. Just as the two Gospels contain discrepancies in

other places, so here too they are different from each other. Had

they been free from discrepancies throughout, some justification

for the difference in genealogical description might have been

found.

|

Adam Clarke, however, making comments on chapter 3 of

Luke, has reluctantly quoted some justifications together with

his remarks of astonishment about them. He has, for instance,

quoted Harmer on page 408 of vol. 5 making this unpalatable

excuse:

|

The genealogical tables were well kept by the Jews.

It is known to everyone that Matthew and Luke have

erred in such a way as to embarrass all the ancient and

modern scholars. But as several objections were raised

in the past against the author, for several doubtful points

of the books, and, these objections, later on, turned out

to be in his favour, similarly this objection too, will

come to his aid. And time will certainly do it.

|

However, this contradiction is so serious that it has caused

great embarrassment to both ancient and modern scholars. Their

claim that the genealogical tables were kept safe by the Jews is

false as it has been historically proved that they were destroyed

in the course of the calamities and unfortunate accidents that

have dogged the history of the Jews. For this obvious reason

errors are found in the text of Ezra as well as these Gospels.

Now if this was the condition of the scriptures in Ezra own time,

one can imagine the condition of these texts in the time of the

disciples. If the genealogies of the notable personalities and the

priests could not be preserved, how much reliance can be put on

the genealogy of poor Joseph who was only a carpenter. It is a

possible assumption that the evangelists might have adopted

two different genealogical tables concerning Joseph, the car-

penter, without proper regard to their accuracy. Harmer own hope

that time would change this objection in favour of the authors

seems very far from being realized since nineteen centuries

have passed without the Evangelists being exonerated in this

matter.

|

Had it been possible to do so, it would have been done a long

time ago, seeing that in the last three centuries Europe has made

such extraordinary advances in all branches of science and tech-

nology and has accumulated a treasure-house of resources to

help in the search for the truth. As a result of scientific

research

in the field of religion, they first made some reforms in their

faith and then rejected outright many of the established tenets

and creeds of their religion.

|

Similarly the Pope, who was considered infallible and the

highest authority of the Christians all over the world, was

declared an impostor and unworthy of trust. Further, in the

name of reforms, the Christians became subdivided into several

sects and continued to make so-called reforms until they finally

had to declare that Christianity as a whole was not more than a

|

collection of whimsical ideas and fabulous stories. Given this

situation the future does not allow us to hope for any positive

results

|

The only explanation for this contradiction presented by

some scholars is to say that perhaps Matthew has described the

genealogy of Joseph whereas Luke might have written the

genealogy of Mary. In this case Joseph would become the son-

in-law of Heli who was himself without a son. Joseph, there-

fore, might have been described as the son of Heli. This expla-

nation is unacceptable and is rejected for several reasons.

Firstly because in this case Jesus would not be a descendant of

Solomon but a descendant of Nathan, as he would be included

in the genealogy on his mother own side, not that of Joseph, the

carpenter. If this were so, Jesus could not possibly have been the

Messiah, since the Messiah who had been predicted by the

prophets had to be a descendant of Solomon. This is why a great

leader of the Protestant faith rejected this explanation saying to

the effect that, "Whoever excludes the Christ from the

genealogical line of Solomon, precludes the Christ from being

the Christ."

|

Secondly this explanation is not acceptable until it is proved

through authentic historical reports that Mary was indeed the

daughter of Heli and Nathan own line was through her. Mere

assumptions are of no avail in this regard especially in the pres-

ence of the adversary remarks of Calvin and Adam Clarke. On

the contrary, it is expressly mentioned in the Gospel of John that

the parents of Mary were Jehoachim and Joanna. And though

this Gospel is not recognised by the modern Christians as a

revealed book written by John, the disciple of Jesus, it is,

undoubtedly a document of great historical value. Its author cer-

tainly belongs to the early times of Christianity. The book cer-

tainly has more historical value than the most reliable books of

history. It cannot, therefore, be denied by unauthenticated

reports.

|

St. Augustine said that he found a statement in a certain book

that Mary was a Levite. This goes against her being a descen-

dant of Nathan. Besides, we find the following statement in the

Book of Numbers:

|

And every daughter, that possesseth an inheritance in

any tribe of the children of Israel, shall be wife unto one

of the family of the tribe of her father, that the children

of Israel may enjoy every man the inheritance of his

fathers.

|

Neither shall the inheritance remove from one tribe

to another tribe; but every one of the tribes of the chil-

dren of Israel shall keep himself to his own inheritance.

(Numbers 36:8,9)

|

And in the Gospel of Luke we read:

|

There was a certain priest named Zacharias, of the

course of Abia: and his wife was of the daughters of

Aaron.

|

It is known from the Gospels that Mary was closely related

to the wife of Zacharias (Elisabeth) which implies that Mary

was also a descendant of Aaron. We have just read the com-

mandment of Torah (Pentateuch) that any daughter of the chil-

dren of Israel should be married to her own tribe, therefore

Joseph also should be a descendant of Aaron. Jesus, in this case,

would be a descendant of David.

|

To avoid this confusion two different genealogies were writ-

ten. Since these Gospels were not known until the end of the

second century, the writer of one genealogy remained unknown

to the other genealogist. This is the apparent reason for the pre-

sent contradiction in the two Gospels.

|

Thirdly, had Mary been the daughter of Heli, it must have

been in the knowledge of ancient writers, who would not know-

ingly have presented such unbelievable explanations which,

later on, were rejected and laughed at by modern writers

|

Fourthly, the Gospel of Matthew says:

Jacob begat Joseph, the husband of Mary, of whom

was born Jesus, who is called the Christ.

|

While Luke says:

|

The son of Joseph, which was the son of Heli.

|

Both the statements clearly show that the authors are writing

the genealogy of Joseph.

|

Fifthly, if we presume that Mary was the daughter of Heli,

Luke own statement will not be true unless it is proved that it was

customary among the Jews that they, in the absence of a real

son, used to include the name of their son-in-law in their

genealogy. This has not so far been proved by any authentic

ARGUMENT. As far as the unauthentic claims of the scholars of the

protestant faith are concerned, they remain unacceptable to us

on account of their lack of proof and valid ARGUMENTs.

|

We do not deny the possibility of a certain person being

associated with another person who is related to him through his

father or wife or even being his teacher or his priest and he may

be associated with the name of another person. That is to say we

may, for example, refer to him as the king own nephew or the

king own son-in-law in order to recognise him through a known

personality. This kind of association is a totally different thing

from someone being included in the genealogical line of another

person. It is possible that it might have been a custom among

the Jews to say that someone was the son of his father-in-law,

but it remains to be historically proved that such a custom

existed.

|

Another point to be noted here is that the Gospel of Matthew

cannot have been known or acknowledged in the time of Luke.

Otherwise it would have not been possible for Luke to contra-

dict Matthew so blatantly that it has resulted in a serious embar-

rassment to the ancient and modem advocates of Christianity.

|

52 Contradictions No. 52 - 53

53

A comparative reading of Matthew 2 and Luke presents a

great contradiction to the reader and tends to indicate that nei-

ther of the two Gospels are divinely inspired.

|

It is understood from the description in Matthew that the par-

ents of the Messiah lived in Bethlehem even after his birth. It is

also made clear by another description in Matthew that the peri-

od of their stay in Bethlehem was two years. Due to the domina-

tion of the Magians they afterwards migrated to Egypt and lived

there during the lifetime of Herod,l and after his death, they

retumed to live in Nazareth. Luke, on the other hand, gives us a

different description. He says that Jesus" parents went to

Jerusalem after Mary own confinement,2 and that after offering the

sacrifice they went to Nazareth and lived there. However they

used to go to Jerusalem every year at the feast of Passover.

|

According to him there is no question of the Magians" com-

ing to Bethlehem. Similarly, the parents of Jesus could have not

gone to Egypt and stayed there as it is clear from what is said

that Joseph never left Judah in his life neither for Egypt nor for

any other place.

|

We learn from the Gospel of Matthew that Herod and the

people of Judah were not aware of the birth of Jesus4 until the

Magians reported it to him.

|

On the other hand Luke says that after Mary own confinement

when Jesus" parents had gone to Jerusalem to offer the sacrifice

they met Simeon, who was a righteous man and to whom it had

been revealed by the Holy Ghost that he would not die until he

had seen the Messiah. He lifted Jesus high in his arms and told

the people of his great qualities. Similarly Anna, a prophetess,

|

also told the people about the coming of the Messiah and

thanked God. Now if we accept that Herod and his people were

enemies of Jesus, Simeon would have not informed the people

about Jesus in the temple where his enemies were all around,

nor would the prophetess, Anna, have disclosed the identity of

the Christ to the people of Jerusalem.

The scholar Norton, who is a great advocate of the Gospels,

has admitted the presence of real contradiction in the two texts,

and decided that the text of Matthew was erroneous and that of

Luke was correct.

|

54 Contradiction No. 54

|

It is learnt from the Gospel of Mark that Christ asked the

congregation to go away after his sermon of parables,l and the

sea at that time was stormy. But from the Gospel of Matthew we

learn that these events took place after the Sermon on the

Mount.2 This is why Matthew described the parables in chapter

13 of his Gospel. This sermon, therefore, is proved to have been

a long time after these events, as the two sermons are separated

by a long period. One of the two statements, therefore, has to be

essentially wrong. The two authors, who claim to be men of

inspiration or are considered by the people to be so, should not

make erroneous statements.

|

55 Contradiction No. 55

|

The Gospel of Mark describes the debate of Jesus with the

Jews as taking place three days after his arrival in Jerusalem.

Matthew writes that it took place on the second day.

One of the two statement obviously has to be wrong. Horne

says in his commentary (vol. 4 p. 275 1822 edition) regarding

this contradiction and the one discussed before it that: "There is

no way of explaining these discrepancies."

|

56 Contradiction No. 56

|

The sequence of events after the Sermon on the Mount as

given by Matthew 8:3,13,16 is different from the one given by

Luke 4:38 5:13, 7:10

For instance, the events according to Matthew happened in this

order; curing a leper, Jesus" arrival at Capernaum, healing the

servant of a Roman officer, and healing of Peter own mother-in-

law. The Gospel of Luke first describes the event of Peter own

mother-in-law, then in chapter describes the healing of the

leper and in chapter the healing of the servant of a Roman

officer. One of the two statements certainly has to be erro-

neous.

|

57 Contradiction No. 57

|

According to the Gospel of John 1:19-21 some of the priests and

Levites were sent by the Jews to John to inquire if he was Elias.

He replied, "I am not Elias." This statement is expressly contra-

dicted by Jesus according to Matthew 11:14 where Jesus is

quoted as saying "And if ye will receive it, this is Elias which

was for to come." And also we find this statement in Matthew

17:10-13:

|

And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say

the scribes that Elias must first come?

And Jesus answered and said unto them, Elias truly

shall first come, and restore all things.

But I say unto you, That Elias is come already, and

|

they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever

they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of

them.

Then the disciples understood that he spake unto

them of John, the Baptist.

|

Both these texts denote that John the Baptist is the promised

Elias, with the result that the statements of John and Jesus con-

tradict each other.

|

A careful reading of the books of Christianity makes it

almost impossible to believe that Jesus was the promised

Messiah. To premise our ARGUMENT, the following four points

should first be noted:

|

Firstly, according to the book of Jeremiah when Jehoiakim,

son of Josiah, burnt the scripture which was written by Baruch

from Jeremiah own recitation, Jeremiah received the following rev-

elation from God:

|

Thus saith the Lord of Jehoiakim King of Judah; He

shall have none to sit upon the throne of David [Jeremiah 36:30]

|

According to the word of Gabriel as quoted by Luke it is neces-

sary for the Messiah to sit on the throne of David:

|

And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of

his father, David [Luke 1:32]

|

Secondly, the coming of the Christ was conditional on the

coming of Elias prior to him. One of the major ARGUMENTs of the

Jews to support their disbelief in Christ was that Elias had not

come, whereas his coming prior to the Messiah was positively

necessary according to their books. Jesus himself confirmed that

Elias must come first, but at the same time he said that Elias had

already come but the people did not recognize him. On the other

|

Unable to recognize this page.

|

except that the earlier versions have been changed.

|

64 Contradictions No. 64-67

65

66

67

|

The following texts contradict each other:

|

(1) Matthew 2:6 and Micah 5:2.

The Matthew text says:

|

And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Judah, art not the

least among the Princes of Judah: for out of thee shall

come a governor, that shall rule my people Israel.

|

In the text of Micah, Bethlehem is mentioned as little.

|

(2) Acts 2:25-28 and four verses of Psalm 15, according to

the Arabic version and Psalm 16:8-11 according to other trans-

lations.

|

(3) The Epistle to the Hebrews 10:5-7 contradicts Psalm No.

39 (Arabic) and Psalm No. 40:6-8 according to other transla-

tions. The text of Hebrews has:

|

Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith,

Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast

thou prepared me: In burnt offerings and sacrifices for

sin thou hast had no pleasure. Then said I, Lo: I come to

do thy will, O God!

|

Whereas in the Psalms it says:

|

Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine

ears thou has opened: burnt offering and sin offering

hast thou not required.

Then said I, Lo, I come: in the volume of the book it

is written of me,

I delight to do thy will, O my God: yea, thy law is

within my heart.

|

(4) Acts 15:16,17 are inconsistent with Amos 9:11,12.

In Acts 15 it says:

|

After this I will return, and will build again the

tabernacle of David, which is fallen down; and I will

build again the ruins thereof; and I will set it up, that the

residue of men might seek after the Lord.

|

Amos has:

|

In that day will I raise up the tabernacle of David

that is fallen, and close up the breaches thereof; and I

will raise up his ruins and I will build it as in the days of

old. That they may possess the remnant of Edom, and of

all the heathen, which are called by my name.

|

The Christian commentators have admitted the presence of

contradictions in these texts and have acknowledged that the

Hebrew version has been manipulated.

|

68 Contradiction No. 68

|

Paul own first letter to Corinthians 2:9 says:

|

But as it is written, Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard,

neither have entered into the heart of man, the things

which God hath prepared for them that love him.

|

The researches of the Christian theologians have concluded that

this statement derives from Isaiah 64:4 which is this:

|

For, since of the beginning of the world, men have

not heard, nor perceived by the ear, neither has the eye

seen, O God, besides thee, what he hath prepared for

him that waiteth for him.

|

The difference between the two texts is quite obvious. The

commentators of the Bible admit the presence of incompatibili-

ty in the above texts and say that the text of Isaiah has been dis-

torted.

|

69 Contradiction No. 69

|

The Gospel of Matthew 9:27-31 describes in chapter 9 that Jesus

after departing from Jericho, saw two blind men on the way and

healed them of their blindness. Contradicting this, Mark writes

in chapter 10 of his gospel:

|

..blind Bartimaus, the son of Timaeus, sat by the

highway side begging.

|

So in Mark the healing of only one man by Jesus is mentioned.

|

70 Contradiction No. 70

|

Matthew describes this event in chapter 8:28:

|

...into the country of Gergesenes, there met him two

possessed with devils, coming out of the tombs.

|

Then Jesus is described as healing them. This statement is

inconsistent with the texts of Mark chapter S and Luke chapter

8, which is this:

|

There met him out of the city a certain man which

had devils ...[Luke 8:27]

|

Then he was healed by Jesus. Two men in the first quotation

become one in the second.

|

71 Contradiction No. 71

|

It appears from chapter 21:7 of Matthew that Jesus sent two of

his disciples to bring an ass and a colt from a village and the

disciples:

|

...brought the ass and the colt, and put on them their

clothes, and they set him thereon.

|

While the rest of the Evangelists said that Jesus asked his

disciples to bring only the colt or an ass and that when it came

he rode on it.

|

72 Contradiction No. 72

|

Mark 1:6 says in his first chapter "And John ...did eat locusts

and wild honey.

|

While Matthew 11:18,19 states that: "John came neither eating nor

drinking."

|

73 Contradiction Nos. 73-75

74

75

|

A comparison between the texts of Mark chapter one,

Matthew chapter four and John chapter one, reveals inconsisten-

cies regarding the circumstances-in which the disciples

embraced the new faith. The Gospels of Matthew and Mark

write:

|

And Jesus walking by the sea of Galilee, saw two

brethren, Simon called Peter, and Andrew, his brother,

casting a net into the sea... and he saith unto them

Follow me ... And they followed him ... He saw other

two brethren James, the son of Zebedee and John his

Brother, mending their nets ... he called them . and they

followed him [Matthew 4:18-22]

|

But the text of John is different from the above text in three

ways. Firstly John does not mention the name of James

Secondly it describes that Jesus saw them with the exception of

John on the banks of the Jordan (not Galilee). Thirdly John does

not speak of their nets. The contents of John own text inform us

that Jesus met John and Andrew on the banks of the Jordan then

Peter was sent by Andrew. And on the next day came Philip and

Nathanael. James is not mentioned [John 5:22,23]

|

76 Contradiction No. 76

|

A comparison of chapter 9 of Matthew with chapter 5 of

Mark reveals contradictions in the reports of the two evangelists

concerning the ruler own daughter. Matthew reports:

|

There came a certain ruler .... saying my daughter is

even now dead.

|

While Mark 5:22,23 says:

|

He fell at his feet... saying, my little daughter lieth at

the point of death.

|

Further he says that Jesus went with the ruler, but on the way

people came from the synagogue and said, "Thy daughter is

|

Some early scholars have admitted that incompatibility exist-

ed between the two texts. Some of them favoured the text of

atthew while some others preferred the text of Mark. Luke own

text is similar to the text of Mark except that he writes that the

report of the daughter own death was given only by one man [8:49]

|

The death of the ruler own daughter has consistently been a

point of confusion among scholars of the Bible. There is dis-

agreement on the question of whether the daughter had died or

was just looking as if she was dead. The learned scholar Nander

is not convinced that she was dead. He said that, in fact, she was

not dead but only looked as if she was. The scholars Balish,

Sliemasher and Sassoon are also of the opinion that she was not

dead but only unconscious. This is also supported by the state-

ment of Jesus [Like 8:52]

|

Weep not, she is not dead, but sleepeth.

|

According to these opinions this event does not serve the

purpose of proving the miracle of the resurrection of the dead.

|

77 Contradiction No. 77

|

It is understood from Matthew 10:10 and Luke that when Christ

sent his disciples to preach, he forbade them to keep staves with

them, while on the contrary the text of Mark 6:8 says that Jesus

allowed them to keep their staves.

|

78 Contradiction No. 78

|

\*\*

|

It is said in chapter 3:13 of Matthew that:

|

Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John,

to be baptized of him. But John forbad him, saying, I

have need to be baptized of thee, and comest thou to

me?

|

Further in the chapter it says:

|

And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straight-

way out of the water ... and he saw the Spirit of God,

descending like a dove...

|

And the Gospel of John 1:32,23 describes this event in these

words:

|

And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit

descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon

him. And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize

with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou

shall see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him,

the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost.

|

The Gospel of Matthew 11:2 contains this statement in chapter

|

Now when John had heard in the prison the works of

Christ, he sent two of his disciples and said unto him.

Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another.

|

The first statement gives us to understand that John knew

Jesus before the descending of the Spirit on him. Contrary to

this the second statement quotes the words of John, "I knew him

not", implying that John did not know Jesus before the descent

of the Spirit on him. While the third takes a middle position.

|

Contradiction No. 79

|

The Gospel of John has reported Christ as saying:

|

If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true.

(5:31)

|

And the same Gospel has reported Christ as contradict-

ing this:

|

Though I bear record of myself, yet my record is true.

(8:14)

|

Contradiction No. 80

|

It appears from Matthew chapter 15:22 that the woman who

came to Jesus crying for her daughterl was from Canaan. This

information is contradicted by the Gospel of Mark chapter 7:26

where he reports that she was a Greek and a Syrophoenician by

tribe.

|

Contradiction No. 81

|

We read in the Gospel of Mark 7:32 :

|

And they bring unto him one that was deaf, and had

an impediment in his speech.

|

It is clearly understood from this that the man who was deaf

and dumb, was a single person, but the description in the Gospel

of Matthew 15:30 plainly contradicts this, saying:

|

And great multitudes came unto him, having with

them those that were lame, blind, dumb, maimed and

many others, and cast them down at Jesus" feet, and he

healed them.

|

This exaggeration is similar to the one made by John 21:25, the

author of the fourth Gospel who says at the end of the book:

|

And there are also many other things which Jesus

did, the which, if they should be written every one, I

suppose that even the world itself could not contain the

books that should be written.

|

What one should think of such statements? They are sup-

posed to be men of inspiration beyond any criticism.

|

Contradiction No. 82

|

We read in the Gospel of Matthew 26:21-25 that Jesus, addressing

his

disciples, said:

|

...I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me.

And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every

one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I? And he

answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in

the dish, the same shall betray me, ... then Judas

answered and said, Master, is it I? He said unto him,

Thou hast said.

|

The same event is described by John 13:21-26 in a way that is

greatly

different from the above:

|

Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall

betray me, Then the disciples looked one on another,

doubting of whom he spake. Now there was leaning on

Jesus" bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved.

|

Simon Peter, therefore beckoned to him, that he should

ask who it should be of whom he spake. He then Iying 13

on Jesus own breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it? Jesus

answered, He it is to whom I shall give a sop, when I

have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he

gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.

|

Contradiction No. 83

|

The Gospel of Matthew, describing the event of the arrest of

Jesus says in chapter 26:48-50:

|

Now he that betrayed him gave them a sign, saying,

Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast.

And forthwith he came to Jesus and said, Hail, Master;

and kissed him... Then came they, and laid hands on

Jesus, and took him.

|

The Gospel of John gives the same story with great differ-

ences in chapter 18:3-12

|

Judas then, having received a band of men and offi-

cers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither

with lanterns and torches and weapons. Jesus therefore,

knowing all things that should come upon him, went

forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye? They

answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them,

I am he. And Judas also, which betrayed him, stood with

them. As soon then as he had said unto them, I am He,

they went backward and fell to the ground. Then asked

he them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of

Nazareth. Jesus answered, I have told you that I am he:

if therefore ye seek me, let these go heir way.... Then

the band and the captain and officers of the Jews took

Jesus, and bound him.

|

Contradiction No. 84

|

All the four Gospels give a description of Peter denying

Jesusl after his arrest. But each description is different from the

other in eight respects.

|

1. According to the reports of Matthew 26:6-75 and Mark 14:66-72

there

were two maids who claimed that Peter was one of the dis-

ciples of Jesus, and some other men who "stood by". While

Luke own description claims that there was one maid and two

other men.

|

2. According to Matthew, when the first maid spoke to

Peter he was sitting on the outside of the palace, while

according to Luke 22:55, he was "in the midst of the hall," and

according to Mark, he was "beneath in the palace", and

according to John he denied him when he was inside the

palace.

|

3. The wording of the maid own question to Peter is different

in all the four Gospels.

|

4. According to the reports of Matthew, Luke and John, the

cock crew only once after Peter had denied Jesus three

times, while according to Luke, the cock crew three times;

once just after the first denial of Peter, and twice, after the

second denial.

|

5. According to Matthew and Luke, Jesus had foretold

Peter that he would deny Jesus thrice before the cock crew

that night, while Mark has reported it differently, saying

that Jesus said to Peter that he would deny him three times

before the cock crew twice that night.

|

6. Peter own answer to the maid who first challenged Peter is

reported by Matthew 26:70 as: "I know not what thou sayest."

While according to John 18:25 he only said, "I am not." Mark 15:68

on the other hand, has reported it in these words: "I know

not, neither understand I what thou sayest." And Luke 22:57 has

put it this way: "Woman, I know him not."

|

7. Peter own second answer is also reported differently by all

the Evangelists. According to Matthew 26:72 ..Peter denied

him with an oath and said, "I do not know the man," and

according to John 18:25 his answer was, "I am not,"6 while Mark

14:70

has just said, "And he denied it again," and according to

Luke 22:58 his answer was, "Man, I am not."

|

8. The people who "stood by " at the time of Peter own denial

were, according to Mark, outside the palace, while Luke

reports them as being, "in the midst of the hall".

|

Contradiction No. 85

|

Describing the event of crucifixion of Jesus Luke 23:26 says:

|

And as they led him away, they laid hold upon one

Simon, a Cyrenian, coming out of the country, and on

him they laid the cross, that he might bear it after Jesus.

|

This statement is contradicted by the Gospel of John 19:17, where

it says that Jesus, bearing his cross himself, went forth to the

place of crucifixion.

|

Contradiction No. 86

|

The first three [Matthew 27:45, Mark 15:23, Luke 23:44] Gospels

agree

that Christ was on the cross at the sixth hour on the day of

crucifixion,

but contrary to this the Gospel of John 19:14 reports him to be in

the court

of Pilate exactly at the sixth hour on the same day.

|

Contradiction No. 87

|

The Gospel of Mark 15:32 says regarding the thieves who were

crucified with Jesus:

|

And they that were crucified with him reviled him,

|

while Luke 23:43 reports that one of them reproached Jesus and the

other said,

|

Lord remember me when thou comest into thy king-

dom. Then Jesus replied to him, Today shalt thou be

with me in Paradise.

|

The Urdu translators of the editions 1839, 1840, 1844 and

1846 changed the texts of Matthew and Mark to avoid this

difference to the effect that there was only one person who was

crucified with Jesus.6 It is a common practice of Christian schol-

ars to change the texts of their Holy scriptures whenever they

think they should.

|

Contradiction No. 88

|

It is understood from chapters 20:29 and 21:1 of Matthew that

Jesus arrived in Jerusalem after departing from Jericho, while

from John 11:54; 12:1 we learn that Jesus, departing from Ephraim,

arrived

in Bethany, where he stayed for the night.

|

Contradiction No. 89

The Resurrection of Jesus:

|

We learn from Matthew 27:56; 28:5,6 that when Mary Magdalene and

Mary, the mother of James, arrived near the grave, an angel of

God descended from the heaven, and the stone rolled back from

the grave and he sat upon it, and said to the women not to fear

and go home quickly.

|

The Gospel of Mark 16:1-6 describes this incident as follows:

|

Mary Magdalene, and Mary, the mother of James

and Salome.... Came unto the sepulchre,.... and when

they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away....

And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man

sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white

garment.

|

Luke own description of this is 24:2-4 :

|

And they found the stone rolled away from the

sepulchre, and they entered in and found not the body of

the Lord Jesus......behold, two men stood by them in

shining garments.

|

Contradiction No. 90

|

It is expressly mentioned in Matthew 28:8-10 that after the angels

informed the women of Jesus" resurrection, they returned from

there, and on the way they met Jesus. Jesus hailed them and

asked them to tell the people to go to Galilee where they would

see him.

|

But Luke 24:9-11 differs from this statement when he says:

|

And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these

things unto the eleven, and to all the rest. It was Mary

Magdalene and Joanna, and Mary, the mother of James

and other women that were with them which told these

things unto the apostles. And their word seemed to them

as idle tales, and they believed them not.

|

On the other hand we learn from the Gospel of John 20:13-15 that

Jesus met Mary Magdalene near the grave.

|

Contradiction No. 91

|

The Gospel of Luke says in chapter 11:51 :

|

From the blood of Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias

which perished between the altar and the temple: Verily

I say unto you, it shall be required of this generation.S

|

But we read this in the Book of Ezekiel 18:20 :

|

The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not

bear the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father

bear the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the

righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the

wicked shall be upon him.

|

However in other places in the Old Testament there are sev-

eral passages which imply that the children of a man will be

accountable for the sins of their father up to three or four gener-

ations.

|

Contradiction No. 92

|

Paul own first letter to Timothy 2:3,4 contains this statement:

|

For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God,

our Saviour, who will have all the men to be saved, and

to come unto the knowledge of the Truth.

|

This statement is incompatible with, and contradicts, Paul own

statement in his second letter to Thessalonians 2:11,12 :

|

And for this cause, God shall send them strong delu-

sion, that should believe a lie, that they all might be

damned who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in

unrighteousness.

|

It may be noted how Paul own two statements contradict each

other. The first text gives us to understand that God own aim is to

redeem all the men and take them to knowledge of the truth,

while the latter statement would have us believe that God sends

strong delusions to them so that they believe in falsehood like a

truth; and God will punish them for that. The Protestants raise

the same objection against other religions. According to them

God first deludes them to make them stray from the right path,

and then punishes them for unrighteousness.

|

Contradictions No. 93-6

|

Acts 9:1-5,22 and 26 give a description of Paul own conversion to

Christianity. The texts of all three chapters are different in

many respects. We intend to give only three discrepancies in

this book.

|

1. We read in Acts 9:7 this statement:

|

And the men which journeyed with him stood

speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man.

|

This statement is contradicted by the following Acts 22:9

statement:

|

And they that were with me saw indeed the light

and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that

spoke to me.

|

The contradiction between "hearing a voice" and "heard not the

voice of him" speaks for itself.

|

2. Again in Chapter 9:7 we find Paul quoting these words of

Jesus:

|

..and the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the

city; and it shall be told thee, what thou must do.t

|

Chapter 22 also contains this:

|

Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be

told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to

do.

|

But in Chapter 26 we are told a different story:

|

But rise, and stand upon thy feet; for I have appeared

unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a

witness both of these things which thou has seen, and of

those things in the which I will appear unto thee.

Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles,

unto whom now I send thee to open their eyes and to

turn them from darkness to light, and from the Power of

Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of

sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified

by faith that is in me.

|

It may be noted that according to the first two texts, Jesus

did not assign any duty to Paul at this occasion, but he was

promised that he would be told after he arrived in Damascus,

while the later statement shows that Jesus explained his duties

at the time of his appearance.

|

3. It is understood from the first text that the people who

were with Paul stood there silently, while the third text shows

them as having fallen onto the ground, and the second text does

not mention it at all.

|

Contradiction No. 97

|

We find in Paul own first letter to Corinthians 10:8 :

|

Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them

committed,l and fell in one day three and twenty thou-

sand.

|

This statement is contradicted by the book of Numbers 25:1,9 :

|

And those that died in the plague were twenty and

four thousand.

|

One of these two texts must be wrong.

|

Contradiction No. 98

|

We read this statement in the book of Acts 7:14 :

|

Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him,

and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls.

|

The above text expressly denotes that Joseph and his chil-

dren who were with Joseph in Egypt are naturally excluded

from this number. In fact, it refers to Jacob and his family, but

in

Genesis 46:27 we read:

|

And the sons of Joseph which were born of him in

Egypt were two souls. All the souls of the house of

Jacob which came into Egypt were threescore and ten.

|

and according to the commentaries of D"Oyly and Richardment

the number of the house of Jacob comes to seventy only when

Joseph and his two sons are included in it. They enumerate as

folloWS: the children of Leah thirty two souls, of Zilpah sixteen,

of Rachel eleven, and of Bilhah seven. They were in all sixty-

six souls. They become seventy when Jacob, Joseph and his two

sons are included. This means that the above text of the book of

Acts is certainly erroneous.

|

Contradiction No. 99

|

The death of Judas Iscariot is described both by Matthew and

Acts. The two texts disclose serious contradictions in two

respects. Firstly according to Matthew 27:4,5,6,7 Judas "departed,

and

went and hanged himself."

While Acts 1:18 says:

|

Now this man (Judas) purchased a field with the

reward of iniquity; and falling headlong; he burst asun-

der in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.

|

Secondly, we know from the first text, that chief priests of

the temple bought a field with the money left by Judas3 while

the second text clearly says that Judas himself bought a field

with that money. Peter in the latter text also adds:

|

And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem.

|

There are several reasons to believe that the statement made

by Matthew is erroneous as compared to Luke, which may be

true. We discuss five of these reasons here:

|

1. It is clear from the text of Matthewl that Judas was

remorseful about his sin of betrayal, before hanging

himself, but this cannot be true as Jesus, at that hour,

was in the court of Pilate and not yet sentenced to

death.

|

2. The text shows that Judas had returned the money to

the high priests and elders of the Temple. This is also

wrong on the same ground that the high priests and

elders were all with Pilate at that time and were not pre-

sent at the temple.

|

3. The context of Matthew own text clearly indicates that

the passage referred to, which lies between the second

and ninth verses, does not correspond to the rest of the

text.

|

4. Judas died on the morning of the night in which Jesus

was arrested. It seems unlikely that, in such a short

time, he should repent and kill himself because he

knew, even before the arrest of Jesus, that Jesus would

be killed by the Jews.

|

5. The ninth verse of this text contains a serious error

which will be discussed in the section discussing the

errors of the Bible.

|

Contradiction No. 100

|

The First Letter to John 2:1,2 says:

|

Jesus Christ, the righteous: and he is the propitiation

for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of

the whole world.

|

Contrary to this we read in the book of Proverbs 21:18 :

|

The wicked shall be ransom for the righteous, and

the transgressor for the upright.

|

The contradiction here needs no comment.

|

Contradiction No. 101

|

It is understood from the text of Paul own letter to the Hebrews

7:18

that one of the commandments of Moses is weak and unprof-

itable and therefore defective, while Psalm No. 18 says in verse

7, "The law of the Lord is perfect."

|

Contradiction No. 102

|

The Gospel of Mark describes the women coming to the

grave of Jesus "very early in the morning", while the Gospel of

John tells us that only Mary Magdalene came to the grave

"when it was yet dark."

|

Contradiction No. 103

|

The inscription superscribed on the cross by the Pilate is

given differently in all four Gospels. In Matthew 27:37 it is,

"This is

Jesus, the king of the Jews."

|

In the Gospel of Mark 15:26 it appears as only, "The king of the

Jews."

|

Luke 23:38 says that written in letters of Greek, Latin and Hebrew

was, "This is the king of the Jews.""

And the Gospel of John 19:19 puts it in these words, "Jesus of

Nazareth, the king of the Jews."

It is strange that the evangelists could not record such a short

sentence consistently. How then can their records be trusted for

detailed and long reports.

|

Contradiction No. 104

|

We learn from the Gospel of Mark 6:20 that Herod believed in the

righteousness of John the Baptist, and was pleased with him.

He arrested and killed him only for the sake of Herodias (his

brother own wife).

Luke 3:19, on the other hand, reports that Herod did not persecute

John only for the sake of Herodias but also for the reproaches of

John regarding his own perversion.

|

Contradiction No. 105

|

The three evangelists, Matthew, Mark and Luke are unanimous

about the description of the names of eleven of the disciples of

Jesus, but all the three disagree regarding the name of the

twelfth disciple. The names of eleven disciples unanimously

mentioned are: Peter, Andrew, James son of Zebedee, John,

Philip, Bartholomew, Thomas, Matthew, James son of Alpheus,

Simon the Canaanite and Judas Iscariot. According to Matthew,

|

the name of the twelfth disciple was Lebbeus whose surname

was Thaddeus. Mark says it was Thaddaeus. Luke claims it was

Judas, the brother of James.

|

Contradiction No. 106

|

The first three Evangelists make mention of the man who

was sitting at the receipt of custom, and who followed Jesus

when he called him. There is, however, considerable disagree-

ment among them regarding his name. According to Matthew

his name is Matthew, l while Mark says he was Levi, the son of

Alpheus, 2 and Luke writes Levi without his father own name.3

|

Contradiction No. 107

|

We read in Matthew that Jesus considered Peter as the best

of his disciples, as Jesus said to him.

|

Blessed art thou Simon: .... and I say also unto thee,

That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my

church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it.

And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of

heaven: and whatsoever shalt bind on earth shall be

bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on

earth shall be loosed in heaven.4

|

Further in the same chapter, Jesus is reported to have said, to

Peter:

|

Get thee behind me Satan: thou art an offense unto me:

for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but

those that be of men.5

|

Protestant scholars have reproduced many statements of the

ancient scholars about Peter own accusation. John, in his commen-

tary on Matthew, said that Peter was arrogant and a man of

"feeble intellect". St Augustine said that he was not steadfast

and sure, at one time he would believe and at another he would

doubt.

Is it not strange and ridiculous that a man of such qualities is

promised "the keys of the kingdom of heaven"?

|

Contradiction No. 108

|

The Gospel of Luke describes two disciples of Jesus asking

him, "Wilt thou that we command fire to come down from

heaven, and consume them, even as Elias did?" Jesus rebuked

the two disciples saying, "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye

are of. For the Son of man is not come to destroy men own lives,

but to save them.""l Further on in the same Gospel we find

another statement of Jesus, which absolutely contradicts this. It

says, "I am come to send fire on earth; and what will I, if it be

already kindled?2

|

Contradiction No. 109

|

Matthew has reported that the mother of Zebedee own sons had

requested Jesus to:

|

Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy

right hand, and the other on the left in thy kingdom.3

|

Mark on the other hand reports that the request was made by

Zebedee own sons themselves.4

|

Contradiction No. 110

|

The Gospel of Matthew includes a parable of a man who

planted a vineyard. At the end of the parable we find:

|

" When the lord therefore of the vineyard cometh,

what will he do unto those husbandmen? They say unto

him, He will miserably destroy those wicked men, and

will let out his vineyard unto other husbandmen which

shall render him the fruits in their seasons.""

|

Luke, however, has at the end of the parable:

|

What therefore shall the lord of the vineyard do unto

them? He shall come and destroy these husbandmen,

and shall give the vineyard to others. And when they

heard it, they said, God forbid.2

|

The texts are obviously contradictory. The second text con-

tradicts the first, by adding, "When they heard it, they said, God

forbid!"

|

Contradiction No. 111

|

The event of a woman of Bethany, who poured perfumed

ointment on the head of Jesus, is described in three gospels.3

There are several contradictions between the different

accounts.

|

1. Mark4 reports that this event took place two days before

|

the feast of Passover,l while John reports it to have hap\_

pened SlX days prior to the festival.2 Matthew is silent

regarding the time of this incident.

|

2 Mark and Matthew agree that Jesus was in the house of

Slmon the leper when the woman came, while John reports

him to be in the house of Lazarus, the brother of Mary.

|

3. Matthew and Mark agree that the ointment was poured

on the head of Jesus,3 while John contradicts this and says

that she anointed the feet of Jesus.4

|

4. Mark says that the people who rebuked the woman were

from among the people who were present there at that time,

while Matthew has said that they were the disciples of

Jesus, and John own version is that the objection was raised

by Judas.

|

5 The three Gospels have quoted Jesus" speech to his dis-

clples on this occasion differently.

|

The serious contradictions presented by these texts cannot be

eliminated by claiming that this event of Jesus" anointment

might have taken place a number of times, and each gospel

might have reported a different story. The event is clearly the

same in each case and the contradictions in the different

accounts is clear indication of the usual manipulation in the

text.

|

Contradiction No. 112

|

A comparison of the texts of Matthew 22, Luke 26 and Mark

14 regarding the description of The Last Supper,l reveals two

serious contradictions

|

1. There are two cups mentioned in Luke own description, one

before the meal and the other after it, while Matthew and Mark

speak of only one cup. Apparently Luke own description is erro-

neous, because this description involves serious objection

against the faith of the Catholics who believe that the wine and

the bread actually turn into the flesh and the body of Christ.

|

2 According to Luke, the body of Christ was sacrificed only

for the disciples,2 while Mark reports it to have been sacrificed

is given for many,3 and from Matthew we understand that nei-

ther the body, nor the blood of Jesus is shed, but the blood of

the New Testament is the thing which is shed for others. How

the blood of the New Testament is shed is a riddle.

|

We are greatly surprised to note that the Gospel of John

describes ordinary events like Jesus riding on an ass or applying

perfume to his clothes, but does not make any mention of as

important an event as the Last Supper which holds such a vital

place in Christian ritual.

|

1. The Last Supper or Eucharist is a sacramental rite of the

Christians. According to

e Gospels, the origin of this sacrament was an event which took

place on the night

preceding Jesus" arrest when he was eating a meal with his

disciples. He took bread

and recited blessings and thanks over it and gave it to the

disciples to share among

themselves. Then he said, ""rhis is my body which is given for you,

this do in remem-

brance of me." Afler the supper he took a cup with wine in it and

said, ""rhis cup is

new testament in my blood, which is shed for you." The Christians

have made it a rite

that they take a cup of wine and offer their thanks, and break the

bread and offer their

thanks on it. The Catholics believe that the bread and wine

actually tum into the body

and flesh of Jesus. The ceremony was named Eucharist, which

signifies "thankful-

ness", by Paul.

2. "This is my body which is given for you." 22:19

3. "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many."

14:24

|

Contradiction No. 113

|

We read this verse in Matthew:

|

Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way,

which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it.

|

But further in the same Gospel we read of Jesus" saying:

|

Take my yoke upon you, and learn of me, ... for my

yoke is easy and my burden is light.2

|

Contradiction No. 114

|

We read in chapter 4 of Matthew that the Devil first took

Jesus to the Holy City, and set him on the pinnacle of the tem-

ple, then took him up to the peak of a mountain. Jesus then

went to Galilee. Then leaving Nazareth came to Capernaum and

dwelt there.

Luke says in chapter 4 of his Gospel that the Devil first took

Jesus onto the mountain then to Jerusalem and then he was

stood on the Pinnacle of the Temple, then Jesus returned to

Galilee and started teaching there, then he went to Nazareth,

where he had been brought up.

|

Contradiction No. 115

|

Matthew reports that a Roman officer himself came to Jesus

and requested him to heal his servant and said:

|

Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest come

under my roof, but speak the word only, and my servant

shall be healed.3

|

Jesus, commending the faith of the officer, said:

|

As thou hast believed, so be it done unto thee. And

his servant was healed in the selfsame hour.l

|

Luke reports this event differently. According to him the

centurion himself did not come to Jesus, but sent some elders of

the Jews. Then Jesus went with them. When he came near the

house:

|

...the centurion sent friends to him saying unto him,

Lord, trouble not thyself: for I am not worthy that you

shouldest enter under my roof. Wherefore neither

thought I myself worthy to come unto thee: but say in a

word, and my servant shall be healed.2

|

Then Jesus praised the officer, and the people who were sent

by the officer returned to his house, the servant had been healed.

|

Contradiction No. 116

|

Matthew reports in chapter 8 that a scribe came to Jesus and

asked his permission to follow him wherever he went. Then a

disciple said to him that first he should go and bury his father

and then follow Jesus. Matthew describes many events after

this, and in chapter 17 reports the event of the Transfiguration3

of Jesus. Luke, on the other hand, reports the request of the

scribe in chapter 9 after the Transfiguration. One of the two

texts must be wrong.

|

Contradiction No. 117

|

Matthew talks in chapter 9 of a dumb man possessed by

devil who is healed by Jesus. Then in chapter 10 he describes

the mission of the disciples and Jesus commanding to them to

heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead and cast out dev-

ils. Then in other chapters he describes many other events and

then in chapter 17 the event of the Transfiguration. Luke, on

the other hand, first describes the mission of the disciples, then

the Transfiguration of Jesus in the same chapter and then after

the description of many other events in chapters 9, 10 and 11 he

has the report of the dumb man healed by Jesus.

|

Contradiction No. 118

|

Mark states that the Jews crucified Christ at the third hour of

the day.l This statement is contradicted by the Gospel of John

which reports that Jesus was in the court of Pilate until sixth

hour of the day.2

|

Contradiction No. 119

|

It is understood from the descriptions of Matthew and Mark

that the soldiers who mocked Jesus and put the scarlet rope on

him were Pilate own soldiers not Herod own , while Luke own statement

is just the opposite.

|

HE ERRORS

|

This section contains the errors mistakes and contradictions

of the Biblical Text that are in addition to the ones discussed

previously.

|

Error No. 1

|

It is stated in the Book of Exodus that the period that the

Israelites stayed in Egypt was 430 years, which is wrong. The

period was 215 years.l This error is admitted by the historians

and the biblical commentators.

|

Error No. 2

|

It appears in the Book of Numbers that the total number of

the Israelites, who were 20 years of age or over, was six hun-

dred thousand, while all the males and females of the Levites

and the women and children of all the other tribes are not

included in this number. This statement is highly exaggerated

and erroneous.

|

Error No. 3

|

The statement of Deuteronomy 23:2, "A bastard shall not

enter into the congregation of the Lord..." is wrong, as has

already been discussed in Part One.

|

Error No. 4.

|

In Genesis 46:15 the phrase "thirty and three" is certainly

wrong, thirty-four is the correct number. The details of this error

|

have been given in part one under the tenth ARGUMENT on page

twenty-seven.

|

Error No. 5

|

I Samuel contains this statement "...fifty thousand, three

score and ten men." " The number fifty thousand in this verse is

wrong as will be discussed later.

|

Errors No. 6 and 7

|

2 Samuel 15:7 contains the words "forty years" and in the

next verse of the same chapter the name "Geshur" is mentioned

Both are wrong. The correct words are "four years" and

"Adom" respectively.

|

Error No. 8

|

It is stated in 2 Chronicles:

|

And the porch that was on the front of the house, the

length of it was according to the breadth of the house,

twenty cubits, and height was a hundred and twenty.2

|

This is an exaggerated and erroneous account of the height.

According to 1 Kings the height of the porch was thirty cubits 3

Adam Clarke in volume 2 of his commentary expressly admit-

ted the error in this statement and said that the height was

twenty cubits.

|

Error No. 9

|

The Book of Joshua, describing the borders of the land given I "

to the children of Benjamin, states:

|

And the border was drawn thence and compassed the

corner of the sea southward.l

|

The word "sea" in this statement is wrong as there was no sea

near their land. The commentators D"Oyby and Richardment

acknowledged this fact and said, that the Hebrew word which

was translated as "sea" actually signified "west".

|

Error No. 10

|

In Chapter 19 of the Book of Joshua, under the description

of the borders of Naphtali, we read:

|

And reacheth to Asher on the west side and to Judah

upon Jordan toward the sun rising.2

|

This statement is also wrong as the land of Judah extended

towards the South. Adam Clarke also pointed out this error in

his commentary.

|

Errors No. 11-13

|

The commentator Horseley remarked that verses 7 and 8 of

Chapter 3 of the Book of Joshua are wrong.

|

Error No. 12

|

The Book of Judges contains this statement:

|

And there was a young man out of Bethlehem-Judah,

of the family of Judah, who was a Levite.

|

In this statement the phrase, "who was a Levite", cannot be true

because anyone belonging to the family of Judah cannot be

Levite. The commentator Horseley also acknowledged this

error, and Houbigant even excluded this passage from his text.

|

Error No. 13

|

We read this statement in 2 Chronicles:

|

And Abijah set the battle in array with an army of

valiant men of war even four hundred thousand chosen

men: Jeroboam also set the battle in array against him,

with eight hundred thousand chosen men, being mighty

men of valour. 1

|

Further in the same chapter it gives this description:

|

And Abijah and his people slew them with a great

slaughter: and so there fell down slain of Israel five hun-

dred thousand chosen men.2

|

The numbers mentioned in the two texts are wrong. The com-

mentators of the Bible have admitted the error. The Latin trans-

lators changed four hundred thousand to forty thousand, and

eight hundred thousand to eighty thousand, and five hundred

thousand to fifty thousand men.

|

Error No. 14

|

It is stated in 2 Chronicles:

|

For the Lord brought Judah low because of Ahaz,

King of Israel. l

|

The word Israel in this statement is certainly wrong, because

haz was the King of Judah and not the the King of Israel. The

Greek and the Latin translations, therefore, have replaced Israel

with Judah which is an open distortion of the text of their Holy

Scriptures

|

Error No. 15

|

We find this statement in 2 Chronicles:

|

...and made Zedekiah, his brother, king over Judah

and Jerusalem.

|

The words "his brother" are incorrect in this statement. It

should say his uncle or his father own brother.2 The Arabic and the

Greek translators have replaced "his brother" with "his father own

brother", another example of blatant manipulation of the text of

the Holy scriptures. Ward says in his book words to this effect,

"Since it was not correct, it has been changed to uncle in the

Greek and other translations."

|

Error No. 16

|

The name "Hadarezer" is wrongly spelled in 2 Samuel

1o:l6-l9 in three places and in 1 Chronicles 18:3-10 in seven

places, whereas the correct spelling is Hadadezer (as given in

all other references in the Old Testament).

|

1.2Chr.28:19.

|

2. We do find the words, "his father own brother" in 2 Kings 24:17,

and this is correct

|

because Jehoiachin was the son of Jehoiakim. He would have been

known as

Zedekiah, the son of Jehoiakim, while in fact he is called

Zedekiah, the son of Josiah.

See Jen 26 1 and 27:1.

|

Errors No. 17-19

|

Another name "Achan" is given wrongly in the Book of

Joshua." The correct name is Achar, with an "r" at the end.2

|

Error No. 18

|

We find in 1 Chronicles 3:5 under the description of the sons

of David, "Bath-shua, the daughter of Ammiel". The correct

name is, "Bath-sheba, the daughter of Eliam, the wife of

Uriah".3

|

Error No. 19

|

The Second Book of Kings4 gives the name "Azariah" which

is certainly wrong. It should be "Uzziah", as can be ascertained

from several other sources.5

|

Error No. 20

|

The name "Jehoahaz", which appears in 2 Chronicles,6 is not

correct. It should be "Ahaziah". Horne admits that the names

we have pointed out in errors No 16 20

- are all wrong and then

adds that there are some other places in the scriptures where

names have been written erroneously.

|

Error No. 21

|

2 Chroniclesl gives an account of how Nebuchadnezzar, the

king of Babylon, bound Jehoiakim in chains and deported him

to Babylon. This statement is certainly not true. The fact is that

he killed him in Jerusalem and ordered his body to be thrown

outside the city wall and left unburied.

The historian Josephus says in Volume 10 of his book:

|

The King of Babylon came with a great army and

captured the city without resistance. He killed all the

young men of the city. Jehoiakim was one of them. He

threw his body outside the city wall. His son Jehoiachin

was made the king. He imprisoned three thousand men.

The Prophet Ezekiel was among the captives.

|

Error No. 22

|

According to the Arabic versions of 1671 and 1831, the

Book of Isaiah (7:8) contains this statement:

|

...and within three score and five years shall Aram

be broken.

|

While the Persian translation and English version says:

|

...and within three score and five years shall Ephraim

be broken.

|

Historically this prophecy was proved false, as in the sixth

year of Hezekiah own reign,2 the King of Assyria invaded Ephraim,

as is recorded in 2 Kings in Chapters 17 and 18. Thus Aram was

destroyed in twenty-one years. l

|

Vitringa, a celebrated Christian scholar, said:

|

There has been a mistake in copying the text here. In

fact, it was sixteen and five years, and the period

referred to was sixteen years after the reign of Ahaz and

five after that of Hezekiah.

|

There is no justification for the opinion of this writer, but at

least, he has admitted the error in this text.

|

Error No. 23

|

The Book of Genesis says:

|

But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil,

thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest

thereof, thou shalt surely die.2

|

This statement is clearly wrong since Adam, after eating from

that tree, did not die that very day but lived for more than nine

hundred years after it.

|

Error No. 24

|

We find in the book of Genesis:3

|

My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that

he also is flesh: his days shall be an hundred and twenty

years.

|

To say that the age of man is a hundred and twenty years is

erroneous as we know that the men of earlier ages lived far

longer - Noah own age, for instance, was nine hundred and fifty,

Shem, his son, lived for six hundred years and Arphaxad for

three hundred and thirty-eight years; while the life-span of pre-

sent-day man is usually seventy or eighty years.

|

Error No. 25

|

Genesis reports this address of God to Abraham:

|

And I will give unto thee, and to thy seed after thee,

the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of

Canaan, for an everlasting possession, and I will be their

God.

|

This statement is again historically wrong, since all the land

of Canaan was never possessed by Abraham nor has it been

under the everlasting rule of his descendants. On the contrary

this land has seen innumerable political and geographical revo-

lutions.

|

Errors No. 26, 27, 28

|

The Book of Jeremiah says:

|

The word that came to Jeremiah, concerning all the

people of Judah in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, the son

of Josiah, king of Judah, that was the first year of

Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon.

|

urther in the same chapter it says:

|

And this whole land shall be desolation, and an

astonishment: and these nations shall serve the king of

|

Babylon seventy years. And it shall come to pass, when

seventy years are accomplished, that I will punish the

king of Babylon, and that nation, saith the Lord, for their

iniquity, and the land of Chaldeans, and will make it per-

petual desolations.l

|

And further in Chapter 29 of the same book, it states:

|

Now these are the words of the letter that Jeremiah

the Prophet sent from Jerusalem unto the residue of the

elders which were carried away captives, and to the

priests, and to the prophets, and to all the people whom

Nebuchadnezzar had carried away captives from

Jerusalem to Babylon; (After that Jeconiah, the king and

the queen, and the eunuchs, the princes of Judah and

Jerusalem, and the carpenters, and the smiths were

deported from Jerusalem;)2

|

And further in the same chapter we read:

|

For thus saith the Lord, that after seventy years be

accomplished at Babylon I will visit you and perform

my good word to you in causing you to return to this

|

In the Persian translation of 1848 we find these words:

|

After seventy years be accomplished in Babylon, I

Wlll turn towards you.

|

Further in chapter 52 of the same book we find the following

statement:

|

This is the people whom Nebuchadrezzar carried

away captive in the seventh year, three thousand Jews

and three and twenty: In the eighteenth year of

Nebuchadrezzar, he carried away captive from

Jerusalem eight hundred and thirty and two persons: in

the three and twentieth year of Nebuchadrezzar

Nebuzar-adan the captain of the guard carried away cap-

tive of the Jews seven hundred forty and five persons: all

the persons were four thousand and six hundred.l

|

After a careful reading of the several passages quoted above

the following three points are established:

|

1. Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne in the fourth year of

the reign of Jehoiakim. That is historically correct. The Jewish

historian Josephus said in Vol. 10 and Chapter 5 of his history

that Nebuchadnezzar ascended the throne of Babylon in the

fourth year of Jehoiakim. It is, therefore, necessary that the

first

year of Nebuchadnezzar must coincide with the fourth year of

Jehoiakim.

2. Jeremiah sent his words (the book) to the Jews after the

deportation of Jeconiah, the king, the elders of Judah and other

artisans to Babylon.

3. The cumulative number of the captives in the three exiles

was four thousand and six hundred, and that the third exile by

Nebuchadnezzar took place in the twenty-third year of his reign.

|

This reveals three obvious errors. Firstly, according to the

historians, Jeconiah, the elder of Judah, and other artisans were

exiled to Babylon in 599 B.C. The author of Meezan-ul-Haq

printed in 1849 says on page 60, that this exile took place in 600

B.C. and Jeremiah sent the letter after their departure to

|

Babylon. According to the Biblical text quoted above their stay

in Babylon should be seventy years, which is certainly not true,

because the Jews were released by the order of the king of

Persia in 536 B.C. This means that their sojourn in Babylon was

only sixty-three years and not seventy years. We have quoted

these figures from the book Murshid-ut-Talibeen printed in

Beirut in 1852 which is different s from the edition printed in

1840 in several places. We find the following table in the 1852

edltlon.

|

THE YEAR THE VENT THE YEAR

OF THE BEFORE

CREATION CHRIST BC

|

3405 Jeremiah own writing to the 599

captives of Babylon

|

3468 The death of Darius, the uncle of h

Koreish, the ascension of CYrus tc

the throne of Babylon, Madi and

Pharus. His orders to release the

Jews and send them back to

Jerusalem

|

Secondly, the cumulative number of those exiled during the

three exiles is mentioned as four thousand and six hundred peo-

ple, while according to 2 Kings the number of captives, includ-

ing the princes and the brave men of Jerusalem, at the time of

the first exile, was three thousand, the craftsmen and the smiths

not being included in this number. I

Thirdly, from the text quoted above, we understand that the

|

1. "And he carried away all Jerusalem, and all the princes, and all

the mighty men of

valour, even three thousand captives, and all the craftsmen and

smiths." 2 Kings

24: 14

|

r

|

, third captivity took place in the twenty-third year of

Nebuchadnezzars reign whereas this is contradicted in 2 Kings

which says that Nebuzar-adan took them captive in the nine-

- teenth year of Nebuchadnezzar.

|

Error No. 29

|

The Book of Ezekiel contains the following words:

|

And it came to pass in the eleventh year, in the first

day of the month, that the word of the Lord came unto

me.2

|

And later in the same chapter we find:

|

For thus saith the Lord God; Behold, I will bring

upon Tyrus Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon, a king of

kings, from the north, with horses, and with chariots,

and with horsemen and companies, and much people.

He shall slay with the sword thy daughters in the

f1eld, and he shall make a fort against thee, and cast a

mount against thee, and lift up the buckler against thee;

And he shall set the engines of war against thy walls,

and with his axes he shall break down thy towers.

By reason of the abundance of his horses their dust

shall cover thee, thy walls shall shake at the noise of the

horsemen, and of the wheels, and of the chariots, when

he shall enter into thy gates, as men enter into a city

wherein is made a breach.

With the hoofs of his horses shall he tread down all

thy streets; he shall slay thy people by the sword, and

thy strong garrisons shall go down to the ground.

And they shall make a spoil of thy riches, and make

|

a prey of thy merchandise, and they shall break down

thy walls, and destroy thy pleasant houses, and they

shall lay thy stones and thy timber and thy dust in the

midst of thy water."

|

History proved this prediction false because Nebuchad-

nezzar tried his best to capture the city of Tyrus, and kept the

city in a state of siege for thirteen years, but had to go back

without success. Since it is inconceivable that God own promise

would not be fulfilled, it must be that the prediction itself is

misreported.

In Chapter 29, we find the following words attributed to

Ezekiel:

|

And it came to pass in the seven and twentieth year, in

the first month, in the first day of the month, the word of the

Lord came unto me saying,

Son of man, Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon caused

his army to serve a great service against Tyrus; every head

was made bald, and every shoulder was peeled: yet he had

no wages, nor his army, for Tyrus...

...thus saith the Lord God: Behold, I will give the land of

Egypt unto Nebuchadrezzar, king of Babylon; and he shall

take her multitude, and take her spoil, and take her prey; and

it shall be the wages for his army.

I have given him the land of Egypt for his labour where-

with he served against it...2

|

The above text expressly states that since Nebuchadnezzar

could not get the reward of his siege of Tyrus, God promises to

give him the land of Egypt.

|

Error No. 30

|

The Book of Daniel contains this statement:

|

Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint

said unto that certain saint which spake, how long shall

be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the

transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary

and the host to be trodden underfoot?

And he said unto me, unto two thousand and three

hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed.l

|

The Judaeo-Christian scholars, from the very beginning,

have wondered about the significance of this prediction. Almost

all the Judaeo-Christian commentators of the Bible are of the

opinion that it is Antiochus, the consul of Rome who invaded

Jerusalem in 161 BC, who is referred to in this vision,2 and the

days mean the usual days of our calendar. Josephus, the famous

commentator, also agreed with this opinion.

Historically, however, this opinion does not hold water,

because the occupation of the sanctuary and host, lasted for

three and a half years, whereas the period of two thousand and

three hundred days referred to comes to six years, three months

and nineteen days. For the same reason Issac Newton rejected

the assumption that Antiochus had to do anything with this

vlsion.

Thomas Newton who wrote a commentary on the predic-

tions and prophesies of the Bible first quoted several other com-

mentators on this point, and then, like Isaac Newton, completely

rejected the possibility of it being Antiochus who is referred to

in this vision of Hezekiah. He asserted that the Roman emperors

|

and the Popes are the import of the vision.

Snell Chauncy also wrote a commentary on the predictions

of the Bible which was published in 1838. He claimed that in

his commentary he incorporated the essence of eighty five other

commentaries. Commenting on this vision he said that from the

earliest times it has been very difficult for the scholars to

ascer-

tain and define the time of the commencement of the event to

which this vision refers.l

The majority of the scholars have concluded that the time of

its commencement is certainly one of four periods in which four

royal commands were issued by the Kings of Persia:

|

1. Cyrus, who issued his ordinance in 636 B.C.

2. The king Darius, who issued his orders in 815 B.C.

3. Ardashir, who gave his commands about Ezra in 458 B.C.

4. The king Ardashir, who issued his ordinance to Nehemiah

in the twentieth year of his reign in 444 B.C.

|

He also added that the days mentioned in this vision are not

days as usually understood, but days signifying years. Keeping

this in mind Snell Chauncy said, the ending of the period of this

vision would be as follows:

|

1. According to the first command of Cyrus it would end in

1764 A.D.

2. According to the second of Darius it would end in 1782

A.D.

3 .According to the third command of Ardashir it would be

|

1. As far as we understand Snell Chauncy interpreting the days of

this vision as years

has presumed that the vision foretold the realpearance of the

Christ Jesus. The two

thousand three hundred days are assumed to be years. This number

of years should be

counted from any of the occasions when Jerusalem has been taken

out of the posses-

sion of Judaeo-Christian followers.

|

4. According to the fourth ordinance it would end in 1856.

|

All these dates passed without the prophecy being fulfilled

and, in any case, this illogically metaphorical interpretation is

not acceptable.

Firstly it is a mis-statement to say that it would be difficult

for scholars to ascertain the period of its commencement. The

difficulty lies only in the fact that the period should start

right

from the time when this vision was shown to Daniel not from

any period after it.

Next an arbitrary change in meaning of days into years is

not acceptable, because the word, "day" continues to mean the

usual period of 24 hours unless otherwise indicated by the writ-

er himself. The word is used in both the Old and the New

Testaments in its usual meaning and never means "year". Even

if we accept that the word might have been used to mean "year"

it would have been in a figurative sense; but a figurative use of

a word requires some strong indication of it. In the account of

this vision the word "day" has been used for the purpose of

defining a period of time and we do not find any indication that

it should be taken in a figurative sense. Most scholars have,

therefore, accepted it in its usual meaning otherwise scholars

like Isaac Newton, Thomas Newton and Snell Chauncy would

not have tried to put forward such confusing explanations.

|

Error No. 31

|

The Book of Daniell states:

|

And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be

taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate

|

set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety

days.

Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thou-

sand three hundred and five and thirty days.

|

This prophecy is similar to the one previously discussed

which never came true. Neither Christ nor the Messiah of the

Jews appeared within this period.

|

Error No. 32

|

The Book of Daniel contains this statement:

|

Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and

upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to

make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniq-

uity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to

seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the most

Holy.l

|

This prophecy is also wrong as the Messiah did not appear in

this period. None of the explanations forwarded by the Christian

scholars in this regard deserve any serious consideration, partly

for the reasons we have already discussed and partly on account

of a number of facts we discuss below:-

Firstly the period between the first year of the reign of Cyrus,

the year of the release of the Jews as confirmed by Ezra2 and the

birth of the Prophet Jesus is nearly six hundred years according

to Josephus and five hundred and thirty-six years in Snell

Chauncy own estimation.

Secondly, if we accept this as a correct explanation, it would

mean that all true dreams have come to an end for ever, which is

|

obviously untrue. Watson, in the third part of his book, has

reproduced Dr. Grib own letter who said, "The Jews have so much

distorted the text of this prophecy that it has been rendered inap-

plicable to Jesus." This confession by Watson is enough to con-

firm our contention that this prediction, according to the origi-

nal copy of the Book of Daniel, still preserved with the Jews,

which is free from the objection of any kind of manipulation,

that this prophecy is inapplicable to Jesus.

Thirdly, the word "Christ", meaning anointed, has been used

for all the kings of the Jews irrespective of their character or

deeds. It appears in Psalm 18 verse 50. Similarly, David is men-

tioned as the anointed in Psalm 131. And also 1 Samuel con-

tains this statement of David regarding King Saul, who is said

to have been one of the worst kings of the Jews:

|

Behold this day thine eyes have seen how that the

Lord hath delivered thee into mine hand in the cave: and

some bade me to kill thee: but mine eye spared thee; and

I said, I will not put forth mine hand against my lord, for

he is the Lord own anointed.l

|

The same application of this word is also found in 1 Samuel

24 and 2 Samuel 1. Besides, this word is not only limited to the

kings of the Jews. We find it being used for other kings too. It is

stated in Isaiah:

|

Thus saith the Lord to his anointed, to Cyrus, whose

right hand I have holden.2

|

Cyrus, the king of Persia, is mentioned as God own anointed or

the Christ in this text. Cyrus is the one who liberated the Jews

|

from their captivity and allowed the Temple to be rebuilt.

|

Error No. 33

|

The following statement is given through the Prophet David

in 2 Samuel:

|

Moreover I will appoint a place for my people Israel,

and will plant them, that may dwell in a place of their

own, and move no more; neither shall the children of

wickedness afflict them any more, as beforetime.

And as since the time that I commanded judges to be

over my people Israel.l

|

The same prediction appeared in slightly different words in

the Persian translation of 1835. According to this text God had

promised them that they would live in peace there, without any

affliction to them at the hands of wicked people. This promised

place was Jerusalem, where they made their habitations and

lived. History has proved that this promise was not fulfilled.

They were severely afflicted at the hands of several rulers.

Nebuchadnezzar invaded them three times and slaughtered

them, captured them and deported them to Babylon. Titus,2 the

Emperor of Rome, persecuted them so barbarously that one mil-

lion of the Jews were killed, a hundred thousand people were

hanged and ninety-nine thousand were imprisoned. Up to this

day their descendants are living in degradation around the

world.

|

.l Error No. 34

|

In 2 Samuel we read the following promise of God to David:

|

And when thy days be fulfilled, and thou shalt sleep

with thy fathers, I will set up thy seed after thee, which

shall proceed out of thy bowels, and I will stablish his

kingdom.

He shall build an house for my name, and I will stab-

lish the throne of his kingdom for ever.

I will be his father, and he shall be my son. If he

commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod of men,

and with stripes of the children of men;

But my mercy shall not depart away from him, as I

took it from Saul whom I put away before thee.

And thine house and thy kingdom shall be estab-

lished for ever before thee; thy throne shall be estab-

lished for ever.l

|

,1 Another statement of similar nature is given in I Chronicles:

|

Behold, a son shall be born to thee, who shall be a

man of rest: and I will give him rest from all his enemies

round about: for his name shall be Solomon, and I will

give peace and quietness unto Israel in his days.

He shall build a house for my name: and he shall be

my son,... and I will establish the throne of his kingdom

over Israel for ever.2

|

Although, God had promised everlasting kingdom in the

family of David, this promise was not fulfilled, as the family of

David was deprived of the kingdom, a long time ago.

|

Error No. 35

|

Paul reported God own word regarding the prominence of Jesus

over the angels in his letter to the Hebrews: I

|

I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son.2

|

Christian scholars have claimed that this is a reference to the

verses in 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles discussed in the previous

paragraph. This claim is not acceptable for several reasons.

|

1. The text of Chronicles is unambiguous saying that the

son own name will be Solomon.

|

2. Both the texts say that he would build a house in the name

of God. This can only be applied to Solomon who built the

house of God, as promised. Jesus, on the other hand was born

one thousand and three years after the construction of this house

and used to talk of its destruction. This will be discussed under

Error No.79.

|

3. Both predictions foretold that he would be a king, where-

as Jesus was not a king, on the contrary he was a poor man as

he himself said:

|

And Jesus saith unto him, The foxes have holes, and

the birds of the air have nests; but the son of man hath

not where to lay his head.3

|

1. Heb. 1:5.

2. To prove the greatness of ùesus over the angels, Paul argued

that God never said to

any of the angels that any of them was His Son. He only said it to

Jesus that, "I will

be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son."

3. Mat:8:20.

|

4. It is clearly stated in the first prediction that:

|

If he commit iniquity, I will chasten him with the rod

of men, and with the stripes of the children of men.

|

This implies that he will be a man of iniquitous nature.

ccording to the Christians - and they are far from the truth -

Solomon was a man of that nature and gave up the prophethood

and became an apostate in his last days, indulging in idol wor-

ship. building temples for the idols, and committing himself to

heathenism.l Whereas Jesus was absolutely innocent, and could

not commit a sin of any kind.

|

5. In the text of Chronicles it says clearly:

|

Who shall be a man of rest, and I will give him rest

from all his enemies round about.

|

However, Jesus, according to the Christians, was never in

peace right from his early days up to the time of the crucifixion.

He lived in constant fear of the Jews and left one place for

another until he was arrested by them and, they say, killed.

Solomon, on the other hand, fulfilled the condition of living in

rest from his enemies.

|

6. In the prediction of Chronicles the Israelites are promised:

|

I will give peace and quieteness unto Israel in his

days.

|

Whereas it is historically known to everyone that the Jews were

servile to and dominated by the Romans in the time of Jesus.

|

7. The Prophet Solomon, himself has claimed that the predic\_

tion was made about him. This is clear from 2 Chronicles.l

Although the Christians agree that these tidings were for

Solomon. they say that it was in fact for Jesus too, as he was a

descendant of Solomon. We contend that this is a false claim

because the attributes of the predicted son must coincide with

the description of the prophecy. We have already shown that

Jesus does not fulfill the requirements of the prediction.

Apart from this, Jesus cannot be the subject of this predic-

tion, even according to the Christian scholars. In order to

remove the contradiction between the genealogical descriptions

of Jesus in Mathew and Luke, they have said that Matthew

described the genealogy of Joseph of Nazareth, while Luke

described the genealogy of Mary. However, Jesus was not the

son of Joseph, but rather the son of Mary, and according to her

genealogy Jesus is the descendant of Nathan, son of David, and

not the son of Solomon.

|

Error No. 36

|

It is said regarding the Prophet Elijah in I Kings:

|

And the word of Lord came unto him, saying,

Get thee hence, and turn thee eastward, and hide thy-

self by the brook Cherith, that is before Jordan.

And it shall be, that thou shalt drink of the brook;

and I have commanded the ravens to feed thee there.

So he went and did according unto the word of the

Lord: for he went and dwelt by the brook Cherith, that is

|

1. "But the Lord said to David my father, Forasmuch as it was un

thine heart to build a

house for my name, thou didst well in that it was in thine heart:

Not withstanding

thou shalt not build the house; but thy son which shall come forth

out of thy loins. he

shall build the house for my name. The Lord therefore hath

performed his word that

he hath spoken: for I am risen up in the room of David my father."

2 Chr. 6:8-10.

|

before Jordan,

And the ravens brought him bread and flesh in the

morning, and bread and flesh in the evening, and he

drank of the brook.l

|

In the above text the word "raven" is a translation of the orig-

inal word "arem". All the translators except Jerome have trans-

lated it as "raven", only Jerome has translated it differently as

"Arab". Since his opinion did not gain popularity, his followers

distorted the texts in Latin translations and changed the word

"Arab" to raven. This has been much laughed at by non-

Christian scholars. Horne, a famous scholar, was much sur-

prised at it and was, in fact, inclined to agree with Jerome in

that the word "arem" most likely signifies "Arab" and not raven.

He greatly criticised the other translators and gave three argu-

ments to prove the absurdity of their opinion. He said on page

639 of the first volume of his commentary:2

|

Some critics have censured the translators saying that it is

far from being true that crows should provide sustenance to a

Prophet. If they had seen the original word, they would not have

reproached them, because the original word is "Orim" which has

the meaning of "Arab". This word is used for the same purpose

in 2 Kings 21 and in Nehemiah 4.

Besides, it is understood from "Perechat Riba", an exegesis

of the Book of Genesis, that this prophet was commanded to

live and hide himself in a place in the vicinity of "Butshan".

Jerome said that the "Orim" were the residents of that town

which was within the limits of Arabia. They provided food for

this prophet.

|

This is a valuable finding and evidence for Jerome. Although

the Latin translations contain the word "raven", the Book of

Chronicles, the Book of Nehemiah and Jerome have translated

it as "Arab". Similarly it is indicated by the Arabic translation

that this word signified men, and not crows. The famous Jewish

commentator Jarchi also translated this word as "Arab". It is cer-

tainly not likely that God would have provided bread and flesh

to his prophet through such impure birds. A prophet like Elijah,

who was so strict a follower of the commandments of God

would not be satisfied with flesh provided by crows unless he

knew beforehand that the crows were not bringing carrion.

Elijah was provided with such flesh and bread for a whole year.

How could this kind of service be attributed to crows? It is

much more likely the inhabitants of "Orbo" or "Arabs" rendered

this service to him."

It is up to the Protestants now to decide which of the two

opinions is correct.

|

Error No. 37

|

We find the following statement in I Kings:

|

...in the four hundred and eightieth year after the

children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in

the fourth year of Solomon own reign over Israel, in the

month Zif, which is the second month, that he began to

build the house of Lord.l

|

According to the historians, this statement is incorrect. Adam

Clarke, for example, said, when commenting on this verse in

Vol. 2 of his commentary:

|

The historians have differred from this text in the

following details: The Hebrew text gives 480, Latin 440,

Glycas 330, Melchior Canus 590; Josephus 592,

Slipicius Severus 585, Clement Alexander 570,

Cedrenus 672 Codomanus 598, Vosius Capellus 580,

Seranius 680, Nicholas Abraham 527, Mastlinus 592,

Petavius and Watherus 520.

|

Had the year, described by the Hebrew text been correct and

revealed by God, the Latin translator and so many of the

Judeao-Christian historians would have not contradicted it.

Josephus and Clement Alexandrianus also differed from the

Hebrew text, even though both of them are known as staunch

believers in their religion. This, naturally, leads us to believe

that the biblical text was to them no more worthy of respect

than any other book of history. Otherwise they would have not

even thought of disagreeing with it.

|

Error No. 38

|

It is stated in Matthew:

|

So all the generations from Abraham to David are

fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying

away into Babylon are fourteen generations; and from

the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen

generations.l

|

According to this statement the genealogy of Jesus from

Abraham is subdivided into three groups, each consisting of

fourteen generations. It is obviously not correct, because since

the first group from Abraham to David, includes David in it, he

must be excluded from the second group as he cannot be

|

counted twice. The second group should start with Solomon and

end with Jeconias, thus excluding him from the third group. The

third group should start from Salathiel, which leaves only 13

generations in the last group. All of the ancient as well as mod-

ern scholars have criticized this error, but the Christian scholars

are unable to produce any convincing explanation for it.

|

Errors No. 39-42:

|

According to the Arabic translation printed in 1849, describ-

ing the genealogy of the Christ, the Gospel of Matthew states:

|

Josias begat Jeconias and his brethren, in the

captivity of Babylon.l

|

It can be understood from this text that Jeconias and his

brothers were born in the period of exile in Babylon, which

obviously implies that Josias was alive during that period.

However this cannot be the case for the following four reasons:

|

1. Josias had died twelve years before the exile, because after

his death his son Jehoahaz became king and ruled for three

months. Then Jehoiachin, another son of Josias reigned for

eleven years. And it was only when Jeconias, the son of

Jehoiakim. had been ruling for three months in Jerusalem, that

Nebuchadnezzar invaded Jerusalem and imprisoned him along

with all other Israelites and deported them to Babylon.2

2. Jeconias is the grandson of Josias, and not his son, as is

clear from the above statement.

3. At the time of exile, Jeconias was 18 years old,3 therefore

his birth in this period is out of the question.

4. Jeconias had no brothers but his father had three brothers.

|

In view of the above textual difficulties, the commentator

Adarn Clarke reported in his commentaries that:

|

Calmet suggested that this verse should be read as

follows: "Josiah begat Jehoiakin, and his brethren,

Jehoiakin begat Jeconiah about the time of carrying

away to Babylon."

|

This suggestionl of manipulating the text of the holy scrip-

tures is something to be noted by the reader. Even after this

change, our objection discussed in no. 3 above remains unaf-

fected.

In our opinion, some ingenious priests have deliberately

deleted the word Jehoiakin from the text to avoid the objection

that Jesus, being a descendant of Jehoiakin, would not be able to

sit on the throne of David,2 and that in this case it would no

longer be possible for him to be the Messiah.

They did not appreciate the implications that were to occur

as a result of this tiny change in the text. Perhaps they thought

it

|

1. This suggestion has been partially carried out. The suggestion

said that Jehoiachin

should be inserted within the text and that instead of the phrase

" in the captivity" it

should be, "about the time of..." So the translators have

manipulated the text, and in

almost all the translations the text now reads: " Josias begat

Jeconias and his brethren,

about the time they were carried away to Babylon."

By adding the phrase "about the time" they have tried to avoid the

objection that

the author raised in no.3 above.

In the English translation published by the Anglican Church in

1961, this difficul-

ly has been solved a bit differently. In this translation the

verse reads:

"And Josias was the father of Jecohias and his brethren at the

time of the deportation

to Babylon.

2. "Therefore, thus saith the lord of Jehoiakin king of Judah, he

shall have none to sit

upon the throne of David." Jer. 36:30

3. According to Bible it is necessary for the Messiah to be a

descendant of David.

|

was easier to lay blame on Matthew than to preclude Jesus fron

being the descendant of David and from his being the Messiah.

|

Error No. 43

|

The genealogical description in Matthew records seven gen-

erations between Judah and Salmon,l and five generations from

Salmon to David. The period from Judah to Salmon is about

three hundred years, and from Salmon to David four hundred

years. Even bearing in mind the long lives of those people, this

statement cannot be true, as the age of the first group of genera-

tions was longer than the second group. Matthew own description

puts seven generations in three hundred years, and five genera-

tions in four hundred years.

|

Error No. 44

|

The second of the three groups of fourteen generations

described by Matthew in the genealogy of Jesus, has in fact

eighteen generations and not the fourteen mentioned in the third

chapter of I Chronicles. Newman expressed great concern about

this and mocked it saying that so far it had only been necessary

to believe in the parity of one and three, now it was necessary to

believe in the parity of eighteen and fourteen, because the holy

scriptures cannot be thought of as being incorrect.

|

Errors No. 45 & 46

|

In the same passage of Matthew we read:

|

1. According to this the generations from David to Jeconias are as

follows: David.

Solomon, Roboam, Abia, Asa, Josaphat, Joram, Ozias, Joatham,

Achaz, Ezekias.

Manasses, Amon, Josias, Jehoiachin, and Jeconias, whereas Matthew

records thirteen

generations which is wrong. Matt. 1:6-11

|

Jehoram begat Uzziah.

|

This statement is incorrect for two reasons:

|

1. It claims that Uzziah was the son of Jehoram which is not

true, because Uzziah was the son of Ahaziah, son of Joash who

was the son of Amaziah, son of Joram. These are the three gen-

erations which have been left out by Matthew perhaps to make

them fourteen. These three were kings of repute. They are men-

tioned in Chapters 8, 12 and 14 of the Second Book of Kings,

and in Chapters 22-25 of 2 Chronicles. There is no way of

knowing why these generations have been left out by Matthew

from the geneology. It seems simply to be one of his great mis-

takes.

2. Is the correct name Uzziah or Ozias, as he is named by 2

Kings and I Chronicles?

|

Error No. 47

|

Again in the same passage we find this statement:

|

And Salathiel begat Zorobabel.l

|

This is also incorrect because Zorobabel was the son of

Pedaiah2 and the nephew of Salathiel as is expressly mentioned

in I Chronicles 3.

|

Error No. 48

|

The same passage of genealogy in Matthew states:

|

2 I Chr. 3:19 says: "And Ihe sons of Pedaiah were Zerubbabel arld

Shimei."

|

Zorobabel begat Abiud.l

|

This, too, is wrong since Zerubbabel had only five sons, as is

confirmed by I Chronicles. None of the five sons is of this

name.2

There are in all eleven errors in the genealogy recorded by

Matthew. If the differences of Luke and Matthew, discussed ear-

lier are also included they total seventeen mistakes. This short

passage of Matthew is, therefore, erroneous in no less than sev-

enteen places.

|

Error No. 49

|

Matthew describes the event of some wise men from the east

who had seen the star which was the sign of the birth of Christ.

They came to Jerusalem, and, guided by the star, they reached

Bethlehem where the star halted above the head of the infant.

Astronomically this statement is ridiculous and unacceptable.

The movement of stars and some comets as seen from the earth

is from the East to the West, and some of the comets move con-

trarily from the West to the East. Bethlehem is situated to the

south of Jerusalem. Besides the men coming from the east could

not possibly see the movement of a star which is too slow to be

seen by the naked eye. And in any case how could a moving

star, if it did ever come to a stop in the sky, be said to have

stopped at the head of a new born child.3

|

Error No. 50

|

In Chapter One of Matthew we read this statement:

|

Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled

which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,

Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring

forth a son, and they shall call his name ""Emmanuel"".l

|

According to the Christian writers the Prophet referred to in

this verse is the Prophet Isaiah, because in his book he had said:

|

Therefore, the Lord himself shall give you a sign:

Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall

call his name "Emmanuel.2

|

This is again incorrect for the following reasons:

|

1. The original word that has been translated as "virgin" by

Matthew and the translator of the book of Isaiah is "alamah"

which is the feminine form of "alam" which according to the

Jewish scholars, signifies a "young girl" married or unmarried.

This word is also used, as they say, in the Book of Proverbs,

Chapter 30, where it is used for a young married woman. The

three famous Latin translations say "young woman". These

translations are the earliest known translations and are said to

have been made in 129,175, and 200. In view of these ancient

translations and the opinion of the Jewish scholars, Matthew own

statement is shown to be erroneous.

Frier, in his book on the etymology of Hebrew words, a book

|

cometS and stars as explained by the author was accepted up to the

18th century A.D.

Modern scientific data, however, has produced more convincing

explanations of the

directions and paths of the stars.

|

that is considered the most authentic work on the subject, said

that the word "alamah, had a dual meaning: "virgin" and "young

woman". His opinion, as compared to the commentaries of the

Jews, is not acceptable, and even if we accept this opinion, the

word cannot be taken to mean a virgin with any ARGUMENT

against the established meaning adopted by the commentators

and the ancient translators. The above facts are certainly enough

to prove falsity of the statement of the author of Meezan-ul-

Haq, who claimed that the word had no other meaning than

"virgin".

|

2. Jesus was never called by the name Emmanuel, nor did his

adopted fatherl give this name to him:

|

The angel told his father to call him with the name of

Jesus.2

|

It is also a fact that Gabriel came to his mother and said:

|

Thou shall conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a

son and shalt call his name Jesus.3

|

Apart from this Jesus himself never claimed that his name was

Emmanuel.

|

3. The passage where this word occurs, precludes its applica-

tion to Jesus. It states that Rezin, the king of Syria, and Pekah,

the king of Israel, went together to war against Ahaz, the king

of Judah. He was very frightened and God sent a revelation to

Isaiah as a consolation for Ahaz, saying that he should not be

|

,F frightened as his enemies would not be able to prevail against

him. and that their kingdoms would be destroyed, and that the

sign of their destruction was that a young woman would bring

forth a son and before the child grew up their kingdoms would

be destroyed.l

In fact Jesus was born after 721 years of the destruction of

the kingdoms which were destroyed only 21 years after the

above Prophecy. Judaeo-Christian scholars disagree on this

1 point. Some of them have claimed that Isaiah used the word

young woman" for his own wife who would conceive and give

birth to a child. And the two kings, of whom the people were

frightened, would be destroyed along with their kingdom before

the child grew up. This was said by Dr. Benson and seems to

have logic and bear truth.

|

Error No. 51

|

There is another statement in Matthew regarding Joseph, the

carpenter

|

And was there until the death of Herod, that it might

be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the

Prophet, saying out of Egypt have I called my son.2

|

The Prophet referred to in this text is Hosea and Matthew

makes reference to the first verse of Chapter 11 of his book,

which is absolutely incorrect as that verse has nothing to do

with Jesus. The verse, according to the Arabic translation, print-

ed in 1811, reads like this:

|

When Israel was a child, then I loved him and called

|

his sons out of Egypt.

|

This verse, is in fact, an expression of God own benevolence to

the Israelites conferred upon them in the time of Moses.

Matthew made two changes in the text. He changed the plural,

own ons", into the singular, own on", and turned the third person "his"

into the first person making it "my son".

Following the example of Matthew, the Arabic translator of

1844 changed the text to incorporate this alteration.

Besides, this change cannot be overlooked because further in

this chapter the people who were called from Egypt are men-

tioned in these words:

|

As they called them, so they went from them, they

sacrificed unto Baalim.l

|

This statement cannot be applied to Jesus.

|

Error No. 52

|

It is also stated in Matthew:

|

Then Herod, when he saw that he was mocked of the

wise men, was exceeding wroth, and sent forth, and slew

all the children that were in Bethlehem, and in all the

coasts thereof, from two years old and under, according

to the time which he had diligently inquired of the wise

men.2

|

This statement is wrong both logically and historically.

Historically because none of the non-Christian historians men-

tioned this event of the slaying of the infants by Herod.

|

For example Josephus did not said anything regarding this

. event Similarly the Jewish scholars, who are very hostile and

antagonistic towards Herod, and have been very particular in

describing any weak points of Herod which they could dig out

from history, have not said anything in this regard. Had this

incident been true they would have jumped at it and described it

as negatively as possible. If any Christian historian were to

describe it, he would certainly base his description on the state-

ment in the Gospel of Matthew.

And logically it is not acceptable because Bethlehem, at that

time, was a small village situated near Jerusalem. Herod, being

the governor could easily have found out the house where the

wise men had stayed. It was absolutely unnecessary for him to

commit such a heinous act as killing innocent children.

|

Error No. 53

|

The Gospel of Matthew also contains this statement:

|

Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by

Jeremiah the Prophet, saying,

In Rama was there a voice heard, lamentation, and

weeping, and great mourning, Rachel weeping for her

children, and would not be comforted because they are

not.2

|

This is again a clearly distorted rendering of the text of

Jeremiah. Any reader can himself look up the passage in

|

Jeremiah," and see for himself that the above verse has nothing

to do with Herod. It is clearly related to the famous historical

calamity of Nebuchadnezzar own invasion of Jerusalem. The peo-

ple of Rachel own tribe were among the Israelites who were exiled

to Babylon. Her soul lamented over the misery of her people.

God, therefore, promised that her children would be released to

go back to their own land.

|

Error No. 54

|

We find this statement in Matthew:

|

And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth:

that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the

prophets. He shall be called a Nazarene.2

|

This is also certainly incorrect, as this statement is not found

in any of the books of the Prophets. The Jews deny the validity

of this kind of prediction. According to them it is simply a false

claim. On the contrary they had a firm belief that no prophet

would ever come from Galilee, not to speak of Nazareth, as is

expressly stated in the Gospel of John:

|

They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of

Galilee? Search, and look: For out of Galilee ariseth no

Prophet.3

|

The Christian scholars have put forward4 weak explanations

|

Oregarding this, which do not deserve any serious consideration.

f Readers will have noted that there are seventeen errors in

the first two chapters of Matthew.

|

Error No. 55

|

According to the Arabic translations printed in 1671, 1821,

1826, 1854 and 1880, there is a statement in Matthew which

reads as follows:

|

In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the

wildemess of Judaea.l

|

And in the Persian translations printed in 1671, 1821, 1826,

1854 and 1880, we find the same statement:

|

In those days came John the Baptist, preaching in the

wilderness of Judaea.

|

In this passage the phrase, "in those days" refers to the days

when Archelaus did reign in Judaea, because just before the

verse in question, Matthew has described that after the death of

Herod, Archelaus became the king of Judaea and Joseph, the

carpenter, took the child (Jesus) and his wife to Galilee and set-

tled in the city of Nazareth, and that at this time came John, the

Baptist.

This statement is certainly wrong because John, the Baptist

delivered his sermon preaching the baptism of repentance for

the remission of sins eighteen years after the events discussed

above, since it is clear from Luke that John, the Baptist deliv-

ered this sermon when Pontius Pilate was the governor of

Judaea, and that it was the fifteenth year of Tiberius" reign. The

|

Emperor Tiberius began his reign fourteen years after the birth

of Jesus. (Britannica page 246 Vol. 2 under Tiberius) This

implies that John, the Baptist came twenty-nine years after the

birth of Jesus. In the seventh year after the birth of Jesus,

Archelaus had left his throne of Judaea. (Britannica 246 vol. 2

under Archelaus) If we assume that the beginning of Archelaus

reign and the arrival of Joseph in Nazareth were before the birth

of Jesus, the coming of John the Baptist will be proved to have

been twenty-eight years after the birth of Jesus.

|

Error No. 56: The Name of Herodias" Husband

|

We find in Matthew:

|

For Herod had laid hold on John and bound him, and

put him in prison for Herodias" sake, his brother Philip own

wife.l

|

This statement is also historically wrong, because the name

of Herodias" husband was Herodius, as is stated by Josephus in

Chapter 12 of Vol. 8 of his history.

|

Error No. 57

|

It is stated in Matthew:

|

But he said unto them, Have ye not read what David

did, when he was an hungred, and they that were with

him;

How he entered into the house of God and did eat

the shewbread, which was not lawful for him to eat, nei-

ther for them which were with him.2

|

The phrase "neither for them which were with him" is clear-

Iy wrong as will be discussed under Error No. 92.

|

Error No. 58

|

Matthew contains this statement:

|

Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy

the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of

silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of

the children of Israel did value.l

|

This statement is also wrong as will be shown later in the

book.

|

Error No. 59: The Earthquake on Jesus" Crucifixion

|

Once more we find in Matthew:

|

And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain

from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and

the rocks rent;

And the graves were opened; and many bodies of the

saints which slept arose.

And came out of the graves after his resurrection,

and went into the holy city and appeared unto many.2

|

This is a concocted story. Norton, the famous scholar,

though he favoured the gospels, said, proving the falsity of this

story with several ARGUMENTs, "This is a totally false story. It

seems that such stories were prevalent among the Jews at the

time of destruction of Jerusalem. Possibly someone might have

written this story as a marginal note in the Gospel of Matthew,

|

and later on it might have been included in the text, the transla-

tor might have translated it from that text.l

The falsehood of this story is evident for several reasons:

|

1. The Jews went to Pilate, the day after the Crucifixion of

Christ, and said to Pilate:

|

Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he

was yet alive. After three days I will rise again.

Command therefore, that the sepulchre be made sure

until the third day.2

|

Moreover, Matthew, in the same chapter expressly states that

Pilate and his wife were not pleased at the crucifixion of Christ.

The Jews would not dare go to Pilate in these circumstances,

especially when there was an earthquake and the graves opened

and the rocks rent. The fact that Pilate was not pleased at the

crucifixion of Christ, would have put him into a rage against the

Jews. They could have not gone to Pilate to say that Christ was

a "deceiver", God forbid.

|

2. In the presence of such miraculous signs a great number of

people of that time would have embraced the new faith without

hesitation, whereas, according to the Bible, three thousand peo-

ple did accept the new faith, but only when the Holy Spirit

descended on the disciples and they spoke several languages

before the people. This event is explicitly mentioned in Acts.3

The events described by Matthew were obviously of a much

more compelling nature than the disciples speaking in several

|

languages.

|

3. Is it not surprising that none of the historians of that time

and of the time succeeding it, and none of the evangelists except

atthew, has written a single word about these events of so

great an historical importance?

It is of no avail to say that opponents have deliberately avoid-

ed any reference to these events. But what do they have to say

of the absence of any account of these events in the books of

those Christian historians who are considered to be advocates of

Christianity. In particular the absence of any description of

these events in the Gospel of Luke is very surprising, as he is

generally known for reporting the rarities of the life of Jesus, as

is clear from the first chapters of his gospel and of the Book of

A ts

c .

We cannot understand why all the evangelists, or at least

most of them, have not referred to these events when they have

given full account of events of no or lesser, significance. Mark

and Luke, too, only speak of the splitting of the veil and not of

anything else.

|

4. Since the veil in question was made of silk, we cannot

understand how a soft curtain of silk could be torn like this, and

if it was true, how the building of the temple could remain unaf-

fected. This objection is forwarded equally to all evangelists.

|

5. The bodies of the saints coming out of the graves happens

to be in clear contradiction to the statement of Paul, in which he

said that Christ was the first to rise from the dead.

The learned scholar Norton truthfully said that this evange-

list seems to be in the habit of making his own guesses, and is

not always able to sort out the truth from the available stock of

|

events. Can such a man be trusted with the word of God?

|

Errors No. 60,61,62: The Resurrection of Jesus

|

The Gospel of Matthew reports Jesus" answering to some

scribes:

|

But he answered and said unto them, An evil and

adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there

shall no sign be given to it, but the sign of the Prophet

Jonas:

For Jonas was three days and three nights in the

whale own belly; so shall the son of man be three days and

three nights in the heart of the earth.2

|

We find a similar statement in the same gospel:

|

A wicked and adulterous generation seeketh after a

sign; and there shall no sign be given unto it, but the

sign of the Prophet Jonas.3

|

The same is understood from the statement of the Jews

reported by Matthew:

|

Sir, we remember that, that deceiver said while he was

yet alive, After three days I will rise again.4

|

f All these statements are incorrect for the fact is that accord-

ing to the gospels Jesus was crucified on Friday in the afternoon

and died at about nine in the evening. Joseph asked Pilate for

his body in the evening and arranged his funeral, as is clear

from the Gospel of Mark. He was therefore buried in the night

of Friday, and his body is said to have disappeared on the morn-

ing of Sunday, as described by John. According to this detail,

his body did not remain in the earth for more than one day and

two nights. Therefore his statement of staying in the earth for

three days and three nights is proved incorrect.

Seeing the error in these statements, Paley and Channer

admitted that the statement in question was not of Jesus but was

the result of Matthew own own imagination. Both of them said

words to the effect that Jesus would have meant to convince

them only through his preachings without their asking a sign

from him, like the people of Nineveh, who embraced the new

faith without a sign from Jonah.

According to these two scholars this statement was proof of a

lack of understanding on the part of Matthew. It also proves that

Matthew did not write his gospel by inspiration. His not under-

standing the intention of Jesus in this case, shows that he could

well have written similarly erroneous accounts in other places.

It is, therefore, a natural conclusion that the gospel of

Matthew cannot, in any way be called revelation but is rather a

collection of accounts influenced by the local environment and

the result of human imagination.

|

Error No. 63: The Second Coming of Jesus

|

It is stated in Matthew:

|

For the son of man shall come in the glory of his

Father with his angels; and then he shall reward every

|

man according to his works.

Verily I say unto you, There be some standing here,

which shall not taste of death, till they see the son of

man coming in his kingdom.l

|

This statement has definitely been wrongly attributed to

Jesus, because all those own tanding here", died nearly two thou-

sand years ago, and none of them saw the Son of Man coming

into his kingdom.

|

Error No. 64: Another Prediction of Jesus

|

Matthew reports Jesus saying to his disciples:

|

But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into

another, for verily I say unto you, Ye shall not have gone

over the cities of Israel, till the son of man be come.2

|

Again this is obviously wrong as the disciples have, long,

long ago, done their duty of going over the cities of Israel, but

the Son of Man never came with his kingdom.

|

Errors No. 65 - 68

|

The book of Revelations contains this statement:

|

Behold, I come quickly:3

|

The same words are found in chapter 22 verse 7 of the same

book. And verse 10 of the same chapter contains this statement:

|

Seal not the sayings of the prophecy of this book: for

the time lS at hand."

|

Further in verse 20 it says again:

|

Surely, I come quickly.

|

On the basis of these statements of Christ, the earlier follow-

ers of Christianity held the firm belief that the second coming of

Christ would be in their own time. They believed that they were

living in the last age and that the day of Judgement was very

near at hand. The Christian scholars have confirmed that they

held this belief.

|

Errors No. 69 - 75

|

The Epistle of James contains this statement:

|

Be ye also patient; stablish your hearts: for the com-

ing of the Lord draweth near.

|

It also appears in I Peter:

|

But the end of all things is at hand: be ye therefore

sober and watch unto prayer.2

|

And the First Epistle of Peter contains these words:

|

Little children, it is the last time.3

|

And the First Epistle of Paul to the Thessalonians states:

|

For this we say unto you, by the word of the Lord,

that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of

|

the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep.

For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with

a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the

trump of God: and the dead in Christ shall rise first

Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught

up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in

the air: and so shall we ever be with the Lord.

|

And Paul said in his letter to Philippians:

|

The Lord is at hand.2

|

And in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, Paul said:

|

And they are written for our admonition, upon whom

the ends of the worlds are come.3

|

Paul also said later in the same letter:

|

Behold, I shew you a mystery; We shall not all sleep,

but we shall all be changed,

In a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last

trump: for the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be

raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.4

|

The above seven statements are the ARGUMENTs for our claim

that the early Christians held a firm belief in the second coming

of Christ during their own lifetime, with the result that all the

seven statements are proved false.

|

Errors No. 76 - 78: The Signs of the End of the World

|

Matthew describes in Chapter 24 that the disciples of Jesus

|

asked the Messiah, when they were on the Mount of Olives,

about the signs of the destruction of the Temple and the second

coming of Jesus and about the end of the world. Jesus told them

all the signs, first of the destruction of the House of the Lord,

of

his own coming to the earth again and of the day of Judgement.

The description up to verse 28 talks of the destruction of the

Temple; and verse 29 to the end of the chapter consists of the

events related to the second coming of Christ and the Day of

Judgement. Some verses of this chapter according to the Arabic

translation" printed in 1820, read thus:

|

Immediately after the tribulation of those days, shall

the sun be darkened, and the moon will not give her

light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the pow-

ers of the heavens shall be shaken.

And then shall appear the sign of the son of man in

heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn,

and they shall see the son of man coming in the clouds

of heaven with power and great glory.

And he shall send his angels with a great sound of

trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the

four winds, from one end of the heaven to the other.2

|

And in verses 34 and 35 it says:

|

Verily I say unto you. This generation shall not pass,

till all these things be fulfilled.

Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words

shall not pass away.

|

The text of the Arabic translation printed in 1844 is exactly

the same. However, the Persian translations of 1816, 1828, 1842

|

Immediately after the trouble of those days, the sun

shall be darkened.

|

Verse 34 of these translations is identical to the one quoted

above. It is, therefore necessary that the day of Judgement

should come at the time when the House of God has been

destroyed and Jesus has reappeared on the earth, "...immediate-

ly after the trouble of those days," according to the statement of

Jesus. Similarly it is also necessary that the generation contem-

porary with Christ should not have died until they saw these

event with their eyes, as was the belief of the early Christians.

However they did die centuries ago and heaven and earth still

continue to exist.

The evangelists, Mark and Luke also included similar

descriptions in Chapters 13 and 21 respectively of their gospels.

The three evangelists are equally responsible for this historical-

ly proved-false statement.

|

Errors No. 79 - 80: The Reconstruction of the Temple

|

The Gospel of Matthew reports this statement of Christ:

|

Verily I say unto you. There shall not be left here

one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down.l

|

The Protestant scholars have therefore said that any con-

struction to be built on the foundations of the temple would be

razed to the ground as had been foretold by Jesus. The Author

of Tehqeeq-e-Deen-ul-Haq, (Inquisition into the True Faith)

printed in 1846, said on page 394:

|

King Julian, who lived three hundred years after

Christ and had become an apostate, intended to rebuild

the temple of Jerusalem, so that he could thus refute the

prediction of Jesus. When he started the construction

suddenly a fire jumped out from its foundations. All the

workers were frightened and fled away from there. No-

one after him ever dared to refute the saying of the

truthful, who had said, "The heaven and the earth shall

pass away but my words shall not pass away."

|

The priest Dr. Keith wrote a book in renunciation of the dis-

believers in Christ which was translated into Persian by Rev.

Mirak entitled "Kashf-ul-Asar-Fi-Qisas-e-Bani Israel" (An

exposition of the Israelite Prophets) and printed in Edinburgh in

1846. We produce the translation of a passage from page 70:

|

King Julian allowed the Jews to rebuild Jerusalem

and the temple. He also promised that they would be

allowed to live in the city of their ancestors, the Jews

were no less grieved than the king was pleased. They

started the work of the Temple. Since it was against the

prophecy of Christ, the Jews, in spite of their best efforts

and all the possible help from the king could not succeed

in their mission. Some pagan historians have reported

that the huge flames of fire burst out of this place and

burnt the workers stopping the work altogether.

|

Thomas Newton, in vol 3 (pages 63 and 64) of his commen-

tary on the prophecies of the Holy Scripture printed in London

in 1803 said, which we translate here from Urdu:

|

Omar, the second great Caliph of Islam, spread cor-

ruption all over the world. He reigned for ten and a half

years. In this short period he made great conquests and

conquered all the countries of Arabia, Syria, Iran and

Egypt. The Caliph personally besieged Jerusalem and in

637 A.D. signed the treaty of peace with the Christians

|

who were tired of the prolonged siege. The Christians

surrendered and handed over the city to Omar.

Omar offered generous terms to the Christians. He

did not take any church into his possession, but he

requested the high priest for a piece of land to build a

mosque. The priest showed him the room of Jacob and

Solomon own temple. The Christians had covered this place

with dirt and filth out of their hatred for the Jews. Omar,

himself, cleansed the place with his own hands.

Following the example of Omar, the great officers of his

army thought it their religious duty and cleansed the

place with religious zeal and built a mosque there. This

was the first mosque ever built in Jerusalem. Some his-

torians have also added that in the same mosque Omar

was murdered by a slave. Abdul Malik, son of Marvan,

who was the twelfth Caliph extended this mosque in his

reign.

|

Though, the above description of this commentator is not

true in several places, he has admitted that the first mosque built

at the place of Solomon own Temple was that built by the Caliph

Omar, and that it was extended by Abdul Malik and still exists

in Jerusalem after over 1200 years.l How would it have been

possible for Omar to succeed in building a mosque there if it

had really been against the prophecy of Christ?

Since this statement of Jesus is also reported by Mark and

Luke, they are equally responsible for this false description.

|

Error No. 82: A False Prediction

|

Matthew reports this statement as having been said by Jesus

to his disciples:

|

And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you,

|

. More than 1400 years have now passed since this event.

|

That ye which have followed me, in regeneration when

the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye

shall also sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve

tribes of Israel.l

|

It is quite apparent from this that Jesus assured his twelve

disciples, of eternal success and redemption promising them to

sit upon twelve thrones on the Day of Judgement. This prophet-

ic witness of eternal success has been proved wrong by the

gospels themselves. We have already seen2 that one of the disci-

ples of Jesus, namely Judas Iscariot, betrayed Jesus and became

an apostate, how, then is it possible for him to sit on the twelfth

throne on the Day of Judgement?

|

Error No. 83

|

We find in the Gospel of John:

|

And he (Jesus) saith unto him, Verily, verily I say

unto you. Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the

angels of God ascending and descending upon the son of

man.3

|

This is also historically false and incorrect, for, this was said

by Jesus after his baptism and after the descent of the Holy

Spirit upon him,4 while we know that nothing like this ever hap-

pened in history after this. These prophetic words have never

come true.

|

who were tired of the prolonged siege. The Christians

surrendered and handed over the city to Omar.

Omar offered generous terms to the Christians. He

did not take any church into his possession, but he

requested the high priest for a piece of land to build a

mosque. The priest showed him the room of Jacob and

Solomon own temple. The Christians had covered this place

with dirt and filth out of their hatred for the Jews. Omar,

himself, cleansed the place with his own hands.

Following the example of Omar, the great officers of his

army thought it their religious duty and cleansed the

place with religious zeal and built a mosque there. This

was the first mosque ever built in Jerusalem. Some his-

torians have also added that in the same mosque Omar

was murdered by a slave. Abdul Malik, son of MaNan,

who was the twelfth Caliph extended this mosque in his

reign.

|

Though, the above description of this commentator is not

true in several places, he has admitted that the first mosque built

at the place of Solomon own Temple was that built by the Caliph

Omar, and that it was extended by Abdul Malik and still exists

in Jerusalem after over 1200 years.l How would it have been

possible for Omar to succeed in building a mosque there if it

had really been against the prophecy of Christ?

Since this statement of Jesus is also reported by Mark and

Luke, they are equally responsible for this false description.

|

Error No. 82: A False Prediction

|

Matthew reports this statement as having been said by Jesus

to his disciples:

|

And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you,

|

That ye which have followed me, in regeneration when

the son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye

shall also sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve

tribes of Israel.l

|

It is quite apparent from this that Jesus assured his twelve

disciples, of eternal success and redemption promising them to

sit upon twelve thrones on the Day of Judgement. This prophet-

ic witness of eternal success has been proved wrong by the

gospels themselves. We have akeady seen2 that one of the disci-

ples of Jesus, namely Judas Iscariot, betrayed Jesus and became

an apostate, how, then is it possible for him to sit on the twelfth

throne on the Day of Judgement?

|

Error No. 83

|

We find in the Gospel of John:

|

And he (Jesus) saith unto him, Verily, verily I say

unto you. Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the

angels of God ascending and descending upon the son of

man.3

|

This is also historically false and incorrect, for, this was said

by Jesus after his baptism and after the descent of the Holy

Spirit upon him,4 while we know that nothing like this ever hap-

pened in history after this. These prophetic words have never

come true.

|

Error No. 84: The Ascension of Christ

|

It is said in John:

|

And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that

came down from heaven, even the son of man which is

in heaven.l

|

This is also incorrect, as is evident from the fifth chapter of

|

Genesis2 and 2 Kings Chapter 2.3

|

Error No. 85

|

We find this statement in the gospel of Mark:

|

For verily I say unto you, That whosoever shall say

unto this mountain, Be thou removed, and be thou cast

into the sea; and shall not doubt in his heart, but shall

believe that those things which he saith shall come to

pass; he shall have whatsoever saith.4

|

We find another similar statement in the same book:

|

And these signs shall follow them that believe; In

my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with

new tongues;

They shall take up serpents, and if they drink any

deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands

on the sick, and they shall recover.5

|

And in the gospel of John we read the following statement:

|

Verily, verily I say unto you, He that believeth on

me, the works that I do, shall he do also, and greater

works than these shall he do; because I go unto my

Father.l

|

The prophetic promise made in the above texts is a general

statement that does not particularise any man or people, particu-

larly the phrase, "Whosoever shall say unto this mountain"

which is totally unconditional and can be applied to any people

of any time. Similarly the statement, "He that believeth on me,"

can include any believer in Christ of any time. There is no argu-

ment to support the claim that the above predictions were par-

ticularly made in respect of the early Christians. It is therefore,

necessary for a mountain to move and be cast into the sea, if a

believer says so to it, of course, with firm belief in Christ.

Everyone knows that nothing like this has even happened in his-

tory. We would like very much to know if any Christian, in or

after the time of Jesus, did perform "works greater than Christ"

as the evangelist has made Jesus say this in the above predic-

tion.

The Protestants have more than admitted that after the time

of Jesus the occurrence of miracles and marvels has never been

proved in history. We have seen many priests in India, who, in

spite of making strenuous efforts for many years are not able to

speak correctly in Urdu, let alone take up serpents, drink poison

and heal the sick.

|

THE FALLIBITY OF LUTHER AND CALVIN

|

Perhaps we might be allowed at this juncture, for the interest

of the readers, to reproduce two incidents directly related to

Luther and Calvin, the founders of the Protestant faith. We

quote this from the book entitled Mira"atus Sidq that was trans-

lated into Urdu by a Catholic scholar and priest Thomas Inglus

and printed in 1857. He relates the following incidents on pages

105-107:

|

In 1543 Luther tried to cast out the devil from the

son of Messina with a result similar to the Jews who

once tried to cast out devil as is described by the Book

of Acts in Chapter 19. Satan, in the same way attacked

Luther and wounded him and his companions. Stiffels

seeing that his spiritual leader, Luther was being choked

and strangled by Satan, tried to run away but being in

great terror was not able to open the latch of the door

and had to break down the door with a hammer which

was thrown to him from the outside by his servant

through a ventilator.

Another incident is related of Calvin, the great leader

of the Protestants, by another historian. Calvin once

hired a man called Bromius and told him to lie down in

front of the people and pretend to be dead. He arranged

with him that when he heard Calvin say the words,

"Bromius, rise from the dead and be alive," he should

rise from the bed as though he had been dead and had

just risen, having been miraculously brought to life. The

wife of Bromius was also told to cry and lament over the

body of her husband.

Bromius and his wife acted accordingly and people,

hearing her cries and lamentation, gathered there for her

consolation. Calvin came and said to the weeping

woman, "Do not cry. I will raise him from the dead."

He began to recite some prayers and then holding the

hand of Bromius, said, "Rise in the name of God." but

|

his design of deceiving people in the name of God was

not a success as Bromius really had died. God had

avenged Calvin for his deception and iniquity. Bromius"

wife, seeing that her husband had died in reality started

crying and blaming Calvin.

|

Both these leaders were considered to be the greatest spiritu-

al leaders of their time. If they can be blamed for such acts what

remains to be said of the generality of the people.

Pope Alexander VI, the head of the Roman church and the

representative of the Lord on the earth, according to the

Catholic faith, had prepared some poison for some other per-

sons, but drinking it himself by mistake he died. One cannot

avoid coming to the conclusion that the leaders of both the rival

sects do not possess any of the qualities mentioned in the pre-

diction under discussion.

|

Error No. 86

|

The gospel of Luke states:

|

Which was the son of Joanna, which was the son of

Rhesa, which was the son of Zorobabel, which was the

son of Salathiel, which was the son of Neri.l

|

This genealogical description of the Christ contains three

errors:

|

1. The sons of Zorobabel or Zerubbabel are described very

clearly in 1 Chronicles Chapter 3 and none of them has this

name. We have already discussed this earlier and besides this, it

is against the description of Matthew.

2. Zerubbabel is the son of Pedaiah, not Salathiel. He is,

however, his nephew.

3. Salathiel is the son of Jeconias, not of Neri. Matthew has

also agrees with this.

|

Error No. 87

|

In his account of the genealogy of Jesus, Luke states:

|

...which was the son of Sala,

Which was the son Cainan which was the son of

Arphaxad...l

|

This statement is also not correct as Sala was the son of

Arphaxad, and not his grandson, which is clear from the book of

Genesis2 and from I Chronicles.3

The Hebrew version has always preference over any transla-

tion according to the Protestants.4 No translation can be pre-

ferred to the original Hebrew version simply because it corre-

sponds with the description of Luke. On the contrary, such a

translation would be considered unacceptable on the grounds

that it has been modified.

|

Error No. 88

|

We read the following statement in Luke:

|

And it came to pass in those days, that there went

out a decree from Caesar Augustus that all the world

|

should be taxed,

(And this taxing was first made when Cyrenius was

governor of Syria).l

|

This, too, is incorrect because the phrase "all the world"

includes the total population of the Roman empire. No historian

prior to, or contemporary with Luke ever mentioned this tax

before the birth of Jesus in his history.

Later historians, when describing it, only do so using Luke as

their source which is unacceptable. Apart from this, it seems

impossible that Cyrenius, who was governor of Syria fifteen

years after the birth of Jesus, could have done the taxing which

was accomplished fifteen years prior to the birth of Jesus.

Equally unbelievable is the notion that Jesus was born during

the time of his governorship, because in this case we are

required to believe that Mary remained in the state of pregnancy

for as long as fifteen years. It is so because Luke has admitted

in the second chapter that the wife of Zacharias conceived in the

reign of Herod2 and that Mary conceived Jesus six month later.

Realizing this "difficulty" some Christian scholars have

declared that verse 2 is a later addition and not written by Luke.

|

Error No. 89

|

Luke t t -

|

s a es.

|

Now in the fifteenth year of the Tiberius Caesar,

Pontius Pilate being governor of Judaea, and Herod

being tetrarch of Galilee, and his brother Philip, tetrarch

of Ituraea and of the region of Trachonitis, and Lysanias

the tetrarch of Abilene.3

|

This is incorrect as the historians have denied of there being

any ruler of Abilene named Lysaneas in the time of Herod and

Pontius Pilate.

|

Error No. 90

|

In the same chapter of Luke we find this statement:

|

But Herod the tetrarch, being reproved by him for

Herodias, his brother Philip own wife, and for all the evils

which Herod had done.l

|

This is absolutely wrong, as we have shown under Error No.

56 and as will be discussed later in the book. The mistake was

made by Luke and not by the copier, as has been said by some

exegetes admitting the presence of the mistake in the text.

|

Error No. 91

|

We find in Mark:

|

For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon

John, and bound him in prison for Herodias" sake, his

brother Philip own wife...2

|

This statement too, is erroneous, as we have already dis-

cussed. All the three evangelists are equally responsible for this

error. The translator of the Arabic versions printed 1821 and

1844 has manipulated the texts of Matthew and Luke and delet-

ed the word Philip, while other translators have not followed his

example.

|

Errors No. 92-94: Did David Eat Shewbread?

|

It appears in Mark:

|

Have ye never read what David did, when he had

need, and was an hungred, he, and they that were with

him?

How he went into the house of God, in the days of

Abiathar, the high priest, and did eat the shewbread,

which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave

also to them which were with him?l

|

Earlier in the book we showed that this statement is also

incorrect, since David at that time was alone,2 therefore the

phrase "they that were with him" is a mis-statement. Besides, it

is incorrect to say the high priest at that time was Abiathar,

whereas, in fact, Ahimelech was the high priest. The falsity of

this statement can also be understood from the beginning of 1

Samuel 21 and 22.

There are three errors in two verses of Mark. The third error

will also be discussed later. The Christian scholars have plainly

admitted that Mark has made a mistake in this text.

|

Errors No. 95 - 96

|

The Gospel of Luke also describes the same event with

words signifying that David was accompanied at that time,

when, as we have just shown, he was alone.

|

Error No. 97

|

The First Epistle to Corinthians contains the following sen-

|

tence:

|

And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve.l

|

This statement is quite obviously wrong, since one of the

twelve, Judas Iscariot had died prior to this event, reducing the

number of the disciples to eleven. Mark, therefore, says in

Chapter 16:

|

He appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat.2

|

Errors No. 98-100

|

Matthew says:

|

But when they deliver you up, take no thought how

or what ye shall speak: for it shall be given you in that

same hour what ye shall speak.

For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your

Father which speaketh in you.3

|

Luke also reports this in the following words:

|

And when they bring you unto the synagogues, and

unto magistrates, and powers, take ye no thought, how

or what thing shall ye answer, or what ye shall say:

For the Holy Ghost shall teach you in the same hour

what ye ought to say.4

|

A similar statement is also given in Mark in chapter 13. The

implication of the texts contained in the three gospels is that

Jesus promised his disciples that whatever they said to the offi-

|

cers would be inspired to them by the Holy Ghost, which in turn

signified that their words would not be their own words but the

word of the Holy Ghost.

This statement is shown to be incorrect in the light of the fol-

lowing passage of the Book of Acts:

|

And Paul, earnestly beholding the council, said, Men

and brethren, I have lived in all good conscience before

God until this day.

And the high priest Ananias commanded them that

stood by him to smite him on the mouth.

Then said Paul unto him, God shall smite thee, thou

whited wall: For sittest thou to judge me after the law

and commandest me to be smitten contrary to the law?

And they that stood by said, Revilest thou God own

high priest?

Then said Paul, I wist not, brethern, that he was the

high priest: for it is written, Thou shall not speak evil of

the ruler of thy people."

|

Had the statement of Matthew and Luke been true, their spir-

itual leader Paul, who is considered equal in status with the dis-

ciples and who himself claims to be equal to Peter, the greatest

of all disciples,2 could have not said anything erroneous before

the council.l Paul own admission to his fault is enough to prove the

text incorrect. We shall later on show that the Christian scholars

have admitted the presence of error in this text. Since this text

has appeared in the three gospels, this makes three errors in the

text.

|

Errors No. 101& 102

|

In Luke we find:

|

...in the days of Elias, when the heaven was shut up

three years and six months...

|

and in the Epistle of James:

|

...and it rained not on earth by the space of three

years and six months.2

|

This also seems incorrect as it is understood from I Kings

that there was rain in the third year.3

Since this statement has appears in Luke as being said by

Jesus, while in the Epistle of James, as the statement of James

himself, this, in fact, makes it two mistakes.

|

Error No. 103: Jesus and the Throne of David

|

The Gospel of Luke says in chapter 1:

|

And Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his

father David:

And he shall reign over the house of Jacob for ever,

and of his Kingdom there shall be no end.4

|

This is incorrect for the following two reasons:

|

1. Because Jesus, according to the genealogy given by

MaKhew, is a descendant of Jehoiakim, and none of his descen-

|

dants can sit on the throne of David according to the statement

of the Prophet Jeremiah.l

2. Secondly because historically we know that Jesus never

sat on the throne of David even for a single minute; nor did he

ever rule over the house of Jacob. On the contrary, the Jews

became hostile to him to the extent that they arrested him and

took him to Pilate, who reviled him and then handed him over

to the Jews to crucify.

Besides, it is clear from the Gospel of John that Jesus hated

the idea of being a king,2 and, moreover, it is unbelievable that

Jesus would hate something for which he was sent by God.

|

Error No. 104

|

We find the following passage in Mark:

|

Jesus answered, and said, Verily I say unto you,

There is no man that hath left house, or brethren, or

sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands

for my sake, and the gospel own ,

But he shall receive hundred-fold now in this time,

houses, and brethren, and sisters and mothers, and chil-

dren, and lands, with persecutions; and in the world to

come eternal life.3

|

And Luke reports these words in the same context:

|

...who shall not receive manifold more in this pre-

sent time, and in the world to come, life everlasting.

|

This cannot be true because, according to their law the

Christians are not allowed to marry more than one woman. It

would therefore, not be possible for a man leaving his wife for

the sake of Jesus, to receive "hundred-fold or at least manifold

wives in this present life."

Besides the phrase, "lands with persecutions", is out of place

here as Jesus is speaking of the reward that would be given to

them by God, hence the phrase "with persecutions" is not rele-

vant, and does not fit the context.

|

Error No. 105: Jesus Healing the One Possessed by Devils

|

The Gospel of Mark describes the event of a man possessed

by evil spirits and being healed by Jesus, saying:

|

And all the devils besought him saying, Send us into

the swine that we may enter into them.

And forthwith Jesus gave them leave. And the

unclean spirits went out, and entered into the swine; and

the herd ran violently down a steep place into the sea.l

|

This is incorrect, for the reason that the Jews were not

allowed to keep swine, being inadmissible for them under the

law.

|

Error No. 106

|

Matthew reports Jesus saying to the Jews:

|

I say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the son of man

sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the

clouds of heaven.2

|

It is wrong because the Jews have never seen Christ coming

in the clouds of heaven before or after his death.

|

Error No. 107

|

Luke has reported in chapter 6:

|

The disciple is not above his master, but every man

that is perfect shall be as his master.l

|

This appears to be wrong as there are many personalities

who have had greater perfection than their teacher.

|

Error No. 108: Parents: Honour or Hate Them?

|

The following statement of Jesus has been reported by Luke:

|

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.2

|

It is, all the more, incredible to think that such a remark

could have been made by Jesus, when he had said, reproaching

the Jews:

|

For God commanded, saying, Honour "y father and

mother, and, He that curseth father or mother, let him

die the death.3

|

We cannot see how Jesus could have said this.

|

Error No.109

|

The Gospel of John says:

|

And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high

priest that same year said unto them, Ye know nothing at

all.

Nor consider that it is expedient for us, that one man

should die for the people, and that the whole nation per-

ish not.

And this spake he not of himself, but being high

priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for

that nation;

And not for that nation only, but that also he should

gather together in one the children of God that were

scattered abroad.l

|

This statement cannot be accepted as true for the following

inconsistencies in the text.

Firstly, because this statement implies that the high priest

should necessarily be a prophet which is certainly not correct.

Secondly, if the statement of the high priest is accepted as

prophetic, it necessitates that the death of Jesus should be an

atonement only for the Jews2 and not for the whole world,

which is obviously against the established beliefs and claims of

the Christians. And the phrase, "not only for this nation"

becomes an absurd statement and against the prophethood of

Jesus.

Thirdly, according to the evangelist, this high priest who

enjoys the status of a prophet happens to be the same man who

was the high priest at the time of the "crucifixion" of Jesus and

the one who passed the religious decree against Jesus accusing

|

him of being a liar, a disbeliever and being liable to be killed.

And he was the one who was pleased at the smiting and insult-

ing of Jesus. This is witnessed to by Matthew who says:

|

And they that had laid hold on Jesus led him away to

Caiaphas the high priest, where the scribes and the

elders were assembled.l

|

And further in the same chapter we find the following details:

|

But Jesus held his peace. And the high priest

answered and said unto him, I adjure thee by the living

God, that thou tell us whether thou be the Christ, the son

of God.

Jesus saith unto him, Thou hast said: nevertheless I

say unto you, Hereafter shall ye see the son of man sit-

ting on the right hand of power, and coming in the

clouds of heaven.

Then the high priest rent his clothes saying, He has

spoken blasphemy; what further need have we of wit-

nesses? Behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy.

What think ye? They answered and said, He is guilty

of death.

Then did they spit in his face, and buffeted him; and

others smote him with the palms of their hands,

Saying, Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he

that smote thee?

|

The fourth gospel, John, is even more explicit, saying:

|

And led him away to Annas first: for he was father

in law of Caiaphas, which was the high priest that same

year.

Now Caiaphas was he, which gave counsel to the

|

Jews, that it was expedient that one should die for the

people.l

|

We may now be allowed to say that if this statement of the

high priest was made by him as a prophet why did he gave his

judgement to kill Jesus? He declared him blasphemous and was

happy at the humiliation of Jesus in his court. Is it in any way

credible that a prophet should command people to kill his God?

We declare our utter disbelief in such prophet who remains a

prophet even after committing such profane and sacrilegious

acts. From this situation it logically deduced that Jesus was a

prophet of God but having gone astray (may God forbid) he

claimed of being God incarnate and put a false blame on God.

In short, the innocence of Christ, in this case, becomes doubtful.

In fact, the evangelist John is also innocent, as is Jesus Christ,

of making such incredible statements. The responsibility for all

such statements lies totally on the shoulders of the Trinitarians.

If, for a moment, we suppose that Caiaphas own statement is

true, even then the significance of his statement would be that

when the disciples and the followers of Jesus confirmed that

Jesus was, in fact, the Promised Messiah or Christ, since it was

generally believed by the people that it was necessary for the

Messiah to be a great king of the Jews, Caiaphas and his elders,

were afraid that having come to know this fact, the Caesar of

Rome would be angry and might make trouble for them, he pro-

posed, "one should die for the people"

This was the real and natural significance of that statement

and not that the people of the world would be redeemed and

saved from their "original sin", as they call it, which was com-

mitted by Adam thousands of years prior to the birth of the

Christ, which is a whimsical and, of course, illogical interpreta-

|

tion of the statement. The Jews also do not believe in this

whimsical conception of the Trinitarians.

Perhaps this evangelist, later on, realised the mistake and he

replaced the phrase "he prophesied" with the words "he gave

counsel", in Chapter 18, because to give counsel is very differ-

ent from making a prophesy as a prophet. Though by making

this change he has opened himself to the charge of contradicting

his own statement.

|

Error No. 110

|

Paul own letter to Hebrews contains this statement:

|

For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the

people according to the law, he took the blood of calves

and of goats, with water and scarlet wool, and hyssop,

and sprinkled both the book and all the people,

Saying, This is the blood of the testament which God

hath enjoined unto you.

Moreover he sprinkled with blood both the taberna-

cle and all the vessels of the ministry.l

|

The above statement is incorrect for the following three rea-

sons:

Firstly because the blood was not of calves and goats, but

was only of oxen, at that occasion.

Secondly because, the water, the scarlet wool and hyssop

were not present; at that moment only the blood was sprinkled.

Thirdly, because Moses himself did not sprinkle on the book

and on the vessels as described by Paul, rather half the blood

was sprinkled on the altar and half of it on the people.

These three mistakes are clear from the following description

|

given by the book of Exodus. It reads:

|

And Moses came and told the people all the words

of the Lord, and all the judgements: and all the people

answered with one voice, and said, All the words which

the Lord hath said will we do.

And Moses wrote all the words of the Lord, and rose

up early in the morning, and builded an altar under the

hill, and twelve pillars, according to the twelve tribes of

the Israel...

...which offered burnt offerings and sacrificed peace

offerings of oxen unto the Lord.

And Moses took half of the blood and put it in

basons; and half of the blood he sprinkled on the altar.

And he took the book of the covenant, and read in

the audience of the people: and they said, All that the

Lord hath said will we do, and be obedient.

And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled it on the

people, and said, Behold the blood of the covenant,

which the Lord hath made with you concerning all these

words.l

|

In view of the textual defects and inconsistencies present in

the Bible, pointed out to the readers so far, the Roman Catholic

Church prohibited the study and reading of these books for

common people. They rightly said that the damage caused by

the reading of them would be greater than the benefit to be

expected from them. They were certainly right in having this

opinion. In fact, the contradictions, errors and inconsistencies

of

the biblical texts were not known to the people until the appear-

ance of the Protestant movement. They discovered and dug into

these books and the secrets were disclosed, causing the strong

reaction which is well known to the world today.

The book entitled, Kitabu"th-Thalathu-Ashrah (The Thirteen

|

Books) printed in Beirut in 1849, contains the following on

pages 417, 418 of the Thirteenth Book. We give its faithful

translation from Urdu:

|

Let us now look at the law passed by the Council of

Trent and duly stamped by the Pope. It said that the

experience of the past showed that such words when

read by common people would produce greater evil than

good. It was therefore the responsibility of the priest or

of the judge that, according to his description, or in con-

sultation with the teacher of confession, he should allow

the reading of the words in these books only to those

who, in their opinion, might be benefited by them, and it

was of great importance that the book must have been

previously checked by a Catholic teacher, and it had to

bear the signature of the teacher who allowed it to be

read. Anyone who dared read it without permission, was

not to be excused unless he was sent to the proper

authorities.

|

THE BIBLICAL TEXTS

ARE THEY REVEALED?

|

THE ARGUMENTS

|

We intend to show in this chapter that the Judaeo-Christian claim

that the Bible, - both Old and New Testaments, was revealed to and

written down by men inspired by God, is false and ungrounded. There

are numerous ARGUMENTs to prove this, but we will confine ourselves

in the following pages to seventeen of them which, in our opinion,

are

more than sufficient to prove our claim.

r

|

DISTORTIONS

|

A large number of clear contradictions are to be found in the books

of the Bible. The Christian scholars and commentators have always

been at a loss to find any way of explaining them. For some of the

textual differences they have had to admit that one of the texts is

cor-

rect and the other false, due either to delibeMte distortion on the

part

of later theologians or to mistakes of the copiers. For some

contMdic-

tory texts they have put forward absurd explanations that would

never

be accepted by a sensible reader. These have already been

discussed.

|

The Biblical books are full of errors and we have pointed out more

than one hundred of them already. It is self-evident that a

revealed

text must be free from errors and contMdictions.

|

There are also many cases of distortion and human manipulation

in the texts of these books. The alteMtions and changes which have

been delibeMtely or unknowingly made have even been admitted by

Christian theologians. Texts which have been definitely changed or

distorted cannot be accepted as revealed or inspired even by the

Christians. We intend to present a hundred examples of such distor-

tions in the Bible later in this book.

|

As we mentioned previously, certain books or part of books are

accepted by the Catholics as being the revelations of their

Prophets

while the Protestants have proved that these books were not

divinely

inspired. These books are: the Book of Baruch, the Book of Tobit,

the

Book of Judith, the Wisdom of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Maccabees I

and II, chapters eleven to sixteen of the Book of Esther, and ten

verses

from chapter ten of the same book, and the song of the three

children

from chapter three of the Book of Daniel.

|

These books are considered by the Catholics to be an integMl part

of the Old Testament, whereas the Protestants have rejected them

and

do not include them in the Old Testament. We, therefore, leave them

out of our discussion. Any readers particularly curious about these

books should refer to the books of the Protestant scholars. The

Jews

do not accept these books as genuine either.

|

Similarly, the third Book of Ezra is considered part of the Old

Testament according to the Greek church, while both the Catholics

and the Protestants have proved conclusively that this book is not

genuine. The revealed status of the Book of Judges is also in

question

for those who claim it to be written by Phineas or Hezekiah, and

the

same applies to the Book of Ruth, according to those who perceive

it

as being written by Hezekiah. Nor, according to the majority of

writ-

ers, is the Book of Nehemiah divinely inspired, especially the

first

twenty-six verses of chapter twelve.

|

The Book of Job was also not considered revelation by

Maimomides, Michel, Semler, Stock, Theodore and Luther, the

founder of the Protestant faith. The same opinion is held by those

who

attribute this book to Elihu or to someone unknown. Chapters thirty

and thirty-one of the Book of Proverbs are not divinely inspired.

According to the Talmud, Ecclesiastes is not an inspired book.

|

The same applies to the Song of Solomon according to Theodore,

Simon, Leclerc, Whiston, Sewler, and Castellio. Twenty-seven chap-

ters of the Book of Isaiah are also not revelation according to the

learned scholar Lefevre d"Etapes of Germany. The Gospel of

Matthew, according to the majority of ancient scholars and almost

all

later scholars who consider it to have been originally written in

the

Hebrew language and that the present Gospel is merely a translation

of the original which has been lost, is not, and cannot be,

divinely

inspired.

|

As for the Gospel of John, the scholars, Bretschneider and

Lefevre d"Etapes have refused to accept it as genuine. The last

chapter

was certainly rejected by the scholar Grotius as being neither

genuine

or inspired.

|

Similarly all the Epistles of John are not accepted as prophetic by

Bretschneider and the Alogi school. The Second Epistle of Peter,

the

Epistle of Jude, the Epistle of James, the First and Second

Epistles of

John and the Book of Revelations are not considered as genuine by

most of the scholars.

:

|

THE ADMISSIONS OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS

|

Horne says on page 131 of Vol. I of his commentaries printed in

1 822:

|

If we accept that some books of the Prophets have been

lost and have disappeared, we shall have to believe that those

books were never written with the help of inspiration. St.

Augustine proved this fact with very strong ARGUMENTs saying

that he had found many things mentioned in the books of the

kings of Judea and Israel, but could not find any description

of the things in these books. For their explanations, they have

referred to the books of other Prophets, and in some instances

they have also mentioned the names of the Prophets. These

books have not been included in the canon acknowledged by

the church, which has not assigned any reason for their exclu-

sion, except to say that the Prophets, to whom significant reli-

gious instructions are revealed, have two kinds of writings.

Writings without inspiration, which are similar to the writings

of honest historians, and writings guided by inspiration. The

first kind of writings are attributed to the Prophets them-

selves, while the others are ascribed directly to God. The first

kind of writings are meant to add to our knowledge while the

others are the source of the law and religious instructions.

|

Further on page 133 of Vol. I, discussing the cause of the disap-

pearance of the Book of Wars of the Lord, mentioned in the Book of

Numbersl (21:14), he said:

|

The book which has disappeared was, according to the

great scholar Dr. Lightfoot own findings, the one that was writ-

ten for the guidance of Joshua, under the command of the

Lord aRer the defeat of the Amalekites. It seems that the book

in question contained some accounts of the victory of this war

|

l.There is a description given in the Book of Numbers with

reference to the Book

of Wars of the Lords. Only some sentences from that book have been

given, the rest

of the book has been lost.

|

as well as strategic instructions for the future wars. This was

not an inspired book nor was it a part of the Canonical books.

|

Then in the supplement of his first volume he said:

|

When it is said that the Holy books were revealed by

God, it does not necessarily signify that every word and the

whole text was revealed. The difference of idiom and expres-

sion of the authors show that they were allowed to write

according to their own temperament and understanding. The

knowledge of inspiration was used by them similar to the use

of the current sciences. It cannot be imagined that every word

they said or every doctrine they passed was revealed to them

by God.

|

Further he said that it was confirmed that the writers of the books

of the Old Testament were "sometimes inspired".

The compilers of Henry and Scott own Commentary, in the last vol-

ume of their book, quote from the Alexander Canon, that is, from

the

principles of faith laid down by Alexander:

|

It is not necessary that everything said by a Prophet

should be an inspiration or a part of the Canon. Because

Solomon wrote some books through inspiration it does not

mean that everything he wrote was inspired by God. It should

be known that the Prophets and the disciples of Jesus were

sometimes inspired for important instructions.

|

Alexander own Canon is held as a book worthy of great respect and

trust in the eyes of the Protestants. Warn, a great scholar of the

Protestants, has used ARGUMENTs from this book in his discursive

examination of the authenticity of the Bible.

THE OPINION OF ENCYCLOPAEDIA BRITANNICA

|

The author own entry ""Inspiration""l in the Encyclopaedia

Britannica2

has this statement on page 274 vol. 11

|

It has always been a matter of controversy whether every-

thing which is written in the sacred books is inspired or not.

Similarly all accounts of the events described in them are not

inspired by God according to Jerome, Grotius, Papias and

many other scholars.

|

Furlher in vol. 19 on page 20 it says:

|

Those who claim that everything of the Gospels is

inspired by God cannot prove their claim easily.

|

It also says:

|

If ever we are asked which part of the Old Testament is

held by us as inspiration of God, we would answer that the

doctrines and the predictions for future events which are the

foundation of Christian faith cannot be other than inspiration.

As for other descriptions, the memory of the apostles is

enough for them.

|

THE REES ENCYCLOPEDIA

|

In volume nineteen of the Rees Encyclopedia, the author says that

|

l.We did not find this sentence in the present edition of

Britannica, however, we

have found the admission that every word of these books is not

inspired, on page 23

vol. 12 under the entry "Inspiration"

|

2. All the references in the Ercyclopaedia Britannica have been

taken from the

old 18th century edition. The present edition does not have been

them at the places

referred to. We have therefore translated them from Urdu in our own

words. This

however, does not make difference as this admission can be found in

many place in

the Britannica. (Raazi)

|

the authenticity and divinity of the Holy books has been debated

because there are many contradictions and inconsistencies found in

the statements of the authors of these books. For example, when the

texts of Matthew 10:19,20 and Mark, 11:13 are compared with Acts

23:1-6,1 the contradictory nature of these books becomes all the

more

serious.

|

It is also said that the disciples of Jesus themselves did not know

one another to be receiving inspiration from God, as is evident

from

their debates in the council of Jerusalem and from Paul own blaming

of

Peter. Moreover it is clear that the ancient Christians did not

consider

them innocent and free from faults, since they sometimes made them

subject to their criticism. This is obvious from Acts 11:2,32 and

also

Acts 21:20-24.

|

It has also been mentioned that Paul, who considered himself not

less than the disciples of Jesus (see 2 Corinthians 11:5 and

12:11),

nevertheless mentioned himself in such a manner as to show that he

did not feel himself constantly to be a man of inspiration.3 The

author

also said:

|

We are not given a feeling by the disciples of Jesus as

speaking on behalf of God every time they spoke.

|

He has said that:

|

Michaelis thoroughly examined the ARGUMENTs of both the

groups, which was necessary for a matter of such importance,

and decided that the presence of inspiration in the Holy Book

is certainly of great use, but even if we dispense with the

presence of inspiration in the Gospels and the Acts, which are

books of an historical nature, we lose nothing and they still

remain as useful to us as before. It does not damage anything

|

l.This difference of the texts has been discussed by us, under the

errors Nos: 98-

100.

|

2. And when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the

circumcision

contended with him, Saying, Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised,

and didst eat

with them. (Acts 11:2,3)

|

3. I Corinthians 7:10,12,15,40. And also 2 Cor. 11:17.

if we accept that the historical descriptions of the evangelists

in the gospels, are similar to the descriptions of the historians,

since, as was observed by Christ, "And ye also shall bear wit-

ness, because ye have been with me from the beginning."

John 15:27.

|

It is therefore unnecessary to prove the truth of these

books to a non-Christian, on the basis of his acceptance of the

truth of some of the evangelic descriptions. On the contrary

you should put forward auments in favour of such miracles

as the death and resurrection of Christ as related in the writ-

ings of the evangelists, always bearing in mind that they are

historians. For anyone who wishes to examine the foundation

and origin of his faith, it is necessary to consider the state-

ments of the evangelist about those particular matters as simi-

lar to the statements of other historians. Because it would be

physically impossible to prove the truth of the events

described by them, it is necessary that we accept their

descriptions in the manner we accept the descriptions of other

historians. This line of approach would save Christianity from

all dangers. We do not find it mentioned anywhere that the

general events experienced by the apostles, and perceived by

Luke through his investigations, were inspired.

|

If however we are allowed to admit that some evangelists

made mistakes and that they were later corrected by John, this

would be greatly advantageous and facilitate conformity in

the Bible. Mr. Cuddle also favored the opinion of Michaelis

in section 2 of his book. As far as the books written by the

pupils of the apostles are concerned, like the Gospels of Mark

and Luke and the Book of Acts, Michaelis has not given his

decision as to whether they were inspired or not.

|

WATSON own ADMISSION

|

Watson, in volume four of his book on Revelations, which was

based on the commentary of Dr. Benson, remarks that the fact that

Luke own writing is not inspired is evident from the dedication of

his

Gospel to Theophilus:

|

Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in

order a declaration of those things which are most surely

believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us,

which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers

of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect

understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto

thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest

know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been

instructed.l

|

Watson says about this:

|

The ancient writers of Christian theology have also given

a similar opinion. Irenaeus said that Luke conveyed to us the

things which he learnt from the apostles. Jerome said that

Luke does not depend only on Paul, who was never in the

physical company of Christ. Luke also acquired the knowl-

edge of the Evangel from other apostles as well.

|

He further elucidates:

|

The apostles, when they used to speak or write anything

concerning the faith, were protected with the treasure of

inspiration that they had. Being, however, human beings, and

men of reason and inspiration, they were just like other peo-

ple when describing common events.

|

This made it possible for Paul to write in his first epistle to

Timothy, without inspiration:

|

Drink no longer water, but use a little wine for thy stom-

ach own sake and thine often infirmities.2

|

and furLher:

|

The cloak that I left at Troas with Carpus, when thou

comest, bring with thee, and the books, but especially the

parchments. "

|

And that he could write to Philemon, "But withal prepare me also a

lodging." (v.22) And as he wrote to Timothy, "Erastus abode at

Corinth; but Trophimus have I left at Miletum sick."

However there are other occasions when it is clear that Paul speaks

by inspiration, as in his first letter to the Corinthians:

|

And unto the married I command, yet not I, but the Lord,

Let not the wife depart from her husband.3

|

But in verse twelve of the same epistle he says:

|

But to the rest speak I, not the Lord.

|

Then in verse twenty-five he says:

|

Now conceming virgins I have no commandment of the

Lord: yet I give my judgment, as one that hath obtained

mercy of the Lord to be faithful.

|

The book of Acts contains this statement:

|

Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the

region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to

preach the word in Asia. After they were come to Mysia, they

assayed to go into Bithynia: but the Spirit suffered them not.

|

From the above we are given to understand that the apostles" work

|

was based on two things: reason and inspiration. They used the

first to

speak of general events, while through the other they gave

religious

instructions related to the Christian faith. This is why the

apostles,

like other human beings, committed mistakes in their domestic

affairs

and in their intentions. This is quite evident from Acts 23:3; Rom.

15:24,28; I Cor. 16:5,6,8 and 2-Cor. 11:15-18.

|

The nineteenth volume of the Rees Encyclopedia contains this

description under the entry "Dr. Benson":

|

Whatever he has written in connection with inspiMtion

seems to be clear and logical and, indeed, unique in its appli-

cation.

|

BEAUSOBRE AND LENFANT own OPINION

|

Beausobre and Lenfant said the following about this matter:

|

The Holy Ghost, with whose help and teaching the evan-

gelists and the apostles wrote, did not prescribe any particular

language for them, but conveyed the meanings to their hearts

through intuition and protected them from being involved in

errors. They were allowed to preach or write the word of

inspiration in their own language using their own expressions.

As we find differences of expression and idiom in the writ-

ings of the ancient writers, which are mainly dependent on

the temperaments and capabilities of the writers concerned,

so an expert of the original language will easily recognise the

differences of idiom and expression in the gospels of

Matthew, Luke, and John and the epistles of Paul.

|

If, however, the Holy Ghost had truly inspired the words to them,

this would have not happened. The style and expression of all the

gospels would have been identical. Besides, there have been many

events the description of which does not require inspiration. For

example, they write of many events which they saw with their own

eyes or heard from reliable observers. Luke says that when he

intend-

ed to write his gospel he wrote the descriptions according to eye

wit-

nesses of the events described. Having this knowledge in his mind,

he

thought that it was a treasure which should be conveyed to future

gen-

erations.

|

An author who received his account through the inspiration of the

Holy Ghost usually expressed this fact by saying something to the

effect that everything he had written was according to inspiration

he

had received from the Holy Ghost. Though the faith of Paul is of an

unusual kind, it is still strange that Luke does not seem to have

any

witnesses except Paul and his companions.

|

We have produced above the testimony of two of the great schol-

ars of Christianity, who are very much esteemed and celebrated in

the

Christian world. Horne and Watson have also the same opinion of

them.

|

THE VIEWS OF CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS ON THE

PENTATEUCH

|

Horne said on page seven hundred and ninety-eight of volume two

of his great work:

|

Eichhom, one of the German scholars, denied that Moses

received inspiration.

|

And on page eight hundred and eighteen:

|

Scholz, Noth, Rosenmuller and Dr. Geddes are of the

opinion that Moses did not receive inspiration, and that al the

five books of the Pentateuch were simply a collection of ver-

bal traditions current in that period. This concept is making

its way rapidly among the German scholars.

|

He also said:

|

Eusebius and several latter theologians have pronounced

|

that the book of Genesis was written by Moses, in Midian,

when he was pasturing the goats of his father in law.

|

We may be allowed to remark that, in this case, this book cannot

be an inspiration because, according to Eusebius, this was before

Moses was entrusted with prophethood. Therefore the book of

Genesis also must be a collection of current local verbal

traditions. If

the writings of the Prophets, written by them as Prophets, were not

books of inspiration, a fact admitted by Home and other scholars,

how then could a book written by Moses long before his prophethood

be a revealed book?

The Catholic, Ward, has on page thirty-eight of the 1841 edition:

|

Luther said in vol. 3 of his book on pages 40 and 41 that:

"Neither do we hear Moses, nor do we tum to him, for he was

only for the Jews; we have nothing to do with him."

|

In another book he said: "We believe neither in Moses nor

in the Torah, because he was an enemy of Jesus, and said that

he was the master of executioners, and said that the Christians

have nothing to do with the ten commandments."

|

Again he said that he would discard the Ten

Commandments from the books so that heresy was abolished

forever, because these are the root of all heretical ideas.

|

One of his pupils, Aslibius, has said that no one knew the

ten commandments in the churches. The Christian sect called

the Antinomians was initiated by a person who believed that

the Pentateuch did not have any such qualities as to be con-

sidered the word of God. It was their belief that any one com-

mitting sins like adultery and other evil deeds deserved salva-

tion and would be in etemal happiness if only he had faith in

Christianity. Those who tumed to the ten commandments

were influenced by Satan, and they were the ones who cruci-

fied Jesus.

|

These remarks of the founder of the Protestant faith and his pupil

are certainly of great importance. They mean that all Protestants

must

be disbelievers in Moses and the Pentateuch, since, according to

them, Moses was the enemy of Jesus, the master of the executioners,

and the Pentateuch was not the word of God. Having nothing to do

with the ten commandments, they must turn to paganism and multi-

theism. They should also disregard their parents, trouble their

neigh-

bours, commit theft, murder and perjury because, otherwise, they

would be acting according to the ten commandments which "are the

root of all heretical ideas".

|

Some Christians belonging to this sect have said to us that they

did

not believe in Moses as a Prophet but only as a man of wisdom and

a

great legislator, while some others said to us that Moses, God

forbid,

was a thief and a robber. We asked them to fear God, they answered

that they were right in saying this as it had been said by Jesus

himself:

|

All that ever came before me are thieves and robbers: but

the sheep did not hear them.l

|

Now we can see why the founder of the Protestant faith, Luther,

and his pupil reproached Moses; they must have been guided by the

above statement.

|

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES AND THE BOOK OF

REVELATION

|

Luther said regarding the epistle of James:

|

This is the word not suitable to be included in the books,

as the disciple James said in chapter five of his epistle, "Is

any sick among you? Let him call for the elders of the church-

and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the

name of the Lord.2

|

Luther, raising objection on the above statement, said in volume

|

two of his book:

|

If this is what James has said, I answer him that no disci-

ple has the right to define and issue religious injunctions on

his own account, because it was only Jesus who possessed

that status.

|

It is clear from the above that the epistle of James is not,

according

to Luther, inspired, and that injunctions given by the disciples

are not

supported by inspiration, otherwise the above statement would be

absurd and meaningless.

Ward stated in his book printed in 1841:

|

Pomran, an eminent scholar of the Protestants and a pupil

of Luther, says that James has written false and absurd events

at the end of his letter. He has copied from other books events

which cannot be associated with the Holy Ghost. Such a book

therefore must not be considered as inspired.

|

Vitus Theodore, a Protestant preacher in Nuremburg, said that they

had intentionally given up the Book of Revelation and the Epistle

of

James. He said that the Epistle of James is not to be censured

where

he has stressed the necessity of good deeds along with faith, but

that

this letter contains contradictions. The Magdeburg Centuries said

that

the Epistle of James, at one place, is unique among all the

accounts of

the disciples because he says that salvation does not depend on

faith

alone but that it also requires good deeds. He also says that the

Torah

was the Law of Freedom.

|

It is clear from the above that these elders, like Luther, do not

believe in the Epistle of James being inspired by the Holy Ghost.

|

THE ADMISSION OF CLEMENT

|

Clement said:

|

Matthew and Mark are different from each other in their

writings, but when they agree on a certain point they are pre-

ferred to Luke own account.

|

We may be allowed to say that the above statement allows us to

deduce two important points. Firstly that Matthew and Mark them-

selves differ in many places in their accounts of the same event

and

whenever they agree in their statement their accounts are

preferable to

Luke. None of them ever agree word for word about any event.

Secondly that all three gospels are proved to have been written

with-

out inspiration because the preference of the first two gospels

over the

third would be out of the question had they been inspired.

|

Paley, an eminent Protestant scholar, wrote a book conceming the

truth of the four gospels. It was printed in 1850. He writes on

page

323 of his book to this effect:

|

The second thing that has been falsely attributed to the

ancient Christians is that they firmly believed in the coming

of the Day of Judgment in their own time. I will present an

example before any objection to this is raised. Jesus said to

Peter, "If I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee?"

This statement has been taken to mean that John would not

die until the Day of Judgment, and this false concept spread

among the common people. Now if this report was conveyed

to us after it had become a public opinion and the cause

which initiated the mistake is not known, and someone comes

forward to present it as an ARGUMENT against the Christian

faith this would be absolutely unfair, in view of the facts that

we posses.

|

Those who say that the gospels lead us to believe that the

early Christians truly expected that the Last Day would come

about in their own time should keep this explanation in mind,

and it will save them from the blame of deceiving people.

Now there comes another question that if, for a moment, we

accept the possibility of errors and omissions on the part of

the disciples, how then can they be trusted about anything

they say? As a reply to this question it would be enough for

the supporters of Christianity to say to the disbelievers that

|

what we seek from the disciples is their witness not their per-

sonal opinion. The object, in fact, is to achieve the result

which, as a consequence of this, is safe.

|

But in answering this, we must keep two points in mind;

to eliminate all the dangers. First, the object intended by the

mission of all the disciples should be defined. They helped

prove the point which was either strange or mixed with truth.

They are not required to say anything about what is obviously

not related to the faith, but they would be required to say

something to remove ambiguity about something in the text

of the divine books which has accidentally got mixed up with

the truth. Another example of this is the belief in the posses-

sion by devils. In the case of those who hold that this false

opinion had become common in their time and also influ-

enced the evangelists and the early Christians, it must be

accepted that this opinion does not in anyway damage the

truth of the Christian faith, because this is not the matter Jesus

was sent for. But something which, having become a public

opinion in that country, somehow got mixed with the state-

ment of Jesus.

|

It is certainly not a part of their message to rectify their

false belief in the spirits, nor has it anything to do with their

witness. Secondly their message should be separated and dis-

tinguished from what they present to support and elucidate

that which is inspired. For instance, something in what they

say might be inspired, but in addition to that they present per-

sonal explanations to strengthen their message. For example,

the principle that anyone other than a Jew accepting the

Christian faith would not be bound to follow the law of

Moses, in spite of its truth having been proved through mira-

cles.

|

Paul, for example, when speaking of this principle, has

mentioned many things in support of it. Therefore the princi-

ple in itself is acknowledged by us, but it is not necessary for

us to support all their explanatory remarks in order to prove

the truth of the Christian faith. This method may be applied to

other principles of a similar nature. I am absolutely sure of

the truth that any instruction agreed upon by the pious men of

God will always be followed as a religious obligation. It is,

|

however, not necessary for us to explain or to accept all those

details, unless they have, of course, specified those premises.

|

The above passage allows us to advance the following four points:

|

1. We have already proved through sufficient ARGUMENTs and sup-

ports, under the heading of Errors no. 64-78, that all the

disciples of

Jesus and other Christians of that time had firm belief in the

coming

of the Day of Judgment in their own time and that John would not

die

until the Day of Judgment.

|

We have reproduced their unambiguous and definite statements to

this effect. Barnes, making his comments on chapter twenty-one of

the Gospel of John, said the words which we reproduce below from

the Urdu translation:

|

The misconception that John would not die was created

by the words of Jesus which can be easily misunderstood.

The idea became even stronger with the fact that John sur-

vived until after the death of the other disciples.

|

The compilers of Henry and Scott remark:

|

Most probably the purpose of Jesus by this statement was

to annoy the Jews, but the disciples misunderstood it to signi-

fy that John would live up to the Last Day or that he would be

raised to heaven alive.

|

Further they say:

|

Here we must keep in mind that a report of a certain man

may come without proper confirmation. It would, therefore be

a folly to base our faith on such reports. This statement, in

spite of being a report of the disciples and having become

common and established among people, turned out to be

untrue. How then could reports which were not even written

down and recorded demand our belief. These are our own

comments and not a statement made by Jesus.

|

urther they say in their marginal notes:

|

The disciples misunderstood the words of Jesus, as the

evangelist" has elucidated, because they had firm belief that

the coming of the Lord would be for establishing Justice.

|

In view of the above statements, there remains no doubt that the

disciples misunderstood it. Now, when they had such beliefs regard-

ing the Day of Judgment and John not dying until the day of

Judgment. their statement with regard to the occurrence would natu-

rally be taken literally which proves them to have been wrong and

to

find new explanations for them is of no avail. That would involve

an

effort to give the words a meaning which was not intended by their

speakers. Having been proved to have been other than the truth they

obviously cannot be taken as inspirations.

|

2. It is clear from the above description of Paley that the

scholars

have admitted the fact that the matters which are not directly

related

to the faith, or have been somehow mixed with the principles of

faith,

do not damage the Christian faith in any way if they are proved

erro-

neous.

|

3. They have also admitted that the presence of errors and mis-

takes in the ARGUMENTs of the disciples is not damaging to the

Christian faith.

|

4. They have accepted that the existence of evil spirits and their

influence on human beings is not a reality and that belief in them

was

a product of human imagination and superstition; and that they had

found their way in through the statements of the evangelists, and

even

through Jesus, because they had become a part of common tradition

of that period.

|

1. This refers to John, 21:23. "hen went this saying abroad among

the brethren

that that disciple should not die: yel Jesus said not unto him, He

shall not die."

|

Keeping these four conclusions in mind, we must be allowed to

claim that more than fifty perent of the gospels are thus precluded

from having been the result of inspiration. According to this

opinion,

only the descriptions directly related to faith or those defining

the rit-

uals can be considered as inspired.

|

However this opinion does not carry any weight because it hap-

pens to be against the opinion of Luther, the founder of the

Protestant

church, who explicitly declared that none of the apostles had any

right

to issue or define any religious principle on his own account,

because

only Jesus had the right to issue religious doctrines. The

unavoidable

conclusion is that the remaining part of the gospels, consisting of

the

descriptions from the disciples directly related to faith, is

likewise

deprived of its Divine character.

|

ADMISSIONS OF PROTESTANT SCHOLARS

|

Ward reproduced a number of statements from the great scholars

of the Protestant faith. We reproduce below nine of them from his

book printed in 1841.

|

(1) Zwingli, a Protestant bibliographer, said that all the events

described in Paul own letters cannot be considered sacred, as some

events described in these epistles are incorrect.

|

(2) Mr. Fulk accused Peter of making false statements and declared

him to be ignorant of the Evangel.

|

(3) Dr. Goad, during a polemic with Father Campion, said that

Peter was wrong in his belief about the descent of the Holy

Spirit on Jesus.

|

(4) Brentius, called a learned leader and master by Jewel, said

that

Peter the chief disciple and Barnabas made erroneous state-

ments after the descent of the Holy Spirit.

|

(5) John Calvin remarked that Peter spread heresy in the church

and put the independence of Christianity in danger and the

Christian grace was led astray by him.

|

(6) The Magdeburg Centuries accuses the disciples, and especially

Paul, of making false statements.

|

(7) Whittaker said that the people and dignitaries of the church,

and

even the disciples of Jesus, made great mistakes in preaching

the Christian faith to the gentiles, and that Peter made mistakes

in rituals, and that these mistakes were committed by them after

the descent of the Holy Spirit.

|

(8) Zanchius gave an account of some followers of Calvin in his

book. He reported that some of them said that if Paul ever came

to Geneva to preach against Calvin, they would listen to Calvin

and leave Paul alone.

|

(9) Lewathrus, a staunch follower of Luther, giving a description

of

some great scholars has quoted their statements to the effect

that it was possible for them to doubt a statement of Paul, but

there was no room for any doubt about the statements made by

Luther. Similarly it was not possible for them to allow of any

doubt in the book of the church of Augsburg conceming the

principles of faith.

|

The above statements are from the great scholars of the Protestant

faith. They have declared that none of the books of the New

Testament were inspired and genuine. They have also admitted that

the disciples were erratic in what they wrote.

|

ADMISSIONS OF GERMAN SCHOLARS

|

The learned scholar Norton wrote a book on the truth of the Bible

which was printed in Boston in 1837. He said in his preface to the

book:

|

Eichhom observed in his book that, in the first days of the

Christianity, there was a short book consisting of various

accounts of Jesus" life. It is quite possible to say that this was

the original Evangel. Most probably this was written for those

followers who could not listen to the sayings of Jesus and

could not see him with their own eyes. This Evangel was a

model. The accounts of Jesus written there were not in

chronological order.

|

It must be noted that this script was different from the present

gospels in many respects. The present gospels are by no means the

model represented by the one discussed above. The present gospels

were written under very difficult circumstances and contain some

accounts of Jesus which were not present in the original script.

There

is evidence to suggest that this original script was the main

source of

all the gospels which appeared in the first two centuries after the

death of Jesus. It also served as the basis for the gospels of

Matthew,

Mark and Luke which later on became more popular than the others.

Though these three gospels also contained additions and omissions,

they were later on supplemented with the missing events by other

people to make them complete. The other gospels, which contained

various accounts of Jesus occurring after his prophethood, such as

the

Gospel of Marcion and the Gospel of Tatian were abandoned. They

also added many other accounts, accounts of Jesus" birth and also

accounts of his youth and reaching maturity and other things. This

fact is evident from the gospel called the Memoirs from which

Justin

quoted in his book. The same is understood from the gospel of

Corinth.

|

The portions of these gospels which are still available, if

compared

with each other, clearly show that the addition of these accounts

has

|

been quite gradual, for example, the heavenly voice which was heard

originally spoke in these words:

|

Thou art my son, I have begotten thee this day.

|

As has been quoted by Justinian in two places. Clement also repro-

duced this sentence from a Gospel of unknown identity in these

words:

|

Thou art my beloved son, I have begotten thee this day.

|

The present gospels, however, have this sentence in these words:

|

Thou art my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased.l

|

The Ebionite Gospel combined the two statements together thus:

|

Thou art my beloved son, I am pleased unto thee, thou art

begotten this day.

|

This was stated by Epiphanius.

|

Christian history, through gradual additions and innumerable

manipulations, has totally lost its original form and is now a

mixture

of unidentifiable ingredients. Any one curious enough can easily

sat-

isfy his curiosity by reading an account of Jesus" baptism that has

been collected together from several gospels.

|

This gradual mixture of contra-factual events with original scrip-

ture has so terribly deformed the authenticity of the gospels that

they

no longer retain their original divine character. The more they

were

translated from one language to another, the more they lost their

origi-

nal shape and form.

|

Realising this situation, the Church came to their aid towards the

end of the second century or at the beginning of the third century

AD

|

and tried to save the true and the original Evangel and to convey,

as

far as possible, the truth to the future generations. They,

therefore,

selected the four present gospels out of many gospels that were

cur-

rent in that period, because these four scripts seemed more compre-

hensible than any of the others.

|

There is no sign of the existence of the gospels of Matthew, Mark

and Luke before the end of the second century or the beginning of

the

third century AD. The first man to speak of these gospels in

history

was Irenaeus in 200 AD who also advanced some ARGUMENTs concern-

ing the nu nber of the gospels.

|

Then in 216 AD Clement of Alexandria made a painstaking effort

to prove that these four gospels were inspired and, therefore,

should

be acknowledged as the source of Christian faith. The result of

this is

that, towards the end of the second century and the beginning of

the

third, the Church made serious efforts to get these four gospels

acknowledged, in spite of the fact that they did not deserve this

acknowledgement since they are clearly not genuine in all respects.

The Church also tried hard to convince people to discard all other

existing gospels.

|

Had the Church devoted this serious effort to purifying the

original

script found by the early preachers, it would have been a great

contri-

bution towards the future generations. But perhaps it was not

possible

for the Church to do so since none of the existing gospels was free

from additions and alterations, and there was no way of

distinguishing

the right from the wrong. Eichhom further said in the footnotes to

his

book:

|

Many early theologians had doubts about several parts of

these gospels, but they were not able to put forward any cor-

rections to them.

|

He also said:

|

In our times, printing facilities have made it impossible

for people to distort and manipulate the text of a certain book.

Before the invention of printing the conditions differed from

|

those of today. It was possible for the owner of a certain ver-

sion to insert distortions and additions into the book, which

then became the source for all subsequent copies, leaving no

means for them to ascertain which parts of the book were

from the author and which had been added or changed.

Subsequently these corrupted copies became common among

the people.

|

You will flnd that many saints and theologians complained that the

copiers and the owners of the copies of these books distorted the

texts

shortly after they were written. The script of Dionysius was

distorted

even before it was circulated. You also find that there were

complaints

of impurities being inserted into the books by the followers of

Satan

who were said to have excluded certain things and included certain

others on their own account. In the view of these witnesses it is

clear

that the Holy Scriptures did not remain safe and intact. This in

spite of

the fact that it was quite difficult for the people of that period

to dis-

tort the texts as the authors of that period used to issue heavy

curses

and make sworn oaths in order to discourage people from daring to

make changes in them.

|

The same also happened with the history of Jesus, otherwise

Celsus would have not felt it necessary to point out the changes

and

distortions that had been made by the Christians in their texts.

That is

how some sentences regarding certain accounts of Jesus, which were

scattered in several gospels, came to be combined together in a

single

gospel. For example, the Ebionite Gospel gives a complete account

of

the baptism of Jesus which has been compiled from things found

scat-

tered in all of the first three gospels and in the memoirs from

which,

according to Epiphanius," Justin quoted.

In another place Eichhom said:

|

Manipulations in the sacred texts, in the form of additions

and omissions and the replacement of a word by its synonym,

by those who lacked the necessary scholastic aptitude, is his-

|

1. A pagan scholar of the second century AD.

|

torically traceable right from the time of the appearance of the

gospels. This is not surprising since, from the beginning of

the history of the Christianity, it has been a common habit of

writers to make changes according to their own whims, par-

ticularly in the sermons of Jesus and the accounts of events in

his life which were preserved by them. This procedure, initi-

ated in the first era of Christian history, continued to be fol-

lowed by the people of later centuries. In the second century

AD, this habitual distortion in the texts had become so com-

monly known to the people that even the opponents of the

Christian faith were aware of it. Celsus, as noted above,

raised objections against the Christians that, they had changed

their texts more than three or four times, and these changes

were not of a superficial nature but done in such a manner

that the subjects and meanings of the gospels were altogether

changed. Clement also pointed out that at the end of the sec-

ond century AD there were some people who used to tamper

with the texts of the gospels. He has specified that the sen-

tence, "For theirs is the kingdom of heaven,"" was changed in

some versions to, "They shall be perfect." Some others even

made it read: "They shall attain a place where they shall see

no trouble."

|

Norton, having quoted the above statement by Eichhom said:

|

No one thinks that Eichhorn is alone in this opinion,

because no other book is as popular in Germany as the book

of Eichhom, and it is considered to be in accordance with the

opinions of most of the modern writers with regard to the

gospels, and the same applies to matters which cast doubt

upon the truth of the gospels.

|

Since Norton is known as an advocate of the gospels, having quot-

ed the above statements of Eichhom, he refutes them all in favour

of

the gospels, but, as will be evident to any reader of his book, his

argu-

ments are not convincing. In spite of all this. he had to admit

openly

|

that the following seven portions of the New Testament are

definitely

not from those who are considered to be their authors, and had been

added later.

|

1. He says on page 53 of his book that the first two chapters of

Matthew were not written by him.

|

2. On page 63 he says that the event of Judas Iscariot" contained

in

Matt. 27:3-10 is certainly a false statement and was added later

on.

|

3. Similarly he declared that verses 52 and 53 of chapter 27 of

Matthew are a later addition.2

|

4. It appears on page 70 that verses 9-20 of chapter 16 of Mark are

a later invention.3

|

5. On page 89 he says that verses 43 and 44 of chapter 22 of Luke

are a later addition.4

|

6. On page 84 he points out that verses 3, and 4 of chapter 5 of

the

Gospel of John, are a later addition. That is from, "Waiting for

the moving of the water..." to, "...was made whole of whatsoev-

er disease he had."

|

l.The event of his hanging himself after the aTrest of Jesus and

selling his land for

thirty pieces of silver.

|

2. This refers to a description of raising the dead saints from the

graves after the

death of Jesus.

|

3.These verses contain the description of the resurrection of ksus

which contains

a number of errors.

|

4.This refers to the visit of Jesus to the Mount of Olives a rlight

before his cruci-

fixion. It reads, "And there appeared an angel unto him from

heaven, strengtherling

him. And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat

was as it were

great drops of blood falling down to the ground." (Luke 22:43 and

44) Home, howev-

er, has confirmed the correctness of this verse and has opposed the

opinion which

advocates excluding it from the books. We have discused this verse

in detail later in

the book.

i

|

7. On page 88 he specifies thal verses 24 and 25 of chapter 21 of

the Gospel of John are certainly later additions.

|

Further on page 610 he says:

|

The miraculous events described by Luke have been

mixed with traditional untruths and poetic exaggeration by

the scribes. But it is very difficult in this age to separate the

truth from falsifications. Any statement containing traditional

untruths and poetic exaggeration is obviously very far from

being an inspiration.

|

We may be allowed to draw the following four conclusions from the

above statement of Eichhorn which has also been favoured by other

German scholars.

|

1. The original Evangel has become extinct from the world.

|

2. The present gospels are a mixture of true and false descrip-

tions.

|

3. The text of these gospels has been distorted and changed

by the people of different times. Celsus tried hard to

inform the world that the Christians had changed their

texts three or four times or more, to the extent that they

had actually changed the subject matter of these texts.

|

4. The present gospels did not show any signs of existence

before the end of the second century and the beginning of

the third century AD.

|

Scholars such as Leclerc, Koppe, Michael, Lessing, Niemeyer and

Manson agree with regard to our first conclusion, because they have

all said that perhaps Matthew, Mark and Luke might have had the

same copy in the Hebrew language of a document containing an

account of the life of Christ. Matthew borrowed most of the

contents

|

l.These verses contain greatly exaggerated number of people and

animals healed

by lesus.

|

of that script while Mark and Luke did not use as much of it as he

did.

Home also stated this in his commentary printed in 1822 AD,I but he

does not seem to agree with their opinion, which, however, does not

make any difference as far as our point of view is concerned.

|

EWSONTHESUBJECTOFTHECHRONICLES

|

Almost all the Judaeo-Christian scholars are agreed on the point

that both Books of Chronicles were written by the Prophet Ezra with

the help of two other Prophets, Haggai and Zechariah. The above

three Prophets are jointly supposed to be the author of this book.

However, strangely enough, we know for a fact that the First Book

of

Chronicles contains many errors as has been admitted by the

scholars

of both the Christians and the Jews. They have said that through

the

folly of the author the name of the grandson was written instead

the

name of the son.

|

They have also said that Ezra, who wrote these books, did not

even know which of them were sons and grandsons. The script from

which Ezra copied was defective and incomplete and he could not

distinguish the false from the true, as will be shown in the next

chap-

ter. This evidence is more than sufflcient to reach the conclusion

that

these books were not written through inspiration. Their dependence

on defective and incomplete documents is further proof. However the

two books of the Chronicles are held to be as sacred as the other

books of the Bible both by the Christians and the Jews.

|

This also confirms our suspicion that, according to the Christian

faith, it is not necessary for the Prophets, as we have seen

before, to

be free from committing sins. Similarly, they are not necessarily

free

from errors in their writings, with the result that these books

cannot

be considered to be written through inspiration.

|

Whatever we have so far discussed in this chapter is enough to

show that the Christians are not in a position to make a definite

claim

|

that any single book of the Old or the New Testaments was written

through inspiration.

|

THE MUSLIM ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE GOSPELS

|

From all that has preceded it is quite clear that we can claim

with-

out the fear of being wrong that the original Pentateuch and the

origi-

nal Evangel have disappeared and become extinct from the world.

The books we have today which go by these names are no more than

historical accounts containing both true and false accounts of past

ages. We strictly deny that the original Torah (Pentateuch) and the

original Evangel existed at the time of the Prophet Muhammad (Peace

be on him) and that they were not changed until later. As far as

the

Epistles of Paul are concemed, even if we grant that they were

really

written by him, they are still not acceptable to us because it is

our

well-founded opinion that Paul was a traitor and a liar who

introduced

a completely new concept of Christianity, absolutely different from

what Jesus himself preached. I

|

As far as the disciples of Jesus who were living after the

Ascension of Jesus are concemed, they are held to be respectable

and

honest by the Muslims. They are not, however, considered to be

Prophets (and therefore able to have received inspiration from

God).

They were ordinary human beings and not free from human errors.

Their teachings and their statements have lost validity through the

absence of authenticated historical verification: for instance, the

|

1. This opinion of the Muslim community should not be misunderstood

as the

product of prejudice and slander. He was considered a traitor even

by the family of

Jesus and his disciples. We reproduce below the opinion of a modern

French scholar,

Maurice Bucaille. He says on page 52 of his book The Bible, The

Koran and

Science: " Paul is the most controversial figure in Christianity.

He was considered to

be a traitor to Jesus own thought by the family of Jesus and by the

aposdes who had

stayed in Jerusalem in the circle around James. Paul created

Christianity at the

expense of those whom Jesus had gathered around him to spread his

teachings. He

had not known Jesus during his lifetime and he proved the

legitimacy of his mission

by declaring that Jesus, raised from the dead, had appeared to him

on the road to

Damascus."

absence of any sign of the existence of the present gospels until

the

end of the second century AD, the disappearance of the original

Hebrew copy of Matthew s gospel and the unavailabity even of the

name of the translator of the remaining translation, and the

presence

of accumulated errors and manipulations in the present text. As far

as

Mark and Luke are concemed, they were not disciples of Jesus, and

there is no indication that they ever received inspiration from

God.

|

However we do solemnly believe that the Torah (Pentateuch) was

the book revealed to the Prophet Moses: The Holy Koran says:

|

We gave Moses the Book (Torah)

|

And we also find in the Holy Koran in reference to Jesus son of

Mary:

|

We gave him the Evangel.2

|

And the nineteenth chapter of the Holy Koran, called "Maryam"

after

Mary the mother of Jesus, quotes Jesus as saying:

|

He hath given me the book (the Evangel).3

|

The present gospels, chronicles and epistles are certainly not the

Evangel referred to by the Holy Koran and so they are not, as

such,

acceptable to the Muslims. The Islamic teaching regarding the

Pentateuch, the other books of the Old Testament, and the Gospels

and the rest of the New Testament is that any biblical statements

which are confirmed by the Koranic Revelation will be accepted and

respccted by the Muslims and any statements rejected by the Koran

will be rejected by the Muslims. Any statements about which the

Holy Koran is silent, the Muslims too should remain silent about

without rejecting or accepting them.

|

Allah the Almighty addressed His Prophet Muhammad (Peace be

on Him) in the Holy Koran in these words:

|

To thee we sent the Book (Koran) in truth confirming

what came before it of the Book, and assuring its safety. "

|

The famous commentary on the Holy Koran, Ma"alim-u-Tanzeel,

contains the following comments on this verse:

|

According to Ibn al-Jurayj, the last phrase of this verse,

"assuring its safety", signifies that any statement produced by

the People of the Book (the followers of Christianity and

Judaism) will be accepted, subject to its confirmation by the

Holy Koran, otherwise that particular statement will be con-

sidered as false and unacceptable. Sa"id ibn Musayyab and

Zihaq said the word "muhaimin" in this verse signifies " the

one who judges", while Khalil gave its meaning as "protector

and guard". These different shades of meanings, however, do

not change the general implication that any book or statement

confirmed by the Holy Koran should be considered as the

word of God; the rest are obviously excluded as not being the

word of God.

|

What follows are the remarks on this matter from the commentary

Tafseer-e-Mazhari:

|

If the Holy Koran bears witness to it, you are bound to

confirm it, and if it rejects or says it is false, it must be

reject-

ed by us. If the Holy Koran has been silent, you too have to

be silent because, in that case, the possibility of truth and

falsehood will be equal.

|

Imam al-Bukhari cited a tradition of the Holy Prophet, reported by

Ibn "Abbas, in his Kitabu own h-Shahadat along with its chain of

authori-

ties, then the same hadith has been cited by him in

Kitabu"l-l"tisam

|

supported by a different chain of reporters, and the same hadith

was

again quoted by him in his book Kitabur Radd "ala Jahmiyyah,

reported by a different group of narrators

|

Why do you go to the People of the Book, the Jews and

the Christians, to seek injunctions about the Shari"a while

your Book, the Holy Koran, revealed to Muhammad, the

Prophet of Allah, is the latest and freshest revelation of God.

You recite it in its original form. Allah Almighty has told you

that the the Jews, have changed the Pentateuch, the Book of

Allah, having written it with their own hands. They started

saying that it was from Allah, only to get a small amount of

money in retum. Does not your knowledge prevent you from

asking them questions.

|

The other version of this hadith as cited by al-Bukhari in

Kitab-ur-

Radd "alal Jahmiyyah is as follows:

|

O Muslims ! Why do you ask the People of the Book

questions regarding anything when your own Book is the

Word which God has revealed to your Prophet, Muhammad

(Peace be on Him). It is new and fresh, pure and original, free

from foreign touch. Allah has declared in His Book that the

People of the Book have changed and distorted their Books.

They have written them with their own hands and claimed

that they come from God, (they did so) only for a small

amount of money. Does the knowledge which has come to

you not prevent you from seeking guidance from them? No,

by God ! We have not seen them asking you about what has

been sent to you. Why then do you ask them knowing that

their books have been distorted.

|

Kitabu"l-l"tisam contains the following statement of the compan-

ion Mu"awiyah (may Allah be pleased with Him) regarding Ka"b al-

Ahbar (an expert on the Bible and a scholar of Islam):

|

Although he was one of the most truthful of those schol-

ars of hadith who sometimes report traditions from the People

of the Book, we have nevertheless found falsehood in them

(in the reports of the Bible).

|

This implies that the falsehood found in those reports was due to

the fact that those books had been distorted, not Ka"b al-Ahbar own

mis-

statement, because he is considered one of the righteous scholars

of

the Bible by the Companions of the Prophet. The phrase, "We have

found falsehood in them," clearly denotes that the Companions of

the

Prophet had the belief that all the Judaeo-Christian books had been

distorted.

|

Every Muslim scholar who has examined the Torah and the

Evangel has certainly refused to recognise the authenticity of

these

books. The author of the book Takhjeel Man Harrafaal Injeel said in

chapter two of his book regarding the present gospels:

|

These gospels are not the true and genuine Gospel which

was sent through the Prophet (Jesus) and revealed by God.

|

Later in the same chapter he said:

|

And the true Evangel is only the one which was spoken

by the tongue of Christ.

|

Again in chapter nine he stated:

|

Paul through his clever deception deprived all the

Christians of their original faith, because he found their

understanding so weak that he deluded them quite easily into

believing anything he wished. By this means he totally abol-

ished the original Pentateuch.

|

One of the Indian Scholars has written his judgement about the

thesis of the author of Meezan ul Haq and the speech made by me in

the public debate held in Delhi. This judgement has been added as

a

supplement to a Persian book called Risalatu"l-Munazarah printed in

1270 AH in Delhi. He said that a certain Protestant scholar, either

|

because of a misunderstanding or perhaps through misinformation,

publicly claimed that the Muslims did not refute the present Torah

and Evangel. This scholar himself went to the scholars of Delhi to

find out whether this was true. He was told by the "ulama"(Muslim

scholars) that the collection of books called the New Testament was

not acceptable as it was not the same Evangel which had been

revealed to the Prophet Jesus. He got this judgement of the "ulama"

in

writing and then made it part of his book. All the Indian scholars

of

Islam have verified this judgement for the guidance of the people.

ars of hadith who sometimes report traditions from the People

of the Book, we have nevertheless found falsehood in them

(in the reports of the Bible).

|

This implies that the falsehood found in those reports was due to

the fact that those books had been distorted, not Ka"b al-Ahbar own

mis-

statement, because he is considered one of the righteous scholars

of

the Bible by the Companions of the Prophet. The phrase, "We have

found falsehood in them," clearly denotes that the Companions of

the

Prophet had the belief that all the Judaeo-Christian books had been

distorted.

|

Every Muslim scholar who has examined the Torah and the

Evangel has certainly refused to recognise the authenticity of

these

books. The author of the book Takhjeel Man Harrafaal Injeel said in

chapter two of his book regarding the present gospels:

|

These gospels are not the true and genuine Gospel which

was sent through the Prophet (Jesus) and revealed by God.

|

Later in the same chapter he said:

|

And the true Evangel is only the one which was spoken

by the tongue of Christ.

|

Again in chapter nine he stated:

|

Paul through his clever deception deprived all the

Christians of their original faith, because he found their

understanding so weak that he deluded them quite easily into

believing anything he wished. By this means he totally abol-

ished the original Pentateuch.

|

One of the Indian Scholars has written his judgement about the

thesis of the author of Meezan ul Haq and the speech made by me in

the public debate held in Delhi. This judgement has been added as

a

supplement to a Persian book called Risalatu"l-Munazarah printed in

1270 AH in Delhi. He said that a certain Protestant scholar, either

|

because of a misunderstanding or perhaps through misinformation,

publiclY claimed that the Muslims did not refute the present Torah

and Evangel. This scholar himself went to the scholars of Delhi to

find out whether this was true. He was told by the "ulama"(Muslim

scholars) that the collection of books called the New Testament was

not acceptable as it was not the same Evangel which had been

revealed to the Prophet Jesus. He got this judgement of the "ulama"

in

writing and then made it part of his book. All the Indian scholars

of

Islam have verified this judgement for the guidance of the people.

|

THE OPINION OF MUSLIM SCHOLARS

|

THE OPINION OF IMAM AR-RAZII

|

Imam ar-Razi said in his book "Matlib ul-Aliya" in the chapter on

Nubuwah (the prophethood) in the fourth section:

|

The effect of the original teaching of Jesus was very lim-

ited because he never preached the faith which the Christians

ascribe to him. The idea of Father and son and the concept of

trinity are the worst kind of atheism and association and are

certainly the product of ignorance. Such heretical teachings

cannot be ascribed to so great a Prophet as Jesus who was

innocent of all such crimes. We are therefore certain that

Jesus could have not preached this impure faith. He originally

preached monotheism and not tritheism as the Christians

claim. But this teaching of Jesus did not spread due to many

historical factors. His message therefore remained very lim-

ited.

|

THE OPINION OF IMAM AL-QURTUBI

|

Imam al-Qurtubi said in his book Kitabul A"lam Bima Fi Deeni"n-

Nasara Mina"l Fisadi Wa"l Awham:

|

The present gospels, which are called evangels, are not

the same Evangel which the Prophet Muhammad (Peace be

on Him) alluded to in the words:

|

"And Allah revealed the Torah and the Evangel for

the guidance of the earlier people. "

|

Then al-Qurtubi put forward the ARGUMENT that the disciples of

Jesus were not Prophets, hence not protected from impurity, and the

|

1. Imam ar-Razi, a great authority on almost all the Islamic

Sciences and author

of many valuable books on Koran, hadith, history and other

sciences.

|

miraculous events ascribed to them have not been proved by an

unbroken chain of reporters. There are only statements made by iso-

lated reporters. We also do not find any indication that the copies

of

these gospels are free from serious manipulations. They are wrong.

If,

for a moment, we accept that these reports are true, they are still

not

an ARGUMENT for proving the truth of all the wonders attributed to

the

disciples, nor do they help in proving the claim of prophethood for

them, because they never made any claim to prophethood; on the con-

trary, they solemnly confirmed that the Prophet Jesus was a

preacher.

Al-Qurtubi also said:

|

It is evident from the above discussion that the present

gospels have not been authenticated by means of an unbroken

chain of transmission, nor is there any indication that the

copiers were protected from wrong action and therefore the

possiblility of error and fault from them cannot be over-

looked. The presence of the above two factors deprives the

gospels of their divine character, authenticity and hence their

reliability. The proven presence of human manipulation with-

in the text of these gospels is enough to prove their unaccept-

ability. We quote, however, some examples from these books

to show the carelessness of their copiers and blunders made

by them.

|

After producing several examples he said:

|

These examples are sufficient to prove that the present

gospels and the Pentateuch cannot be trusted and that neither

of them are capable of providing divine guidance to man,

because no historical chain of transmission can be adduced in

favour of either in support of their authenticity.

|

We have already cited several examples to show that

these books have been subject to great changes and distor-

tions in their texts. The condition of other books of the

Christian theologians can well be imagined in the light of the

distorted texts of the Judaeo-Christian scriptures, books of

such prime importance to them.

|

This book of al-Qurtubi can be seen in the Topkapi Library in

Istanbul.

|

THE OPINION OF AL-MAQRIZI

|

Al-Maqrizi was a great scholar of Islam in the eighth century AH.

He said in the first volume of his history:

|

The Jews think that the book which they have is true and

original, free from all corruption. The Christians, on the other

hand, claim that the Septuagintl version of the Bible which is

with them is free from any possible distortion and change,

while the Jews deny this and contradict their statement. The

Samaritans consider their Pentateuch to be the only genuine

version as compared to all others. There is nothing with them

to eliminate the doubts about this difference of opinion

among them. 2

|

The same difference of opinion is found among the

Christians regarding the Evangel. For the Christians have four

versions of the Evangel which have been combined together

in a single book. The first version is of Matthew, the second

of Mark, the third of Luke and the fourth of John.

|

Each of them wrote his gospel according to his own

preaching in his own area with the help of his memory. There

are innumerable contradictions, incompatibilities and incon-

sistencies between their various accounts regarding the

attributes of Jesus, his message, the time of his Crucifixion

and his genealogy. The contradictions are irresolvable.

|

Alongside this the Marcionites and the Ebionites have

their separate version of the Evangels, each being different

from the present canonical gospels. The Manichaeans also

claim to have an Evangel of their own totally different from

the current accepted gospels. They claim that this is the only

genuine Evangel present in the world and the rest are inau-

thentic. They have another evangel called the Evangel of AD

70 (Septuagint) which is ascribed to Ptolamaeus. The

Christians in general do not recognize this gospel as genuine.

|

In the presence of the above multifarious differences to

be found within the corpus of the Judaeo-Christian revelation,

it is almost impossible for them to sort out the truth."

|

The author of Kashf az-Zunun said with regard to this matter that

the Evangel was a book which was revealed to Jesus, the son of

Mary,

and, discussing the lack of authenticity and genuineness of the

present

gospels, he said:

|

The Evangel which was in reality revealed to Jesus was a

single book which was absolutely free from contradictions

and inconsistencies. It is the Christians who have put the false

blame on Allah and His Prophet (Jesus) by ascribing the pre-

sent gospel to them.

|

The author of Hidayatu"l-Hayara Fi Ajwibatu"l-Yahood wa"n-

Nasara said quite explicitly:

|

The present Torah (Pentateuch) owned by the Jews is

much distorted and defective, a fact known to every biblical

reader. The Biblical scholars, themselves, are certain and sure

of the fact that the original Torah which was revealed to

Moses was genuine and totally free from the present distor-

tions and corruptions. There was no corruption present in the

Evangel which was originally revealed to Christ and which

could not have included the event of the crucifixion of Christ,

or other events like his resurrection three days after his death.

These are, in fac additions inserted by their elders and have

nothing whatever to do with divine Truth."

|

He further said:

|

Several Islamic scholars have laboriously pointed out

hundreds of specific examples and passages showing contra-

dictions, incompatibilities and differences in the so-called

Canonical Gospels. It is only to avoid an unnecessary elon-

gated discussion that we refrain from presenting more exam-

ples.

|

The first two parts of this book should be more than enough to

prove the truth of this claim.

|

TWO CLAIMS TO THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE GOSPELS

|

Sometimes Protestant scholars try to misguide people with regard

to the historicity of the Synoptic gospels. They put forward their

claim that authentic proofs of the originality of the present

gospels

existed during the first and the second centuries AD, by reason of

the

fact that Clement and Ignatius testified to their presence.

|

The second claim advanced by them is that Mark wrote his gospel

with the help of Peter while Luke wrote his gospel with the help of

Paul. Since both Peter and Paul were men of inspiration, the above

two gospels are also divinely inspired books.

|

It would seem to be our duty to examine the validity of these two

misguiding claims, each one separately, in the light of available

his-

torical data and general human logic.

|

ANSWER TO THE FIRST CLAIM

|

The main point of dispute regarding the originality of the present

gospels is the lack of an uninterrupted continuity in transmission

of

the reporting authorities of any of the gospels. There is no

evidence

that any of the gospels have come down to us direct from Jesus

through his disciples to the subsequent recipients so as to form a

con-

tinuous chain of reliable reporters. To say it more simply, there

should

be a reliable record of a recognised disciple of Jesus bearing

witness

that whatever he has written was told to him by Jesus in the

presence

of one or more people of such and such names. Then the next

reporter

should bear witness to having received, heard or been told the same

statement by that particular disciple of Jesus in the presence of

such

and such people. Then one or more of those present should have con-

veyed the same text to others by the same procedure so that the

texts

would have been conveyed to us with an unintcrrupted chain of

reporters traceable directly back to Jesus himself (as is the case

with

Koranic revelation).

|

Now we say, and without any fear of being wrong, that the

Christians do not possess any such succession of authorities from

the

authors of the gospels to the end of the second century or the

begin-

ning of the third century AD. We, ourselves, have dug into their

books

to find any trace of such proofs, and also sought guidance from

renowned Christian scholars but could not get anywhere. The priest,

French,l during our public polemic with him, tried to explain this

away by saying that we do not have any such authorities due to the

historical calamities which befell the Christians during the first

three

centuries. It is, therefore, not correct to say that the priest

Clement

and Ignatius had no such authority with them in their time.

|

We do not necessarily refute the conjectures and suppositions by

which they ascribe these writings to their authors. What we are

trying

to say is that these suppositions and conjectures cannot be

accepted as

an ARGUMENT for the genuineness of the word of God. Neither do we

deny the fact that the present gospels gained popularity towards

the

end of the second century or at the beginning of the third century,

with all their faults, errors, and contradictions.

|

We must be allowed to bring to light some facts regarding Clement

and Ignatius to eliminate any misapprehensions.

|

THESOURCEOFCLEMENT own LETTER

|

Clement, the Patriarch of Rome, is said to have written a letter to

the church of Corinth. There is a disagreement between the scholars

regarding the exact year that this letter was written. Canterbury

puts it

between 64 and 70 AD. Leclerc claimed it to have been written in 69

AD, while Duchesne and Tillemont have said that Clement did not

become Pope until 91 or 93 A.D. How Clement could have written

letters to the church in 64 or 70 AD when he was not yet Pope is

not

explained. However, setting aside all the differences, the letter

in

|

question could have not been written later than 96 AD. Some sen-

tences of this letter, however, happen to be identical to some of

the

sentences in one of the four gospels. This allowed the Christians

to

claim that Clement had copied those sentences from the gospel. This

claim is liable to be rejected for the following reasons:

|

Firstly, it is not sufficient to copy only some sentences from a

gospel. If this were the case the claim of those people would be

true

who are considered hereticsl by the Protestants because they have

claimed that all the moral teachings contained in the gospels have

been borrowed from the pagans and other philosophers (because some

of their ideas were identical to some of the ideas of the gospels).

The author of Aksihumo said:

|

The moral teachings of the Evangel, of which the

Christians are very proud, have been copied word for word

from the Book of Ethics of Confucius,2 who lived in the sixth

century BC. For example he said under his moral no. 24:

"Behave towards others as you want to be behaved towards

by others. You need only this moral because this is the root of

all other morals. Do not wish for the death of your enemy

because to do so would be absurd since his life is controlled

by God." Moral no. 53 goes: "It is quite possible for us to

overlook our enemy without revenging him. Our natural

thoughts are not always bad."

|

Similar good advice can be found in the books of Indian and

Greek philosophers.

|

Secondly, if Clement really had copied it from the gospel, all its

contents would have been identical to the gospel, but such is not

the

case. On the contrary, he differed from the gospel in many places,

showing that he had not copied what he wrote from the gospels. Even

if it were proved that he had copied from a gospel, it might have

been

|

1. The Rationalists who strongly favour liberalism.

|

2. Confucius, the great moral philosopher of China born in 551 BC,

who had

strong influence on the religion and general character of the

Chinese. The past

Chunese ideology was thus called Confucianism.

|

from any of the many gospels which were current in his time, as

Eichhorn admitted in respect of the sentence spoken by a heavenly

voice at the time of the descension of the Holy Spirit.

|

Thirdly, Clement was one of the followers of the disciples and his

knowledge about Christ was no way less than that of Mark and Luke,

which allows us to believe, and logically so, that he might have

writ-

ten the letter from reports received by himself directly. If there

were

an indication anywhere in his writing that he had copied it from

any

of the gospels, our claim would certainly have been out of place.

|

We quote below three passages from his letter.

|

He who loves Jesus should follow his commandment.

|

Jones claimed that Clement copied this sentence from John 14:15

which reads:

|

If ye love me, keep my commandments.

|

The apparent similarity between these two statements led Mr.

Jones to suppose that Clement had copied it from John. However, he

has chosen to overlook the clear textual difference between these

two

statements. The falsity of this claim has already been proved by

our

showing that the letter could not have been written after 96 AD,

while, according to their own findings, the Gospel of John was

writ-

ten in 98 AD. It is nothing but a desperate effort to provide some

authenticity to the present gospels.

|

Home said on page 307, Vol. 4 of his commentaries printed 1824:.

|

According to Chrysostom and Epiphanius, the early

scholars and according to Dr. Mill, Fabricius, Leclerc and

Bishop Tomline, John wrote his gospel in 97 AD, while Mr.

Jones situates this gospel in 98 AD.

|

However, a true lover always follows what his love commands,

otherwise he would not be a lover in the true sense of the word.

Lardner justly said in his Commentaries printed 1827 on Page 40

|

I understand that the copying of this letter from the gospel

is doubtful, because Clement was fully aware of the fact that

any claim to the love of Christ necessitated practical obedi-

ence to his commandments, because Clement had been in the

company of the disciples of Jesus.

|

THE SECOND PASSAGE OF CLEMENT own LETTER

|

It appears in chapter thirteen of this letter:

|

We follow what is written, because the Holy Spirit has

said that a wise man is never proud of his wisdom. And we

should keep in mind the words of Christ who said at the time

of preaching patience and practice:

|

"Be ye merciful, that ye be shown mercy, forgive

that ye be forgiven; ye will be acted upon, the same as

you will act upon others, as you will give so shall you

be given, you will be judged as you will judge upon

others; as you will pity, so shall you be pitied upon and

with the same measure that ye mete withal it shall be

measured to you again."

|

The Christians claim that this passage was taken by Clement from

Luke 6:36-38 and Matt.7:1,2,12. The passage from the Luke is this:

|

Be ye therefore merciful, as your Father also is merciful.

Judge not, and ye shall not be judged: condemn not, and ye

shall not be condemned: forgive, and ye shall be forgiven:

Give, and it shall be given unto you; good measure, pressed

down, shaken together, and running over, shall men give into

your bosom. For with the same measure that ye mete withal it

shall be measured to you mete.

|

The passage from Matthew 7:1,2 reads:

|

Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment

ye judge, ye shall be judged: and with what measure ye mete,

it shall be measured to you again.

|

And in verse 12:

|

Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men

should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law

and the prophets.

|

THE THIRD PASSAGE OF CLEMENT

|

Chapter forty-six of his letter contains this passage:

|

Remember the words of Lord Christ who said, "Woe unto

the man who has committed a sin. It would have been better

for him if he had not been bom, that he should harm those

chosen by me. And whosoever shall offend my little ones, it

will be better for him that a millstone were hanged about his

neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea.

|

The Christians have claimed that the above passage was copied

from Matthew 26:24 and 18:6 and Mark 9:42 and Luke 17:2: We

reproduce these verses below:

|

The Son of man goeth as it is written of him: but woe

unto that man by whom the Son of man is betrayed! it had

been good for that man if he had not been born.

|

Matthew 18:6 contains the following lines:

|

But whoso shall offend one of these little ones which

believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were

hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth

of the sea.

|

Mark 9:42 reads:

|

And whosoever shall offend one of these little ones that believe in

me. it is better for him that a millstone were hanged about his

neck,

and he were cast into the sea.

|

The text of Luke 17:2 is this:

|

It were better for him that a millstone were hanged about

his neck, and he cast into the sea, than that he should offend

one of these little ones.

|

Having reproduced the passages from Clement and the above texts

of the gospels, Lardner said in his Comrnentaries printed 1827 vol.

2

page 37 that:

|

The above two passages of Clement are his longest pas-

sages and this is why Paley confined himself to them to sup-

port the claim of authenticity for the gospels. This claim does

not, however, stand to reason because Clement would at least

have made a reference to the gospels had he copied any pas-

sage from them and he would also have copied the rest of the

related text or, if that was not possible, the text reproduced by

him should have been totally consistent and similar to the text

of the gospel. However none of these conditions are met.

Such being the case, there is no possibility of its have been

copied from the gospel.

|

It is surprising to see Luke being referred to as the teacher

of Clement, imparting to him the knowledge which he must

already have had, being the companion of the disciples just as

Luke was.

|

In volume 2 of his commentaries, Lardner remarked about the

above two passages:

|

When we study the writings of those who enjoyed the

company of the apostles or of the other followers of our Lord

who, like the evangelists, were fully conversant with the

teachings of Christ, we find ourselves very much in doubt

without the evidence of a clear reference. We are faced with

|

the difficulty of ascerlaining whether Clement copied written

statements of Chlist or whether he is simply reminding the

Corinthians of the sayings which he and the Corinthians had

heard from the Apostlcs and thcir followers. Leclerc preferred

the former opinion, while lhc Bishop of Paris preferred the

latter.

|

If we accept that the three Gospels had been compiled

prior to that time, in that case Clement could possibly have

copied from them, though the word and expression may not

exactly be identical. But that he actually has copied is not

easy to confirm, because this man was fully acquainted with

these matters even prior to the compilation of the Gospels. It

is also possible that Clement would have described events

already known to him without referring to the Gospels even

after their compilation out of his old habit. In both the cases,

the faith in the truth of the Gospels is rearfirmed, obviously

so in first case, and in the second case because his words cor-

respond to the text of the Gospels, proving that the Gospels

were so widely known that the Corinthians and Clement both

had the knowledge of them.

|

Through this we achieve the belief that the evangelists

faithfully conveyed the words consisting of the true teachings

of Christ. These words deserve the most careful preservation,

though there we have a difficulty. I think that the most schol-

ars will agree with the opinion of Leclerc, however, as Paul

advises us in Acts 20:35 with the words:

|

"And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he

|

said, It is more blessed to give than to receive."

|

It is, I am sure, generally acknowledged that Paul did not

copy the above statemenl from any letter but just quoted the

words of the Christ which were in his knowledge and in the

knowledge of others. This does not mean that it may be

accepted as a general rule bul this method can possibly be

applied in letters. We know that Polycarp also used this

method in his writings. We are quite sure that he also copied

from the written gospels.

|

It is clear from the above statement that the Christians are not

cer-

"" tain that Clement really copied from the canonical gospels, and

any

aim to this effect is only based on conjecture.

We do not agree with the conclusion of Lardner that in both cases

the truth of the present gospels is proved because there can be no

cer-

taintY in the presence of doubt. As the evangelists incompletely

recorded the words of Christ in this particular instance, they

might

have done the same in other places too, and they might have not

3 recorded the exact words used.

3 Moreover. if we overlook this point for a moment, it only proves

that these particular sentences are the words of Christ, it does

not in

any way help us to believe that all the contents of the gospels

are the

genuine words of Christ. The knowledge of a certain statement

cannot

be an ARGUMENT for the acceptance of other statements. If that

were the

case, all the rejected gospels would have to be accepted as

genuine

simply because some sentences of Clement bear some similarity with

them.

We are also confident in our refutation of the claim that Polycarp

also used the method of copying from the gospels in spite of his

own

knowledge, gained by being, like Clement, also a companion of the

disciples of Jesus. Both of them are of equal status. His copying

from

the gospels cannot prove their genuineness. It is, on the other

hand,

3 possible that like Paul he might have ascribed some statements to

Christ. I

|

THE LETTERS OF IGNATIUS

|

Let us now find out the truth regarding the letters written by

Ignatius the Bishop of Antioch. Lardner said in vol. 2 of his com-

mentary:

|

1. That is, he might have ascrioed some statements to Christ as

Paul did with the

. tatementS of Acts 20:35 which are not present in the gospels.

|

Eusebius and Jerome both mentioned certain of his let-

ters. Apart from these some other letters are also attributed to

him, which are generally considered by most of the scholars

to be false and concocted. My opinion is no different. There

are two copies of his seven letters, the large and small. Except

for Mr. Weston and a few of his followers, all the scholars

have decided that additions have been made in the larger one,

the smaller version, however, can possibly be ascribed to him.

|

I have carefully made a comparative study of both the

texts and my study revealed that the smaller version was

turned into a larger one by the inclusion of many additions

and insertions. It is not the case that the larger was turned into

the smaller through the exclusion of some of the contents.

The ancient writings, also, are more in accordance with the

smaller version.

|

The question whether Ignatius really did write these let-

ters remains to be settled. There is great dispute and disagree-

ment on this point. The great scholars have made free use of

their pens in expressing their opinions. The study of the writ-

ing of both the camps has made the question all the more

complicated. However, in my opinion, this much is settled

and decided; that these are the same letters which were pre-

sent in the time of Origen and were read by Eusebius. Some

of the sentences are not appropriate to the time of Ignatius. It

is therefore better if we accept that these sentences are later

additions instead of rejecting all the letters on the ground of

these sentences, especially keeping in view the crisis of short-

age of copies which we are facing.

|

It is also possible that some of the followers of Arius" might have

made additions to the smaller version just as they did to the

larger.

Additions may also have been made by others.

|

1. Arius was a great philosopher and theologian who had

monotheistic views as

against trinitarianism. He had many followers. His views were

rejected by the

Council of Nicaea.

|

Paley writes in his footnotes:

|

In the past, the translation of three letters of Ignatius were

present in the Syrian language and were printed by William

Cureton. It is almost certain that the smaller letters, which

were revised by Ussher, contained many additions."

|

The above writings of the Christian scholars bring out the follow-

ing facts:

|

1. All the letters except these seven letters are definitely

fabricated

and forged according to the Christian scholars and are therefore

unacceptable.

|

2. The larger version of the letters is similarly not genuine in

the

opinion of all the scholars except Mr. Weston and a few of his

followers.

|

3. As far as the smaller collection is concemed, there is great

dis-

pute and difference of opinion among great scholars with

regards to its authenticity. Both the groups of scholars have their

own ARGUMENTs against or in favour of its authenticity. The

group of scholars who have favoured it also admit its having

been subjected to later modifications either by Arius or by oth-

ers, with the result that Is collection also appears to be equally

of doubtful authenticity.

|

It seems most probable that this collection of letters was also put

together in the third century AD similarly to the other letters.

This

should not present too much of a surprise, in view of the general

prac-

tice of the theologians of early centuries who frequently prepared

false writings and attributed to other writers to suit their whims.

Historical records bear witness to the fact that there were not

less than

seventy-five gospels which were falsely attributed to Christ, to

Mary

and to the disciples of Christ. It does, therefore, not seem

particularly

far-fetched to assert that these seven letters, too, were prepared

and

|

attributed to Ignatius, similar to other such letters and similar

to the

gospel of Tatianl which was falsely attributed to him. Adam Clarke

said in the introduction of his commentary:

|

The book which was genuinely ascribed to Tatian has dis-

appeared and the one which is now attributed to him is doubt-

ful in the eyes of most of the scholars, and they are right in

their suspicion.

|

Let us ignore all the above points for a moment and take it that

the

letters in question really were originally written by Ignatius.

Even this

does not help much because, after the additions and modifications

inserted by later people, they have lost their originality and are

no

longer acceptable.

|

According to the scholars some sentences of these letters were cer-

tainly added later on and so there is nothing to remove suspicion

from

other sentences which are supposed by them to be original. They,

likewise, might have been added to or modified in subsequent times.

Eusebius said in chapter 23 of the fourth volume of his history:

|

Dionysius, the Bishop of Corinth, admitted that he had

written several letters on the request of some of his friends,

but those deputies of Satan filled them with profanities and

altered some parts and added others. This made me all the

more aggrieved. Therefore, there is no wonder if someone

made intentional additions in the holy books of our Lord,

because they had no qualms in respect of the books of other

authorities.

|

Adam Clarke has said in his introduction to his commentary:

|

The great works of Origen have been lost and several of

his Commentaries which are available contain an abundance

of unfactual and imaginary comments which in itself is a

powerful argurnent in favour of the fact that they have been

interpolated."

|

Michael Musaka, a Protestant scholar, has said in his Arabic work,

|

ibatu l-Engeleer Ala Abateel-At-Taqleedeen, section one, chapter

|

As far as their habit of distorting the statements of the

ancients. we should first produce our ARGUMENTs so that our

position may not be similar to those of our opponents, that is

to say, so that our claims may not be considered as baseless as

theirs. We proceed to say that the book Afshin which is

attributed to John Chrysostom, the Golden Mouth,l and which

is recited in the churches during the services of consecration

presents different texts. That is, the text recited by one group

is different from the text recited by others. For, in the copy of

the Orthodox, the Father God is besought to make descend

his Holy Spirit on the bread and wine and turn them into flesh

and blood, while in the text of the Catholics it is said that He

should send the Holy Ghost on the bread and wine so that

they may be transformed. But in the time of Maximus, it was

changed by the people and they started to say that both the

transformable things have2 fled away for the reason that the

Orthodox had claimed against it. But the Catholics of Syria

say it with these words, own end thy Holy Spirit upon this bread

that is the secret of the body of Christ." There is no word

denoting transformation present in this text. It is possible that

this statement might have been of Chrysostom (the Golden

Mouth) as the preaching of transformation was not introduced

in his time. And Major Bobi Tompter, who had converted to

Catholicism said in his speech to the Orthodox in 1722: "I

have compared these books with the Orthodox version pos-

|

1. Chrysostom, being a great orator, was called the Golden Mouth.

He was born

in 347 AD and was later made bishop of Constantinople.

|

2. We have faithfully tried to remove the ambiguity which is to be

found in the

Araoic Text, but still we are at a loss to understand what the

author has to convey.

sessed by the Basilians,l and we did not find a single word in

these books denoting transformation. This story of transfor-

mation of the bread and wine was invented by Nicephorus,

the patriarch of Constantinople, and is ridiculous. Now, when

they could have made a play of such a pious text as Afshin

and altered its contents to suit their unholy intentions and

when they did not hesitate to attribute their distortions to such

a pious man, how can they be trusted and how can they be

free from the suspicion of changing and distorting the texts of

their ancestors.

|

We have had our own experience in recent years that

Deacon Ghariel of Egypt, who was a Catholic, took great

pains and spent a lot of money in correcting the translation of

the commentary of Chrysostom from the original Greek copy.

The Orthodox scholars, who were expert in the Greek and

Arabic languages, compared it in Damascus and testified to

its accuracy, and then a certified version was prepared. But

Maximus did not allow its publication in Tyre.2

|

This copy was given to Bishop Alexis of Spain who

made a thorough examination of the book. Both of them were

totally ignorant of the original Greek version. In order to

make it correspond with the teachings of the Pope they made

many changes through additions and omissions using their

own discretion. Having so spoilt the whole book they attested

to it with their stamps and then it was allowed to be pub-

lished. It was not until the publication of its first volume,

when it was compared with the original manuscript which

was in safe custody with the Orthodox, that their unholy act

of manipulation was uncovered, with the result that they

became the subject of common reproach. Ghariel was so

appalled at this incident that he never recovered and died of

shock.

|

Musaka further said:

|

We produce the unanimous witness of their elders from

one of the Arabic books generally available there. This is a

report which was unanimously passed in a meeting, along

with all its various parts, by the priests of the Maronites, their

patriarchs and scholars, with the permission of Monsignor

Samani. This report bears the seal of the Church of Rome. It

was printed in Tyre with the permission of the chiefs of the

Catholics. Discussing the ritual of the offerings this report

said that the old liturgies were still present in the churches,

free from errors and faults, but they have been attributed to

some saints and the pious men who were not the authors of

these books, nor could they possibly have written them. Some

of them were included by the copiers only to suit their unholy

needs. It is more than enough for you to admit that your

churches are full of fabricated and forged writings.

|

He further said:

|

We are fully aware that our enlightened generation would

not dare to make alterations in the holy books, as they are

fully wise to the fact that they are watched by the eyes of the

protectors of the gospels. However we are not sure of the cir-

cumstances which prevailed from the fifth century to the

seventh century AD, known as the dark ages, when the Popes

and the priests enjoyed a barbarous kingdom of their own.

Some of them did not even know how to write and read and

the helpless Christians of the East were living a very dis-

tressed life, always anxious to save their souls. What hap-

pened in that period is best known to them alone. Whenever

we come to know the history of that terrible age, and think of

the conditions ruling over the Christian church, which had

become a symbol of corruption, our grief and sorrow knows

no limits.

|

Keeping in view the facts reproduced above, we leave the judg-

ment to our readers to see the truth of our claim themselves.

|

THE CANONS OF NICAEA

|

The number of the canons passed by the council of Nicaeal was

twenty. Subsequently many additions were made to them. The

Catholics derive their ARGUMENTs for the Popes authority from

Canons

No. 37 and 44. It is written on Page 68 and 69 of "Les Treize

Epitres"

of the second letter printed in 1849 AD:

|

The aforementioned council prescribed only twenty

canons according to the witness of the history of Theodorus

and the writings of Gelasius. The Fourth Ecumenical2 council

also affirmed that there were only twenty Canons prescribed

by the Council of Nice.

|

Similarly many other false books were written which were

attributed to several Popes like Calixtus, Sircius, Nectarius,

Alexander and Marcellus. The above book contains this statement on

page 80:

|

Pope Leo and the majority of the Roman scholars have

admitted that the books of these Popes are false and fictitious.

|

1. This council was held in the city of Nice. In 325 AD, a

Christian philosopher

and theologian Arius started preaching that Christ was not equal to

God in his

essence. He had monotheistic beliefs. The Emperor Constantine

convened a meeting

of the great scholars of the Christian world. This council

unanimously disacknowl-

edged and rejected the ideas preached by Arius. This meeting is of

great significance

in Christian history.

|

2. An ecumenical council, in Christian terminology, is a council

inviting scholarS

from all parts of the world. Here the author is referring to the

council which was held

in Chalcedon in 451 AD. This Council declared the Monophysites to

be heretics. (Al

Munajjid).

|

ANswER TO THE SECOND CLAIM OF THE

|

AUTHENTIcITy OF THE GOSPEL

|

The second false claim made by the Christian scholars in order to

support the authenticity of the gospels is their contention that

the

gospel of Mark was written with the help of Peter. This is another

clever contrivance to misguide the general populace. Let us first

have

the witness of Irenaeus. He said:

|

Mark, the follower and the translator of Peter, wrote the

teachings of Peter after the death of Paul and Peter.

|

Lardner said in his commentary:

|

In my opinion Mark did not write his gospel before 63 or

64 AD. This period is also in accordance with the description

of the ancient writer Irenaeus, who said that Mark wrote his

gospel after the death of Peter and Paul. Basnage agreed with

Irenaeus and said that Mark wrote his gospel in 66 AD after

the death of Peter and Paul.

|

The witnesses of Basnage and Irenaeus are sufficient to prove that

this gospel was written after the death of Peter and Paul, and that

Peter certainly did not see the gospel of Mark," and the statement,

often cited to prove that Peter saw it, is weak and unacceptable.

It is

why the author of Murshid ut-Talibeen, in spite of all his

religious

preoccupations said on page 170 of his book printed in 1840:

|

He has falsely answered that the gospel of Mark was

written under the guidance of Peter.

|

This claim of its being written in the life of Peter has therefore,

no

groundS and hence is rejected.

|

THE CANONS OF NICAEA

|

The number of the canons passed by the council of Nicaeal was

twenty. Subsequently many additions were made to them. The

Catholics derive their ARGUMENTs for the Popes authority from

Canons

No. 37 and 44. It is written on Page 68 and 69 of "Les Treize

Epitres"

of the second letter printed in 1849 AD:

|

The aforementioned council prescribed only twenty

canons according to the witness of the history of Theodorus

and the writings of Gelasius. The Fourth Ecumenical2 council

also affirrned that there were only twenty Canons prescribed

by the Council of Nice.

|

Similarly many other false books were written which were

attributed to several Popes like Calixtus, Sircius, Nectarius,

Alexander and Marcellus. The above book contains this statement on

page 80:

|

Pope Leo and the majority of the Roman scholars have

admitted that the books of these Popes are false and fictitious.

|

ANswER TO THE SECOND CLAIM OF THE
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|

The second false claim made by the Christian scholars in order to

sUpport the authenticity of the gospels is their contention that

the

gospel of Mark was written with the help of Peter. This is another

clever contrivance to misguide the general populace. Let us first

have

the witness of Irenaeus. He said:

|

Mark, the follower and the translator of Peter, wrote the

teachings of Peter after the death of Paul and Peter.

|

Lardner said in his commentary:

|

In my opinion Mark did not write his gospel before 63 or

64 AD. This period is also in accordance with the description

of the ancient writer Irenaeus, who said that Mark wrote his

gospel after the death of Peter and Paul. Basnage agreed with

Irenaeus and said that Mark wrote his gospel in 66 AD after

the death of Peter and Paul.

|

The witnesses of Basnage and Irenaeus are sufficient to prove that

this gospel was written after the death of Peter and Paul, and that

Peter certainly did not see the gospel of Mark," and the statement,

often cited to prove that Peter saw it, is weak and unacceptable.

It is

why the author of Murshid llt-Talibeen, in spite of all his

religious

preoccupations said on page 170 of his book printed in 1840:

|

He has falsely answered that the gospel of Mark was

written under the guidance of Peter.

|

This claim of its being written in the life of Peter has therefore,

no

grounds and hence is rejected.

|

3 1. G. T. Menley said that in the Markine Preface of the gospel of

Mark, which

as wntten m 170, we are informed that Mark wrote his gospel in

Italy after the

ath of Peter, and this seems to be correct. (Our Holy Books)

|

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE WAS NOT SEEN BY PAUL

|

Similarly the gospel of Luke was not seen by Paul. This is true for

two reasons:

|

1. Firstly because the findings of the modem Protestant scholars

are that Luke wrote his gospel in 63 AD in Achaias. It is

established

that Paul was released from prison in 63 AD. After that nothing is

known about him up to his death but it is most probable that he

went

to Spain in the West and not towards the Churches of the East, and

Achaias is one of the Eastem cities. Most possibly Luke had sent

his

gospel to Theophilus who was indeed the real cause of writing it.

|

The author of Murshid-u-Talibeen wrote on page 161 of volume

two, printed in 1840, discussing the history of Luke:

|

As Lukel did not write anything related to Paul after his

release from prison, we know nothing about his travels from

his release to his death.

|

Gardner said in his Commentaries printed 1728 vol. 5, p. 350:

|

Now we want to write about the life of the disciple, from

his release to his death, but we are not helped by Luke in this

regard. However we do find some traces in other books of the

modem time. The ancient writers do not help. We find great

dispute over the question of where Paul went after his release.

|

In the light of the above, the contention of some of modem schol-

ars that he went to the Churches of the East after his release is

not

proved. He said in his epistle to the Romans 15:23,24:

|

But now having no more place in these parts, and having

a great desire these many years to come unto you;

Whensoever I take my joumey into Spain, I will come to you;

for I trust to see you in my journey...

|

It is quite explicit from the above statement of their apostle that

he

had an intention to go to Spain, and at the same time we know that

he

never went to Spain before his imprisonment. It is therefore, quite

logical that he might have gone to Spain after his release, because

we

do not see any reason for him to have abandoned his intention to

trav-

el to Spain. It appears in the Book of Acts 20:25:

|

And now, behold, I know that ye all, among whom I have

gone preaching the kingdom of God, shall see my face no

more.

|

This statement also indicates that he had no intention to visit the

Churches of the East. Clement, the Bishop of Rome, said in his

letter:

|

Paul, in order to unveil the truth to the world, went to the

end of the West and then reached the sacred place (i.e. died)."

|

This too obviously implies that he went towards the West and not to

the East before his death.

Lardner first reproduced the statement of Irenaeus as follows:

|

Luke, the servant of Paul, wrote in a book the tidings that

Paul had preached in his sermon.

|

He further said:

|

The context of the description indicates that this (Luke own

writing the gospel) happened after Mark had written his

gospel, that is, after the death of Peter and Paul.

|

On the grounds of this statement it is physically impossible for

Paul to have seen the gospel of Luke. Besides, even if we assume

that

Paul saw this gospel, it does not prove anything because we do not

Corlsider him to have been inspired by God and a statement made by

an uninspired person could not achieve the status of inspiration

sim-

ply by the fact of Paul having seen it.

-

|

HUMAN DISTORTION OF THE BIBLE: ALTERATIONS,

ADDITIONS AND OMISSIONS

|

There are two kinds of biblical distortions: explicit distortions

which are directly related to clear changes in the text, which

arise

through alteration, omission or addition to the original text; and

implicit distortions which are brought about by deliberate

misinterpre-

tation without any actual textual change. There is no dispute over

the

existence of such distortions in the Bible since all Christians,

both

Protestants and Catholics, admit their existence. "I

|

According to them the verses of the Old Testament containing ref-

erences to Christ and the injunctions which were, to the Jews, of

per-

petual value were distorted by the Jews through misinterpretation.

Protestant theologians claim that the Catholics have distorted many

texts of both the Old and the New Testament. The Catholics

similarly

accuse the Protestants of having distorted the text of the Bible.

We

therefore do not need to include demonstrations of implicit

distortions

as they have already been provided by the Christians themselves.

|

As far as textual distortion is concerned, this kind of distortion

is

denied by the Protestants and they offer false ARGUMENTs and

misguid-

ing statements in their writings in order to create doubts among

the

Muslims. It is therefore necessary to demonstrate that all the

three

kinds of textual distortion, that is, alterations in the text; the

deletion

of phrases and verses from the text; and later additions to the

original

texts are abundantly present in both the Old and the New

Testaments.

|

ALTERATIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE

|

It should be noted in the beginning that there are three acknowl-

edged versions of the Old Testament:

|

1. The Hebrew version which is acknowledged equally by the

Jews and the Protestants.

|

2. The Greek version which was recognized as authentic by the

|

, Christians up until the seventh century. Until that time the

Hebrew

vcrsion was considered by the Christians to be inauthentic and

distort-

iL ed. The Greek version is still held to be authentic by the Greek

and

astem Churches. The above two versions include all the books of the

Old Testament.

|

3. The Samaritan version which is recognized by the Samaritans.

This is in fact the Hebrew version with the difference that it

consists

of only seven books that is, the five books of the Pentateuch which

are ascribed to Moses, the Book of Joshua and the Book of Judges.

This is because the Samaritans do not believe in, or acknowledge,

any

of the other books of the Old Testament. Another difference is that

it

includes many additional phrases and sentences that are not present

in

the Hebrew version. Many Protestant scholars and theologians like

Kennicott, Hales and Houbigant recognize it as authentic and do not

accept the Hebrew version which they believe to have been distorted

by the Jews. In fact the majority of Protestant scholars prefer it

to the

Hebrew version, as you will see from the following pages.

|

Here are examples of some of the alterartions.

|

Alteration No.l: The Period from Adam to the Flood

|

The period from Adam to the flood of Noah, as described by the

Hebrew version, is one thousand six hundred and fifty-six years,

while according to the Greek version, it is two thousand three

hundred

and sixty-two yearsl and the Samaritan version gives it as one

thou-

sand three hundred and seven years. A table is given in the commen-

tary of Henry and Scott where the age of every descendant has been

given at the time when he gave birth to his son except Noah, whose

age is given as at the time of the flood.

|

This table is as follows:

|

1. This number is given as 2362 in all the versionS, but according

to this table it

comeS to 2363. The mistake may be either in the book that the

author has usd or

somewhere in the hble.

|

NAME HEBREW SAMARITAN GREEK

VERSION VERSION VERSION

|

The Prophet

Adam 130 130 230

|

Seth 105 105 205

|

Cainan 70 70 170

|

Mabalabel 65 65 165

|

Jared 162 62 162

|

Enoch 65 65 165

|

Methuselah 187 67 187

|

Lamech 182 53 188

|

Noah 600 600 600

|

Total 1650 1307 2262 1

|

The above table shows extremely serious differences between the

statements of all three versions. All three versions agree that the

age

of the Prophet Noah at the time of the Flood was six hundred and

the

total age of Adam was nine hundred and thirty. However according to

the Samaritan version the Prophet Noah was two hundred and thirteen

years of age when Adam died which is obviously wrong and goes

against the unanimous agreement of the historians and is also erro-

neous according to the Hebrew and Greek versions. For according to

the former, Noah was born one hundred and twenty-six years after

the

death of Adan and, according to the latter, he was bom seven hun-

dred and thirty-two years after the death of Adam. In view of this

seri-

ous discrepancy, the renowned historian of the Jews, Josephus, who

is

|

dso recognized by the Christians, did not accept the statement of

any

of the three versions and decided that the correct period was two

thou-

sand two hundred and fifty-six years.

|

Alteration No. 2: The period from the Flood to Abraham

|

The period from the Flood of Noah to the birth of the Prophet

Abraham is given as two hundred and ninety-two years in the Hebrew

version. one thousand and seventy-two years in the Greek, and nine

hundred and forty-two years in the Samaritan version. There is

anoth-

er table covering this period in the Henry and Scott commentary

where against every descendant of Noah, the year of the birth of

their

sons is given except in the case of Shem, against whose name the

year

of birth is given for his child who was bom after the Flood. This

table

is as follows:

|

NAME HEBREW SAMARITAN GREEK

|

Shem 2 2 2

Arphaxad 35 135 135

Cainan 130

Salah 30 130 130

Eber 34 134 134

Peleg 30 130 130

Rew 32 132 132

Sherug 30 130 130

Nohor 29 79 79

Terahl 70 70 70

|

Total 290 942 1072

|

This discrepancy among the three versions is so serious that it can

not be explained. Since the Hebrew version informs us that Abraham

was bom two hundred and ninety-two years after the Flood and that

Noah lived for three hundred and fifty years after the Flood as is

understood from Genesis:

|

And Noah lived after the flood three hundred and fifty

years.l

|

This means that Abraham was fifty-eight years old at the death of

Noah which is wrong according to the Greek and Samaritan versions

and according to the unanimous decision of the historians. The

Greek

version places the birth of Abraham seven hundred and twenty-two

years after the death of Noah while the Samaritan makes it five

hun-

dred and ninety-two years after his death. Secondly, in the Greek

ver-

sion an additional generation is given that is not to be found in

the

other two versions. The Evangelist Luke trusted the Greek version

and therefore included in the genealogy of Christ the name of

Canaan.

|

This great discrepancy in the statements of the above three ver-

sions has caused great difference of opinion among Christians. The

historians rejected all three versions and decided that actual

period in

this case was three hundred and fifty-two years. Josephus, the

renowned Jewish historian, also rejected the above three versions

and

said that the correct figure was nine hundred and ninety-three

years,

as is evident from the Henry and Scott commentary. The great

theolo-

gian of the fourth century, Augustine, and other ancient writers

favoured the statement of the Greek version. Horsley, the commenta-

tor, expressed the same opinion in his comments on Genesis, while

Hales thinks that the Samaritan version was correct. The scholar

Home also seems to support the Samaritan version. Henry and Scott own

commentary includes this statement:

|

Augustine held the opinion that the Jews had distorted the

description in the Hebrew version with regard to the elders

who lived either prior to the Flood or after it up to the time of

Moses, so that the Greek version would be discredited, and

because of the enmity which they had against Christianity. It

seems that the ancient Christians also favoured this opinion.

They thought that this alteration was made by them in 130.

|

Home says in the first volume of his commentary:

|

The scholar Hales presented strong ARGUMENTs in favour

of the Samaritan version. It is not possible to give a summary

of his ARGUMENTs here. The curious reader may see his book

from page 80 onward.

|

Kermicott said:

|

If we keep in mind the general behaviour of the

Samaritans towards the Torah, and also the reticence of Christ

at the time of his discourse with the Samaritan woman, and

many other points, we are led to to believe that the Jews made

deliberate alterations in the Torah, and that the claim of the

scholars of the Old and the New Testament, that the

Samaritans made deliberate changes, is baseless.

|

Christ own discourse with a Samaritan woman referred to in the

above passage is found in the Gospel of John where we find:

|

The woman saith unto him, Sir, I perceive that Thou art a

prophet. Our father worshipped in this mountain; and ye say

that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship."

|

The Samaritan woman, convinced that Christ was a Prophet, asked

about the most disputed matter between the Jews and the Samaritans

in respect of which each of them accused the other of making alter-

ations to the original text. Had the Samaritans distorted it,

Christ,

being a Prophet, must have disclosed the truth. Instead, he kept

silent

on the matter, implying that the Samaritans were right and showing

that there must be human manipulations in the text of the Holy

Scriptures.

|

Alteration No. 3: Mount Gerizim or Mount Ebal

|

We find the following statement in Deuteronomy:

|

It shall be when ye be gone over Jordan that ye shall set

up these stones, which I command you this day, in mount

Ebal, and thou shall plaster them with plaster.."

|

On the other hand the Samaritan version contains:

|

...the stones which I command set them up in Gerizim.

|

Ebal and Gerizim are two mountains adjacent to each other as is

known from verses 12 and 13 of the same chapter and from 11:29 of

the same book. According to the Hebrew version it is clear that the

Prophet Moses had commanded them to build a temple on Mount

Ebal, while from the Samaritan version we know that he commanded

this temple to be built on Gerizim. This was a matter of great

dispute

between the Jews and the Samaritans, and each of them accused the

other of altering the original text of the Pentateuch. The same

dispute

is found among Protestant scholars on this point. Adam Clarke, the

famous Protestant scholar, says on page 817 of the first volume of

his

commentary:

|

The scholar Kennicott maintained that the Samaritan ver-

sion was correct, while the scholars Parry and Verschuur

claimed that the Hebrew version was authentic, but it is gen-

erally known that Kennicott own ARGUMENTs are irrefutable, and

people positively believe that the Jews, out of their enmity

against the Samaritans, changed the text. It is unanimously

acknowledged that Mount Gerizim is full of vegetation.

springs and gardens while Mount Ebal is barren without any

water and vegetation in it. In this case Mount Gerizim fits the

description of "the place of blessing"l and Ebal as the place of

curse.

|

The above makes us understand that Kennicott and other scholars

have favoured the Samaritan version and that Kennicott forwarded

irlefutable ARGUMENTs.

|

Alteration No. 4: Seven Years or Three Years

|

We find the phrase own even years" in II Sam. 24:13, while

I Chronicles 21:12 has "three years". This has been already

discussed

earlier.

Obviously one of the two statements must be wrong. Adam Clarke

commenting on the statement of Samuel said:

|

Chronicles contains "three years" and not own even years".

The Greek version similarly has "three years" and this is

undoubtedly the correct statement.

|

E Alteration No. 5: Sister or Wife

|

I Chronicles of the Hebrew version contains:

|

And whose sister own name was Micah. 2

|

It should be "wife" and not own ister". Adam Clarke said:

|

The Hebrew version contains the word own ister" while the

Syrian, Latin and Greek versions have the word "wife". The

translators have followed these versions.

|

Protestant scholars have rejected the Hebrew version and followed

the above translations indicating that they too consider the Hebrew

version to be erroneous.

|

Alteration No. 6

|

II Chronicles 22:2 of the Hebrew version informs us:

|

Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began to

reign.

|

This statement is undoubtedly wrong because his father Jehoram

was forty years" old when he died, and Ahaziah was enthroned imme-

diately after the death of his father. If the above statement be

true, he

must have been two years older than his father. II Kings reads as

fol-

lows:

|

Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he began to

reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem.2

|

Adam Clarke making comments on the statement of Chronicles

said in the second volume of his commentaries:

|

The Syrian and the Arabic translations contain twenty-

two years, and some Greek translations have twenty years.

Most probably the Hebrew version was the same, but the peo-

ple used to write the numbers in the form of letters. It is most

likely that the writer has substituted the letter "mim" (m=40)

for the letter "k4 (k=20).

|

He further said:

|

The statement of II Kings is correct. There is no way of

comparing the one with the other. Obviously any statement

allowing a son to be older than his father cannot be true.

Home and Henry and Scott have also admitted it to the mis-

take of the writers.

|

Alteration No. 7

|

II Chronicles 28:19 of the Hebrew version contains:

|

The lord brought Judah low because of Ahaz king of

Israel.

|

The word Israel in this statement is certainly wrong because Ahaz

|

- was the king of Judah and not of Israel. The Greek and the Latin

ver-

sions have the word "Judah". The Hebrew version therefore has been

changed.

|

Alteration No. 8

|

Psalm 40 contains this:

|

Mine ears hast thou opened.

|

Paul quotes this in his letter to the Hebrews in these words:

|

But a body hast thou prepared me.l

|

One of these two statements must be wrong and manipulated. The

Christian scholars are surprised at it. Henry and Scott own compilers

said:

|

This is a mistake of the scribes. Only one of the two state-

ments is true.

|

They have admitted the presence of alteration in this place but

they

are not definite which of the two statements has been changed. Adam

Clarke ascribes the change to the Psalms. D"Oyly and Richard Mant

observe in their comments:

|

It is surprising that in the Greek translation and in the

Epistle to the Hebrews 10:5 this sentence appears as: "but a

body hast thou prepared me."

|

Alteration No. 6

II Chronicles 22:2 of the Hebrew version informs us:

|

Forty and two years old was Ahaziah when he began to

reign.

|

This statement is undoubtedly wrong because his father Jehoram

was forty yearsl old when he died, and Ahaziah was enthroned imme-

diately after the death of his father. If the above statement be

true, he

must have been two years older than his father. II Kings reads as

fol-

lows:

|

Two and twenty years old was Ahaziah when he began to

reign, and he reigned one year in Jerusalem.2

|

Adam Clarke making comments on the statement of Chronicles

said in the second volume of his commentaries:

|

The Syrian and the Arabic translations contain twenty-

two years, and some Greek translations have twenty years.

Most probably the Hebrew version was the same, but the peo-

ple used to write the numbers in the form of letters. It is most

likely that the writer has substituted the letter "mim" (m=40)

for the letter "kF (k=20).

|

He further said:

|

The statement of II Kings is correct. There is no way of

comparing the one with the other. Obviously any statement

allowing a son to be older than his father cannot be true.

Home and Henry and Scott have also admitted it to the mis-

take of the writers.

|

Iteration No. 7

|

II Chronicles 28:19 of the Hebrew version contains:

|

The lord brought Judah low because of Ahaz king of

Israel.

|

The word Israel in this statement is certainly wrong because Ahaz

was the king of Judah and not of Israel. The Greek and the Latin

ver-

sions have the word "Judah". The Hebrew version therefore has been

, changed.

|

Alteration No. 8

|

Psalm 40 contains this:

|

Mine ears hast thou opened.

|

Paul quotes this in his letter to the Hebrews in these words:

|

But a body hast thou prepared me.l

|

Z One of these two statements must be wrong and manipulated. The

Christian scholars are surprised at it. Henry and Scott own compilers

said:

|

This is a mistake of the scribes. Only one of the two state-

ments is true.

|

They have admitted the presence of alteration in this place but

they

, are not definite which of the two statements has been changed.

Adam

Clarke ascribes the change to the Psalms. D"Oyly and Richard Mant

observe in their comments:

|

It is surprising that in the Greek translation and in the

Epistle to the Hebrews 10:5 this sentence appears as: "but a

body hast thou prepared me."

|

The two commentators agree that it is the statement of the Evangel

that has been altered, that is, the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews.

|

Alteration No. 9

|

Verse 28 of Psalm 105 in the Hebrew version includes the state-

ment: "They rebelled not against his words." The Greek version on

the contrary bears these words: "They rebelled against these

words."

It can be seen that the former version negates the latter. One of

the

two statements, therefore, must be wrong. Christian scholars are

greatly embarrassed here. The commentary of Henry and Scott con-

cludes:

|

This difference has induced much discussion and it is

obvious that the addition or omission of a certain word has

been the cause of all this.

|

The presence of manipulation in the text has been admitted,

though they are not able to decide which version is wrong.

|

Alteration No. 10: The Number of the Israelites

|

II Samuel contains this statement:

|

And there were in Israel eight hundred thousand valiant

men that drew the sword; and the men of Judah were five

hundred thousand men.l

|

This statement is contradicted by I Kings:

|

And all they of Israel were a thousand thousand and a

hundred thousand men that drew sword.

|

Certainly one of the two statements has been altered. Adam Clarke

making his comments on the first statement observed:

|

The validity of both the statements is not possible. Most

probably the first statement is correct. The historical books of

the Old Testament contain more distortions than the other

books. Any effort to find conformity among them is just use-

less. It is better to admit, in the beginning, what cannot be

refuted later. The authors of the Old Testament were men of

inspiration but the copiers were not.

|

This is a plain admission of the fact that alterations are abundant

in

the books of the Old Testament and that one should objectively

admit

their presence because these changes and contradictions are unex-

plainable.

|

Alteration No. 11: Horsley own Admission

|

The famous commentator, Horsley, under his comments on Judges

12:4 observed on page 291 of the first volume of his commentary:

|

There is no doubt that this verse has been distorted.

|

The verse referred to is:

|

Then Jephtah gathered together all the man of Gilead and

fought with Ephraim: and the men of Gilead smote Ephraim,

because they said, Ye Gileadites are fugitives of Ephraim

among the Ephraimites and among the Manassites.

|

Alteration No. 12: Four or Forty

|

II Samuel 15:7 contains:

|

And it came to pass after forty years that Absalom said

unto the King...

|

L Here the word forty" is undoubtedly wrong; the correct number is

E four. Adam Clarke s. d in volume two of his book:

|

There is no doubt that this text has been altered.

Alteration No. 13: Kennicott own Admission

|

Adam Clarke observed in volume 2 of his commentary under the

comments on II Sam 23:8:

|

According to Kennicott three alterations have been made

in this verse.

|

This is a plain admission that a single verse contains three

distor-

tions.

|

Alteration No. 14

|

I Chronicles 7:6 informs us as follows:

|

The sons of Benjamin; Bela, and Becher, and Jediael,

three.

|

While in chapter 8 it says:

|

Now Benjamin begat Bela, his first born, Ashbel the sec-

ond and Aharah the third Noahah the fourth and Repha the

fifth.

|

These two different statements are again contradicted by Genesis

46:21:

|

And the sons of Benjamin were Belah, and Becher, and

Ashbel, Gera and Naaman, Ehi and Rosh, Muppim and

Huppim and Ard.

|

It is quite easy to see that there are two kinds of differences in

the

above three statements. The first passage informs us that Benjamin

had three sons, the second claims he had five while the third

counts

them as ten. Since the first and the second statements are from the

same book, it shows a contradiction in the statements of a single

author, the Prophet Ezra. Obviously only one of the two statements

can be accepted as correct making the other two statements false

and

erroneous. The Judaeo-Christian scholars are extremely embarrassed

|

Adam Clarke said with regard to the first statement:

|

It is because the author (Ezra) could not separate the sons

from the grandsons. In fact any effort to reconcile such con-

tradictions is of no use. Jewish scholars think that the author

Ezra did not know that some of them were sons and the others

grandsons. They also maintain that the genealogical tables

from which Ezra had copied were defective. We can do noth-

ing but leave such matters alone.

|

This is an obvious example of how the Christian as well as the

Jewish scholars find themselves helpless and have to admit the

errors

in Ezra own writings.

|

The above admission of Adam Clarke helps us to conclude many

points of great significance. But before going into those points we

must remind ourselves that it is the unanimous claim of both Jewish

and Christian scholars that the Book of Chronicles was written by

Ezra with the help of the Prophets Haggai and Zechariah. This

implies

that these two books have the unanimous witness of the three

Prophets. On the other hand we have historical evidence that all

the

books of the Old Testament were in a very bad condition before the

invasion of Nebuchadnezzar and after his invasion there was no

trace

of them left but their names. Had Ezra not recompiled them, they

would have ceased to exist then and there. The above fact is

admitted

in the book which is ascribed to the Prophet Ezra." Although the

Protestants do not believe it to be inspired, they nevertheless

acknowledge it as a document of historical value. In it we find:

|

The Torah was burnt. No one knew anything of it. It is

said that Ezra rewrote it guided by the Holy Spirit.

|

1. Perhaps the author is referring to the book of Esdras because it

is the book con-

taining these events. It may be noted that this book is not

included in the Protestant

Bible. However, it is part of the Catholic Bible. In the Kno

version of the Catholic

Bible there are ten chapters in the first book of Esdras and

thirteen in the second

bDok. I was unable to find this passage in the books of Esdras. The

shtement has

been translated from Urdu. (Raazi).

Clement of Alexandria said:

|

All the divine books were destroyed. Then Ezra was

inspired to rewrite them.

|

Tertullian observed:

|

It is generally believed that Ezra recomposed these books

after the invasion of the Babylonians.

|

Theophylactus said:

|

The Holy Books completely disappeared. Ezra gave new

birth to them through inspiration.

|

The Catholic, John Mill, observed on page 115 of his book printed

at Derby in 1843:

|

All the scholars unanimously agree that the original Torah

(Pentateuch) and other original books of the Old Testament

were destroyed by the forces of Nebuchadnezzar. When the

books were recompiled through Ezra, these too were later on

destroyed during the invasion of Antiochus.

|

Keeping the above information in mind will help us understand the

significance of the following six conclusions based on the observa-

tions of the commentator, Adam Clarke.

|

First Conclusion:

|

The present Torah (the Pentateuch) cannot be the original Torah

that was first revealed to Moses and then, after having been

destroyed, rewritten by Ezra through inspiration. Had it been the

orig-

inal Torah, Ezra could have not opposed it in his writings,l and

must

have copied according to it, without trusting its defective

genealogica

tables as he did and without distinguishing right from wrong.

|

The contention that Ezra copied it from the defective versions

|

1. That is the Book of Chronicles would have not contradicted the

book of

Cenesis which is the part of the Torah.

|

available to him at the time, and was unable to remove errors con-

tained in them, exactly as he was unable to do in the case of the

defec-

tive genealogical tables, makes it lose its divine character and,

there-

fore, its trustworthiness.

|

Second Conclusion:

|

If Ezra could have made mistakes in spite of being assisted by two

other Prophets, he could have made mistakes in other books also.

This

kind of situation leaves one in doubt about the divine origin of

these

books. especially when it happens to contrast with definitely

estab-

lished ARGUMENTs and simple human logic. For example we must

reject the truth of the disgraceful event described in chapter 19

of

Genesis where the Prophet Lot is imputed to have committed fornica-

tion with his two daughters, resulting in their pregnancy, and then

two

sons being bom to them who later become the forefathers of the

Moabites and Ammonites. (May God forbid).

|

Similarly we must reject the event described in I Samuel chapter

21 where the Prophet David is accused of fornication with the wife

of

Uriah, making her pregnant, and of killing her husband under some

pretext and taking her to his house.

|

There is another unacceptable event described in I Kings chapter

11 where the Prophet Solomon is reported to have converted to

pagan-

ism, misguided by his wives, and to have built temples for idols

thus

becoming low in the eyes of God. There are many other obscene and

|

t shameful events described in the Bible which make the hair of the

faithful stand on end. All these events have been rejected by irre-

futable ARGUMENTs.

|

Third Conclusion:

|

Protestant theologians claim that, although the Prophets are not

generally immune from committing sins and making mistakes, in

preaching and writing they are innocent of and immune to all kinds

of

errors and omissions. We may be allowed to remind them that this

claim remains unsupported by their holy books. Otherwise they

should explain why the writing of the Prophet EZM is not free from

|

errors especially when he had the assistance of two other Prophets.

|

Fourth Conclusion:

|

This allows us to conclude that according to the Christians there

are times when a Prophet does not receive inspiration when he needs

it. The Prophet Ezra did not receive inspiration while he most

needed

it at the time of writing these books.

|

Fifth Conclusion:

|

Our claim that everything written in these books is not inspired by

God has been proved because a false statement cannot be an inspira-

tion from God. The presence of such statements in the Bible has

been

demonstrated above.

|

Sixth Conclusion:

|

If the Prophet Ezra is not free from error, how can the Evangelists

Mark and Luke be supposed to be immune to error, especially when

they were not even disciples of Christ? According to the People of

the

Book, Ezra was a Prophet who received inspiration and he was

assisted by two other Prophets. Mark and Luke were not men of

inspi-

ration. Though the other two Evangelists, Matthew and John, are

con-

sidered by the Protestants to be Apostles, they too are not

different

from Mark and Luke since the writings of all four evangelists are

full

of errors and contradictions.

|

Alteration No. lS

|

Under his comments on I Chronicles 8:9 Adam Clarke observed in

the second volume of his book:

|

In this chapter from this verse to verse 32, and in chapter

9 from verse 35 to 44 we find names which are different from

each other.l Jewish scholars believe that Ezra had found two

books which contained these verses with names different

from each other. Ezra could not distinguish the correct names

from the wrong ones; he therefore copied both of them.

|

We have nothing to add in respect of this to what we said under the

previous number.

|

Alteration No. 16

|

In II Chronicles 13:3 we find the number of Abijah own army men-

doned as four hundred thousand and the number of Jeroboam own army

as eight hundred thousand, and in verse 17 the number of people

slain

from Jeroboam own army is given as five hundred thousand. Since this

number of the troops of the above kings was incredibly exaggerated,

they have been reduced to forty thousand, eighty thousand and fifty

thousand respectively in the most Latin translations. It is

surprising

that the commentators have willingly accepted this. Home said in

the

first volume of his commentary:

|

Most probably the number described in these (the Latin)

versions is correct.

|

Similarly Adam Clarke in the second volume of his book said:

|

It seems that the smaller number (the reduced number in

the Latin translations) is quite correct. And we are thus pro-

vided with great opportunity to protest against the presence of

distortion in the numbers described by these historical books.

|

This is again an unambiguous example of alterations made in the

texts of the Bible.

|

Alteration No. 17: The Age of Jehoiachin

|

3 We find this statement in II Chronicles:

|

Jehoiachin was eight years old when he began to reign.l

|

The word eight" in this verse is incorrect and is contrary to the

Sment of II Kings which says:

|

lehoiachin was eighteen years old when he began to

reign.l

|

In his comments on the latter verse Adam Clarke said:

|

The word "eight" used in 2 Chronicles 36:8 is certainly

wrong, because he reigned for only three months and was

then made captive in Babylon where he had his wives in the

prison. It seems obvious that a child of eight years could not

have had wivcs with him. A child of this age cannot be

accused of committing an act which is evil in the eyes of

God.

|

Alteration No. 18

|

According to some versions Psalm 20 verse 17, and according to

the Hebrew version, Psalm 22 verse 16, includes this sentence:

|

My both hands are like a lion.

|

In the Catholic and the Protestant translations the sentence reads:

|

They pierced my hands and my feet.

|

All the scholars admit the presence of an alteration at this place.

|

Alteration No. 19

|

Under his comments on Isaiah 64:2,2 Adam Clarke said in volume

4 of his book:

|

At this place the Hebrew text has undergone a great alter-

ation, the correct sentence should be: the fire causeth the wax

to melt.

|

Alteration No. 20: Difference between Isaiah and Paul

|

Verse 4 of the same chapter contains:

|

For since the beginning of the world men have not heard,

nor perceived by the ear, neither hath the eye seen, O God,

besides thee, what he hath prepared for him that waiteth for

him.

|

But Paul records this verse differently in his first letter to Cor-

inthians, saying:

|

Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into

the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for

them that love him.

|

The difference between the two texts is obvious and one of the two

The commentarY of Henrv and Scott con-

|

statements must be wrong.

tains this statement:

|

The best opinion is that the Hebrew text has been

distorted.

|

Adam Clarke reproduced many opinions on this text of Isaiah and

examined the text thoroughly, at the end of which he observed:

|

What can I do under these difficult circumstances except

present one of two altematives to my readers: admit that the

Jews changed the texts of the Hebrew and Latin translations,

as a strong probability exists of alterations in the quotations

of the Old Testament reproduced in the New Testament; or

admit that Paul did not quote this sentence from this book. He

might have quoted it from one of several forged books. For

instance from the Book of the Ascension of Isaiah or from he

revelatjons of Ebiah where this sentence can be found,

because some people think that the apostle (Paul) copied from

forged books. Perhaps people generally would not easily

accept the first possibility, but I must wam the readers that

Jerome considers the second possibility to be the worst kind

of heresy or heterodoxy.

|

Alterations No. 21-26: Differences between the Old and New

Testaments

|

We find Horne observing in the second volume of his commen\_

tary:

|

It seems that the Hebrew text has been changed in the

verses detailed below:

|

1. Malachi 3:1 2. Micah 5:2

|

3. Psalms 16:8-11 4. Amos 9 12

|

5. Psalms 4:6-8 6. Psalms 110:4

|

1. The first verse in Mal. 3:1 seems to have been altered

because Matthew reports it in his Gospel in chapter 11:10 in a

form which is obviously different from Malachi own in the

Hebrew and other translations. The text of Matthew is this:

|

Behold, I send my messengers before ye...

|

The words "before ye" are not to be found in Malachi.l

Besides this Matthew also reported these words, "Shall pre-

pare the way before ye." While Malachi own statement is, "Shall

prepare the the way before me." Horne admitted in a foot-

note:

|

This difference cannot be explained easily except

that the old versions had been changed.

|

2. The second verse (Mic. 5:2) is also quoted by Matthew

in 2:6 in a way which shows clear differences2 from the

above.

|

3. The third passage (Psalms 16:8-11) is reported by Luke

in Acts 2:25-28, and the texts are quite different from each

other.

|

4. The fourth passage is also quoted by Luke in Acts

|

15:16-17 and is different from Amos 9 12.

|

5. Psalms 4:6-8 is quoted by Paul in his letter to the He-

|

brews in verses 5 to 7. The two versions are quite different.

|

Alterations No. 27-29: Contradictory Margin Notes

|

J Exodus 21:8, in the Hebrew version, contains a negative statement

, while the statement included in its margin is affrmative.

|

This verse contains injunctions with regard to keeping maid ser-

vants.

|

Similarly we find in Leviticus 11:21 laws regarding birds and

creeping things on the earth.2 The statement in the Hebrew text is

neg-

ative while in the marginal notes it is found to be affirmative.

|

Leviticus 25:30 gives injunctions with regard to selling houses.

The verse again contains a negative injunction while the marginal

note affirms it.3

|

Protestant scholars have preferred the affirmative texts in the

marginal notes in their translations in all the above three places.

That

is, they have omitted the primary text and have included a marginal

passage in its place, thus distorting these verses. After the

alteration in

these three verses, the injunctions contained in them have lost

their

certainty. Now it cannot be ascertained which of the two

injunctions is

correct, the negative one of the text or the affirmative of the

margin.

This demonstration also refutes the claim of the Christians that

the

distortions found in the Bible do not affect rituals and liturgical

instructions.

|

1. We could not find any difference at this place but since Horne

is considered a

great scholar by the Christians his statement might have been based

on some reason,

ithasthereforebeen included.

|

2. "Yet these may ye eat of every flying creeping thing that goeth

upon all four,

which have legs above their feet to leap withal upon the earth."

|

3. "And if it not be redeemed within the space of a full year, then

the house that is

|

t the walled city shall be established for ever to him that bought

it throughout his

generations. It shall not go out in the jubile." Leviticus 25:30.

|

Alteration No. 30

|

Acts 20:28 says:

|

To feed the church of God, which he hath purchased with

his own blood.

|

Griesbach observed that the word "God" used here is wrong; the

correct word is the pronoun "his", I the third person singular.

|

Alteration No. 31: Angel or Eagle

|

Revelation 8:13 contains this statement:

|

And I beheld an angel flying.

|

Griesbach has suggested that the word "angel" here is wrong, the

correct word should be "eagIe".2

|

Alteration No. 32

|

Ephesians 5:21 contains:

|

Submitting yourselves one to another in the fear of God.

|

Griesbach and Scholtz observed that the word "God" here is again

wrong; the correct word should be "Christ".3

|

In this section we have aimed at demonstrating the presence of

human manipulation in the form of alterations of phrases and words

in the Bible. The above thirty-two examples should be enough to

prove it. We confine ourselves to this much only to avoid

unnecessary

|

prolongation of the subject; otherwise there is no dearth of them

in the

Bible.

|

ADDITIONS TO THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE

|

Addition No- 1: Added Books

|

It must be noted in the beginning of this section that the

following

eight books of the Old Testament remained inauthentic and were

rejected up until 325.

|

1. The Book of Esther 2. The Book of Baruch

|

3. The Book of Judith 4. The Book of Tobit

|

5. The Book of Wisdom 6. The Book of Ecclesiasticus

|

7 & 8. The First and Second Book of Maccabees

|

In 325 Constantine called a meeting of Christian scholars in the

city of Nice (Nicaea) which is known as the Council of Nicaea to

decide which of these books should be discarded from the acknowl-

edged list of biblical books. After a detailed scrutiny, this

council

decided that only the Book of Judith was to be acknowledged as

authentic and the rest of the books were declared doubtful.

|

Another council with the same purpose was held at Laodicea in

364. This committee confirmed the decision of the Nicaean council

and unanimously decided that the Book of Esther was also to be

included in the acknowledged books. This council publicised its

deci-

sion through an official declaration.

|

In 397 another grand council was convened in Carthage. One hun-

dred and twenty-seven great scholars of the time participated in

this

council. The leamed and the most celebrated theologian of the

"i Christian world, St. Augustine, was among the participants. This

Council not only confirmed the decisions of the previous councils

but

also unanimously decided to acknowledge all the remaining six books

with the proviso that the Book of Baruch was not a separate book

but

merely part of the book of Jeremiah, because Baruch was the

assistant

of the Prophet Jeremiah. Its name, therefore, did not appear

separately

|

in the list.

|

Three more subsequent meetings were held in Trullo, Florence and

Trent. These councils reacknowledged the decision of the previous

councils. In this way all the above eight books after being

rejected

received the status of Holy Books under the declaration of the

above

councils. This situation remained unchanged for more than eight

hun-

dred years.

|

Later there was a great revolution over this situation and the

Protestants came forward to change the decisions of their forebears

and decided that the books of Baruch, Tobit, Judith, Wisdom,

Ecclesiasticus and the two books of Maccabees were all to be

reject-

ed. They also rejected the decision of their elders with regard to

a par-

ticular part of the book of Esther and accepted only one part of

it,

with the result that out of sixteen chapters of this book the first

nine

chapters and three verses of chapter 10 were acknowledged and the

remaining six chapters and ten verses of chapter 10 were rejected.

They forwarded many ARGUMENTs in support of their decision.

|

For example the historian Eusebius decided in chapter 22 of the

fourth volume of his book:

|

These books have been distorted, especiauy the Second

Book of Maccabees.

|

Nor do the Jews recognise these books as being inspired. The

Roman Catholics, who have always been greater in number than the

Protestants, acknowledge these books up to this day as being

authen-

tic and divine. The books have been included in the Latin version

that

is considered by them to be the most authentic of all versions.

|

Knowledge of the above facts, proves the presence of distortion

and human manipulation in these books. Having been rejected for

three hundred and twenty-five years these books suddenly turn out

to

be inspired books simply because some people sat together in

several

meetings and decided that they were. The Catholics still insist on

their

being divine. This implies that any consensus of the Christian

schol-

ars lacks value as an ARGUMENT against opponents. If such a

consensus

can authenticate previously rejected books, one may be allowed to

|

preSume that the same kind of consensus might have been held in

case

of the four Gospels which themselves contain many distortions and

human manipulations.

|

The elders first unanimously agreed on the accuracy of the Hebrew

version and then claimed that the Jews had changed it in 130 AD as

we have shown under Alteration No. 2. The Greek and Eastern

Churches still agree on its accuracy, but Protestant scholars have

proved that their consensus was wrong, and have shown that, on the

contrarY the Hebrew version is incorrect and altered. The same is

the

case with the Greek translation. The Catholics, similarly agreed on

the

accuracy of the Latin translation while, contrary to this, the

Protes-

tants have not only proved it to be distorted and changed but have

also said that its distortion is so great that cannot be compared

with

other translations. Home observed on page 463 of the fourth volume

of his commentary printed in 1822:

|

This translation has undergone innumerable alterations

and frequent additions from the 5th century to the 15th

century.

|

Further on page 467 he observed:

|

It may be kept in mind that no other translation in the

world has been so greatly distorted as was the Latin transla-

tion. The copiers took great liberties in inserting the verses of

one book of the New Testament into another and including

marginal notes into the basic text.

|

.,

|

. In the presence of this attitude towards the most popular

transla-

bon, what assurance is there that they might have not changed the

basic text of a translation which was not popular among them. It

can

be assumed that people who were bold enough to change a trans-

lation, would have also tried to change the original version to

cover

theircrime.

|

; Strangely the Protestants did not reject the part of the book of

Esther along with all other books, because in this book the name of

od does not occur even once, let alone His attributes or

injunctions.

|

Also, the name of its author is not known. The exegetes of the Old

Testament do not ascribe it to anyone with certainty. Some of them

ascribe it to the ecclesiastics of the Church from the period of

Ezra to

the period of Simeon. The Jewish scholar Philo thinks that it was

written by Jehoiachin, the son of Joshua who had retumed from Baby\_

lon after his release from captivity. Augustine attributed it

directly to

Ezra, while some others relate it to Mordecai some others even

think

that Mordecai and Esther are the authors of this book. The Catholic

Herald contains the following remarks on page 347 of vol. 2:

|

The learned Melito did not include this book in the list of

acknowledged books, as has been pointed out by Eusebius in

the History of the Church (Vol. 4 Chapter 26). Gregory

Nazianzen described all the acknowledged books in his Poem

and this book is not included by him. Similarly Amphilochius

expressed his doubts about this book in the poem which he

addressed to Seleucus and Athanasius rejected and negated it

in his letter No. 39.

|

Addition No. 2

|

The Book of Genesis contains the following:

|

And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom,

before there reigned any king over the children of Israel."

|

These cannot be the words of the Prophet Moses, because they

denote that speaker belonged to the period after the Israelites had

formed their kingdom.2The first king of this kingdom was Saul,3 who

reigned 356 years after the death of the Prophet Moses. Adam Clarke

remarked in the first volume of his commentaries:

|

I am almost certain that this verse and the subsequent

verses up to verse 39 were not written by Moses. In fact,

|

these verses belong to the first chapter of I Chronicles, and a

strong possibility, which is very near to being a certainty, is

that these verses were written in the margin of the original

Pentateuch- The copier included them in the text on the

aSsumption that they formed a part of the text.

|

This commentator has admitted that the above nine verses were

added to the text later. This proves that their holy books were

capable

of allowing foreign material to be inserted later, otherwise these

later

additions would have not become a part of all the translations.

|

Addition No. 3

|

We find the following statement in Deuteronomy:

|

Jair, the son of Manasseh took all the country of Argob

unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi, and called them

after his own name, Bashan-havothjair unto this day.l

|

It is also not possible for this to be the word of Moses, because

the

words "unto this day" in the above verse situate the speaker in a

peri-

od much later than that of Jair, because such phrases can be used

only

to denote the remote past. The renowned scholar Horne made the fol-

lowing comments on both the above verses in the first volume of his

commentary

|

It is not possible for these two verses to be the word of

Moses, because the former sentence denotes that the speaker

belongs to the period after the Kingdom of Israel had been

founded while the latter verse shows that the author belonged

to a period long after the stay of the Israelites in Palestine.

Even if we accept these two verses as later additions, the truth

of the book still remains unaffected. A careful examination of

these verses will show that they are of great advantage, rather

they carry more weight than the text itself, especially the sec-

ond verse, because the author, be he Moses or someone else,

|

could not say "unto this day"; it is therefore most predomi-

nantly presumed that the original text was: "Jair, the son of

Manasseh took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of

Geshuri and Maachathi and called them after his own name

,and after a few centuries these words were added in the mar-

gin to let the people know that this land still continued to be

known by the same name. This note then was added into the

text in future translations. Anyone with doubt can ascertain

from the Latin version the fact that some later additions

which are found in the text of some translations are present in

the margin of others.

|

The above scholar has openly admitted that the above two verses,

are not the word of Moses and that they are later additions. As for

his

assumption regarding what the above verse would have been, it is

merely personal guesswork that is not supported by ARGUMENT. He has

admitted that these words were inserted into the text "a few

centuries

later" and then became the part of other translations. This is a

clear

admission that these books allowed the possibility of such

insertions

being made, and that is not a character of divine books. His claim

that

the truth remains unaffected even after this distortion, is nothing

but

sheer obstinacy and is rejected by common sense.

|

The compilers of Henry and Scott own commentary observed with

regard to the second verse:

|

The last sentence is an addition that was inserted long

after the period of Moses. It makes no difference if we over-

look it.

|

Addition No. 4: The Towns of Jair

|

The Book of Numbers chapter 32 verse 40 says:

|

And Jair the son of Manasseh went and took the small

towns thereof, and called them Havoth-Jair.

|

This verse is similar to the verse of Deuteronomy discussed aboVe-

The Dictionary of the Bible printed in America, England and India

|

che compilation of which was started by Colmet and completed by

I Zabit and Taylor, contains the following:

|

There are certain verses in the Pentateuch which are

clearly not the word of Moses. For instance, Numbers 32:40

and Deuteronomy 2:14. Similarly some of its passages do not

correspond to the idiom or expression of the time of Moses.

We cannot be certain as to who included these verses.

However there is strong probability that Ezra inserted them as

can be understood from chapter 9:10 of his book and from

chapter 8 of the Book of Nehemiah.

|

The above requires no comment. It gives us to understand that the

rah (Pentateuch) contains passages that are not the word of Moses.

The scholars are not definite about the authors of these books but

they

conjecture that they might have been written by Ezra. This

conjecture

is not useful. The previous chapters do not indicate that Ezra

inserted

any part into the book. The Book of Ezral contains his admission

and

concern over the perversion of the Israelites while the Book of

Nehemiah2 inforrns us that Ezra had read the Torah to the people.

|

Addition No. 5: The Mount of the Lord

|

We read in Genesis:

|

It is said to this day, In the Mount of the Lord it shall be

seen.3

|

We historically know that this mount was called "The Mount of the

ord", only after the construction of the temple, built by Solomon

ur hundred and fifty years after the death of Moses. Adam Clarke

eecided in his introduction to the Book of Ezra, that this sentence

is a

Fter addition, and said:

|

This mount was not known by this name prior to the con-

struction of the Temple.

|

Additions No. 6 & 7: Further Additions to Deuteronomy

|

It says in Deuteronomy chapter 2 verse 12:

|

The Horims also dwelt in Seir before-time; but the chil-

dren of Esau succeeded them, When they had destroyed them

from before them and dwelt in their stead; as Israel did into

the land of his possession which the Lord gave unto them.

|

Adam Clarke decided in his introduction to the book of Ezra that

this verse is also a later addition and the sentence "as Israel did

unto

the land of his possession" is said to denote it.

Deuteronomy chapter 3 verse 11 has:

|

For only Og, King of Bashan remained of the remnant of

giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in

Rabbath of the children of Ammon? Nine cubits was the

length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit

of a man.

|

Adam Clarke observed in his introduction to the book of Ezra:

|

The whole statement, and especially the last sentence,

indicates that this verse was written long after the death of

this king and certainly was not written by Moses.

|

Addition No. 8

|

The book of Numbers contains:

|

And the Lord hearkened the voice of Israel, and delivered

up the Canaanites; and they utterly destroyed them and their

cities and he called the name of the place Hormah.

|

Adam Clarke again observed on page 697 of his first volume:

|

I I know very well that this verse was inserted after the

death of Joshua, because all the Canaanites were not

destroyed in the time of Moses, they were killed after his

death.

|

Addition No. g

|

We find in the Book of Exodus:

|

And the children of Israel did eat "manna" forty years

r until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna until

they came to the borders of the land of Canaan."

|

! This verse also cannot be the word of God, because God did not

l discontinue "manna" in the lifetime of Moses, and they did not

arrive

L at Canaan in that period. Adam Clarke said on page 399 of the

first

E olume of his commentary:

|

From this verse people have reckoned that the Book of

Exodus was written after the discontinuance of Manna from

the Israelites, but it is possible that these words might have

been added by Ezra.

|

We may be allowed to assert that people have reckoned rightly,

and the unsupported conjecture of the author is not acceptable. The

ct is that all the five books ascribed to Moses (the Torah) are not

his

ritings as we have proved in the first part of this book with irre-

Jiltable ARGUMENTs.

|

ddition No. 10: The Book of the Wars of the Lord

|

Numbers chapter 21 verse 14 says:

|

Wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of the Lord

hat he did in the Red Sea, so shall he do in the brooks of

|

This mount was not known by this name prior to the con-

struction of the Temple.

|

Additions No. 6 & 7: Further Additions to Deuteronomy

|

It says in Deuteronomy chapter 2 verse 12:

|

The Horims also dwelt in Seir before-time; but the chil-

dren of Esau succeeded them, When they had destroyed them

from before them and dwelt in their stead; as Israel did 1nto

the land of his possession which the Lord gave unto them.

|

Adam Clarke decided in his introduction to the book of Ezra that

this verse is also a later addition and the sentence "as Israel did

unto

the land of his possession" is said to denote it.

Deuteronomy chapter 3 verse 11 has:

|

For only Og, King of Bashan remained of the remnant of

giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron, is it not in

Rabbath of the children of Ammon? Nine cubits was the

length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit

of a man.

|

Adam Clarke observed in his introduction to the book of Ezra:

|

The whole statement, and especially the last sentence.

indicates that this verse was written long after the death of

this king and certainly was not written by Moses.

|

Addition No. 8

|

The book of Numbers contains:

|

And the Lord hearkened the voice of Israel, and delivered

up the Canaanites; and they utterly destroyed them and their

cities and he called the name of the place Hormah.

|

Adam Clarke again observed on page 697 of his first volume:

|

I know very well that this verse was inserted after the

death of Joshua, because all the Canaanites were not

destroyed in the time of Moses, they were killed after his

|

Addition No. 9

|

We find in the Book of Exodus:

|

And the children of Israel did eat "manna" forty years

until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna until

they came to the borders of the land of Canaan.l

|

This verse also cannot be the word of God, because God did not

discontinue "manna" in the lifetime of Moses, and they did not

arrive

at Canaan in that period. Adam Clarke said on page 399 of the first

volume of his commentary:

|

From this verse people have reckoned that the Book of

Exodus was written after the discontinuance of Manna from

the Israelites, but it is possible that these words might have

|

We may be allowed to assert that people have reckoned rightly

and the unsupported conjecture of the author is not acceptable. The

fact is that all the five books ascribed to Moses (the Torah) are

not his

wntings as we have proved in the first part of this book with irre-

futable ARGUMENTs.

|

Addition No. 10: The Book of the Wars of the Lord

|

Numbers chapter 21 verse 14 says:

|

j Wherefore it is said in the book of the wars of the Lord,

a he did in the Red Sea, so shall he do in the brooks of

|

Amon.l

|

It is not possible for this verse to be the word of Moses and, on

the

contrary, it denotes that the Book of Numbers was not written by

Moses at all, because the author has referred to the Book of Wars

of

the Lord. No one knows anything about the author of this book, his

name or his whereabouts up to this day, and this book is something

like a fairy tale, heard of by many but seen by none. In the

introduc-

tion to Genesis, Adam Clarke decided that this verse was a later

addi-

tion, then he added:

|

It is most probable that "the book of the wars of Lord"

first existed in a margin, then it came to be included in the

|

text.

|

This is again a plain admission of the fact that these holy books

were capable of being distorted by people.

|

Addition No. 11

|

Genesis contains the name of the town Hebron in three paces.2

This name was given to it by the Israelites after the victory of

Palestine. Formerly it was called Kirjath Arba,3 which is known

from

Joshua 14:15. Therefore the author of these verses must have been

someone living in the period after this victory and the change of

its

name to Hebron.

|

Similarly the book of Genesis 14:14 contains the word Dan which

is the name of a town which came into existence in the period of

Judges. The Israelites, after the death of Joshua, conquered the

city of

Laish, and killed the citizens and burnt the whole city. In its

place

they rebuilt a new town which they called Dan. This can be ascer-

|

tained from Judges chapter 18. This verse therefore cannot be the

word of Moses. Home said in his commentary:

|

It is possible that Moses might have written Raba and

Laish and some copier later changed the names to Hebron and

Dan.

|

It is again to be noted how the great scholars find themselves

help-

lessly seeking support from unsound conjectures.

|

Addition No. 12

|

The Book of Genesis says in chapter 13 verse 7:

|

The Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelt then in the Land.

|

Chapter 12 verse 6 of the same book contains these words:

|

And the Canaanite was then in the land.

|

Neither of these sentences can be the word of Moses, as has been

admitted by the Christian commentators. The commentary of Henry

and Scott has the following comment:

|

It is clear that neither of these sentences can be the words

of Moses. These and other similar sentences have been added

later to make a link and might have been added by Ezra or

any other man of inspiration into the holy books.

|

This is an obvious admission of the fact that the holy books con-

tain passages which have been added to them later by unknown peo-

ple. His guess that Ezra might have added it invites no comment as

no

ARGUMENT has been presented to support this conjecture.

|

Addition No. 13: The First Five Verses of Deuteronomy

|

Under his comments on chapter 1 of Deuteronomy, Adam Clarke

observed on page 749 of volume 1 of his book:

|

The first five verses of this chapter form an introduction

to the rest of the book and cannot be regarded as the word of

Moses. Most probably they were added by Ezra or by Joshua.

|

This admission shows that these five verses are a later addition.

Again his guess with regard to their authors is unacceptable

without

ARGUMENT.

|

Addition No. 14: Chapter 34 of Deuteronomy

|

Adam Clarke said in the first volume of his Commentary:

|

The words of Moses end with the previous chapter and

this chapter is not his words. It is not possible for Moses to

have written it... The person who brought the next book must

have been received this chapter from the Holy Spirit. I am

cerlain that this chapter was originally the first chapter of the

book of Joshua."

|

The marginal note which existed at this place written by

some Jewish scholar said:

|

Most of the co nmentators say that the book of Deutero-

nomy ends on the prayer of Moses for the twelve tribes,

that is, on the sentence. "Happy art thou O Israel who is

like unto thee, O peoples saved by the Lord." This chapter

was written by seventy elders long after the death of

Moses, and this chapter was the first chapter of the book

of Joshua which was later put here.

|

Both Jewish and Christian scholars have admitted that this chapter

cannot be the word of Moses. As for their claim that it was written

by

seventy elders and that this chapter was the first chapter of the

Book

|

of Joshua, this is again just a guess not supported by any

ARGUMENT.

Henry and Scott said:

|

The words of Moses ended with the previous chapter.

This chapter is a later addition either by Ezra, Joshua or

another subsequent prophet who is not definitely known.

Perhaps the last verses were included after the release of the

Israelites from the captivity of Babylon.

|

Similar views were expressed by D"Oyly and Richard Mant in

their commentary. They think this was included by Joshua at some

later period. It must be noted here that the verses presented

above as

examples of later additions are based on the presumption that we

have

accepted the Judaeo-Christian claim that the five books of the

Pentateuch are the books of Moses, otherwise these verses would

only

go to prove that these books have been falsely ascribed to Moses

which is what the scholars of Islam believe and claim. We have

already demonstrated that some scholars of the Judaeo-Christian

world have agreed with our claim. As far as their conjectures as

to the

author of these verses, they are unacceptable until they support

them

with authoritative evidence which directly lead us to the Prophet

who

included these verses, and to do that has proved impossible for

them.

|

Addition No. 15: Irrelevant Verses in Deuteronomy

|

Adam Clarke reproduced a long exposition of Kennicott in the

1 first volume of his book while commenting on chapter 10 of

- Deuteronomy that is summarized in the words:

|

The Samaritan version is correct while the Hebrew ver-

sion is wrong. Four verses, that is from 6 to 9, are extremely

E irrelevant in the context and their exclusion from the text

produces a connected text. These four verses were written

here by mistake by the copier. They, in fact, belong to the second

chapter of Deuteronomy.

|

Addition No. 16

|

The book of Deuteronomy contains the following:

|

A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of the

|

Lord, even to his tenth generation shall he not enter in the

|

congregation of the Lord.l

|

It is quite obvious that the above cannot be an injunction from God

or written by Moses, because in that case neither David nor any of

his

ancestors up to Pharez would be able enter the congregation of the

Lord, because Pharez was a bastard as we know from Genesis chapter

38 and David happens to be in his tenth generation as is known from

the first chapter of Matthew. Horsley therefore decided that the

words

"To his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation

of the

lord" are a latter addition.

|

Addition No. 17

|

The compilers of Henry and Scott own commentary said under their

comments on Joshua chapter 4:9:

|

This sentence2 and other similar sentences which are pre-

sent in most of the books of the Old Testament most probably

are later additions.

|

Similarly there are many places where the commentators have

explicitly admitted the presence of additions in these books. For

example, the book of Joshua contains such sentences at 5:9,

8:28-29,

10:27, 13:13-14, 14:15 and 16:10.3 Moreover this book has eight

|

other instances" of phrases which are proved to have been added

later

to the original text. If we were to count all such instances in the

Old

Testament it would require a separate volume.

|

Addition No. 18: The Book of Jasher

|

The book of Joshua has:

|

And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed until the

people had arranged themselves upon their enemies. Is not

this written in the book of Jasher?2

|

This verse cannot, in any case, be the word of Joshua because this

statement is quoted from the book referred to in the verse, and up

to

this day its author is not known. We are, however, informed by II

Sam. 1:18 that he was either a contemporary of the Prophet David or

after him. The compilers of Henry and Scott own commentary main-

tained that the Book of Joshua was written before the seventh year

of

David own succession to throne and according to the books of

Protestant

scholars the Prophet David was bom three hundred and fifty-eight

years after the death of Joshua.

|

Addition No. 19

|

The book of Joshua, describing the inheritance of the children of

Gad, says in chapter 13:25:

|

The land of the children of Ammon, unto Aroer that is

before Rabbah.

|

This verse is wrong and distorted because Moses could not have

given any of the land of the children of Ammon to the children of

Gad, since he had been prohibited by God from doing so, as is

evident

|

from Deuteronomy chapter 2.1 The commentator Horsley had to admit

that the Hebrew version must have been changed here.

|

Addition No. 20

|

We find the following sentence in Joshua chapter 19 verse 34:

|

And to Judah upon Jordan toward the sunrising.

|

This is also wrong because the land of Judah was at a distance

toward the south. Adam Clarke therefore said that the alteration

made

in the text is obvious.

|

Addition No. 21

|

The compilers of Henry and Scott own commentary under their com-

ments on the last chapter of the book of Joshua observed:

|

The last five verses are certainly not the word of Joshua.

Rather they have been added by Phineas or Samuel. It was

customary among the early writers to make such insertions.

|

This is again a plain admission of alteration in the original text.

Their guess that Phineas or Samuel included them in the text is not

acceptable as it is unsupported by ARGUMENT. As for their remarks

that

the ancient Christians habitually altered the text, we may be

allowed

to say that it was the practice of the Jews that deprived these

books of

their originality. Manipulation of the text was not considered a

serious

fault by them. Their common practice of playing with the text

resulted

in serious distortions which were then transferred to other

transla-

tions.

|

Addition No. 22

|

The commentator Horsley says on page 283 of the first volume of

his commentary:

|

Verses 10 to 15 of chapter 11 of the Book of Judges are

later additions.

|

This might be because the event described in them is different

from Joshua 15:13-19. Besides, this event belongs to the lifetime

of

Joshua while in the Book of Judges it is described as an event

happen-

ing after his death.

|

Addition No. 23: Levite or Son of Judah

|

The Book of Judges," giving the description of a certain man of the

family of Judah, uses this phrase, "Who was a Levite." This must be

an error as the commentator Horsley said:

|

This is wrong because, from the sons of Judah, no one

can be a Levite.

|

Houbigant excluded this verse from the text, being convinced that

it was a later addition.

|

Addition No. 24

|

We read in I Samuel the following statement:

|

And he smote the men of Beth-she-mesh, because they

had looked into the ark of the Lord, even he smote of the peo-

ple fifty thousand and threescore and ten men.2

|

This statement is wrong as was observed by Adam Clarke in the

second volume of his commentary. After an analytical examination he

said:

|

It seems most likely that an alteration was made to the

Hebrew version. Either some words were omitted or

unknowingly or otherwise, the words "fifty thousand" were

added, because such a small town could not possibly have

had a population of fifty thousand or more. Besides which

they would have been farmers, busy in their fields. Even more

incredible is the claim that fifty thousand people could, at the

same time, see into the small box which was kept on a stone

in Joshua own field.

|

He further added:

|

The Latin version contains the words: seven hundred gen-

erals and fifty thousand and seventy men; while the Syrian

version says five thousand and seventy men. The historians

give only seventy men. George Salmon and other rabbis give

a different number. These differences, and the over exaggerat-

ed number makes us believe that the text must have been dis-

torted here, either by adding some words or by omitting oth-

ers.

|

Henry and Scott own commentary contains:

|

The number of the men killed, in the Hebrew version, is

written upside down. However, even if we overlook this, it is

incredible that such a large number of people should commit

this sin and be killed in such a small town. The truth of this

event is doubtful. Josephus has written that the number of the

killed men was only seventy.

|

All these commentators are unambiguous in admitting that there is

distortion at this place.

|

Addition No. 25

|

Under his comments on I Samuel 17:18, Adam Clarke points out

|

From this verse to verse 31 of this chapter, verse 41, all

the verses from 54 to the end of the chapter, and the first five

verses of chapter 18, and verses 9,10, 11, 17,18,19 are not

present in the Latin version, while they are present in the

Alexandrian copy of this Book. At the end of his commentary

|

on this chapter Kennicott established that the above verses are

not the part of the original version.

|

In a long discussion he adduced that this verse" was a later addi-

tion. We reproduce a part of his discussion:

|

In reply to your question as to when this addition was

made, I would say, that it was in the time of Josephus. The

Jews, with the purpose of refining the hHoly books, added

fictitious prayers, songs and fresh statements to the original

text. There are innumerable additions in the book of Esther,

the additions regarding wine, women and truth, in the Books

of Ezra and Nehemiah, currently known as the First Book of

Ezra, the songs of the three children added to the Book of

Daniel, and many other additions in the book of Josephus are

all obvious examples of this. It is possible that the above

verses originally existed in the margin, and were later on

included in the text.

|

The commentator Horsley says on page 330 of the first volume of

his commentary:

|

Kennicott knows that twenty verses of chapter 17 of

Samuel, are a later addition and should be excluded from the

text, that is, verses 12 to 31. He hopes that in later versions

they will not be included in the text.

|

We do not understand how the authenticity of these books can be

trusted when there are all these admissions of Kennicott and others

of

people enhancing the beauty of the text by adding material to the

orig-

inal text arbitrarily as they liked. These additions subsequently

became part of all the translations through the ignorance or

careless-

ness of the copiers. This shows that the Protestants falsely claim

that

the Jews did not make any changes in the books, that they were God-

fearing people and considered the Old Testament to be the Word of

God.

|

Addition No. 26

|

The Gospel of Matthew 14:3 contains the following statement:

|

For Herod had laid hold on John, and bound him, and put

him in prison for Herodias" sake, his brother Philip own wife.

|

The Gospel of Mark talks about this event in these words:

|

For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John

and bound him in prison for Herodias" sake his brother

Philip own wife, for he had married her.

|

The Gospel of Luke conLains:

|

But Herod the Tetrarch, being reproved by him for

Herodias, his brother Philip own wife, and for all the evils which

Herod had done, added yet this above all, that he shut up John

in prison.2

|

The name Philip is certainly wrong in all the above three versions.

The historical records do not agree that the name of Herodias" hus-

band was Philip. On the contrary, Josephus claimed that his name

was

also Herod. Since Philip is definitely wrong, Home admitted on page

632 of the first volume of his commentary:

|

Most probably the word "Philip" was wrongly wAtten by

the copier in the text. It should therefore be excluded from the

text. GAesbach has accordingly omitted it.

|

On the contrary, we think that this is one of the mistakes of the

evangelists; the copiers are not responsible for it, as there is no

argu-

ment to support this presumption. It is incredible to believe that

the

copiers should make exactly the same mistake in all the three

Gospels

regarding the same event. This single example of addition in fact.

makes three examples as it appears in the three Gospels referred to

|

above.

|

Addition No. 27: Words added to Luke

|

The Gospel of Luke contains the following words:

|

And the Lord said, Whereunto then shall I liken the men

of this generation and to what are they like."

|

In this verse the words, "And the Lord said," were added later. The

commentator Adam Clarke said about them:

|

These words were never part of Luke own text. The scholars

have rejected them. Bengel and Griesbach excluded these

words from the text.

|

These words have been omitted from the modern English transla-

tions while the King James version still contains them. It is

surpAsing

that they are still included in the Protestant translations. Words

which

have been proved to be a later addition have no reason to remain in

a

text which is supposed to contain the word of God.

|

Addition No. 28

|

We find wAtten in Matthew:

|

Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremiah,

the prophet, saying. "and they took the thirty pieces of silver,

the prAce of him that was valued."

|

The word "Jeremiah" in this verse is one of the well-known mis-

takes of Matthew, because this statement can be traced neither to

Jeremiah nor any other book of the Old Testament. However, a pas-

sage vaguely similar to it is found in the Book of Zechariah 11:13

but

there is an obvious difference between the two which makes it

diffi-

cult to presume that Matthew was quoting it from there. Besides,

the

|

text of the Book of Zechariah has no connection with the event

described by Matthew. Christian scholars have diverse opinions on

this matter. On page 26 of his Book of Errors printed in 1841, Ward

said:

|

Mr. Jewel writes in his book that Mark mistakenly wrote

Abiathar in place of Ahimelech, similarly Mathew mistaken-

ly wrote Jeremiah in place of Zechariah.

|

Horne observed on pages 385 and 386 of the second volume of his

commentary printed in 1822:

|

said:

|

This quote is doubtful, because the Book of Jeremiah

does not contain it though it is found in the Book of

Zechariah 11:13 even if the words of Matthew are different

from it. Some scholars think that it is an error of Matthew own

version and the copier wrote Jeremiah instead of Zechariah;

or it may be a later addition.

|

After having quoted opinions supporting his claim of addition, he

|

Most likely Matthew own text was originally without names

as follows: "Then was fulfilled that which was spoken." This

is supported by the fact that Matthew has the habit of omit-

ting the names of the Prophets when he speaks of them.

|

And on page 625 of the first volume he said:

|

The evangelist did not write the name of the Prophet in

the original, some copier included it later.

|

The above two passages bear witness that he believed that the

word "Jeremiah" was added later. The commentary of D"Oyly and

Richard Mant contains the following comments with regard to this

verse:

|

The words quoted here are not present in the Book of

Jeremiah. They are found in Zechariah 11:13. This may be

|

because some copier in the past, might have written Jeremiah

instead of Zechariah. Subsequently this mistake has found its

way into the text, as Pears has confirmed.

|

Jawad ibn as-Sabat wrote in the introduction of Al-Buraheen As-

sabatiah:

|

I asked many missionaries about this verse. Thomas

replied that it was a mistake of the copier while Buchanan

and others answered that Matthew quoted it simply from his

memory without referring to the books. Another priest said it

could be that Jeremiah was a second name of Zechariah.

|

This leads us to believe that Matthew made the mistakel as was

admitted by Ward, Buchanan and others. Other possibilities are weak

and unsupported by ARGUMENTs. Horne also admitted that Matthew own

words do not correspond to the words of Zechariah and, without

admitting the error of one book, the other cannot be accepted as

cor-

rect. We have presented this witness on the presumption that it was

the mistake of the copier.

|

Bet us now examine the errors found in the Gospel of Mark as

admitted by the Catholic, Ward and Jewel. The text of this Gospel

reads:

|

And he said unto them, Have ye never read what David

did when he had need and was an hungered, he and that they

were with him? How he went into the house of God in the

days of Abiathar, the high Priest, and did eat the shewbread,

which is not lawful to eat but for the priests, and gave also to

them which were with him.2

|

; The word Abiathar in this passage is wrong as has been admitted

|

Oby the above-mentioned author. Similarly the following two

sentences

are wrong: "and that they were with him," and "to them which were

|

r

L l R.A Knox, a recent scholar has allowed no ambiguity to arnit

that Matthew own

ersion has been changed. Commentary on the New Testament.

|

with him." Because the Prophet David at that time was alone and not

accompanied by other people. The readers of the Book of Samuel

know this well. These two sentences are therefore wrong. Similarly

sentences contained in Matthew and Luke must also be wrong. For

example, Matthew 12:34 has:

|

Have ye not read what David did, when he was an hun-

gered, and they that were with him; how he entered into the

house of God, and did eat the shewbread, which was not law-

ful for him to eat, neither for them which were with him, but

only for the priests.

|

And Luke 6:3,4 contains:

|

And Jesus answering them said, Have ye not read so

much as this, what David did, when himself was an hungered,

and they which were with him. How he went into the house

of God, and did take and eat the shewbread and gave also to

them that were with him. Which is not lawful to eat but for

the priests alone.

|

In quoting the above statement of Jesus, the three evangelists made

seven mistakes, if these mistakes are ascribed to the copiers, the

dis-

tortion in all seven places is proved, though it happens to be

against

the apparent evidence that it was the the copiers who were at

fault.

|

Addition No. 29

|

We find in Matthew chapter 27 verse 35:

|

And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting

lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the

Prophet, "They parted my garments among them and upon my

vesture did they cast lots."

|

The Christian scholars do not accept the sentence, "that it might

be

fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophet..." as genuine and

Griesbach even excluded it from the text. Similarly Home presented

ARGUMENTs to prove that it was added later to the text on pages 330

|

and 331 of his first volume and then remarked:

|

Griesbach flnding out the falsity of this sentence has

understandably excluded it from the text.l

|

Under his comments on the same verse, in the fifth book of his

commentary Adam Clarke said:

|

It is imperative to exclude this sentence from the text as it

is not part of it. Later corrected versions have omitted it

except for a few. Similarly it was omitted by many of the

early theologians. It is certainly an addition which has been

taken from the Gospel of John 19:24.

|

Addition No. 30

|

The First Epistle of John contains the following:

|

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father

the Word, and the Holy Ghost: and these three are one. And

there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit and the

water, and the blood: and these three agree in one.2

|

According to the investigations of Christian scholars the original

text was only this:

|

And there are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit

and the water, and the blood, and these three agree in one.

There are three that bear record in heaven, the Father, the

Word, and the Holy Ghost.

|

Griesbach and Sholtz are agreed on its being a later addition.

Horne, in spite of all his prejudice decided that these words

should be

excluded from the text. The compilers of Henry and Scott also fol-

lowed the opinion of Horne and Adam Clarke.

|

l.The current Urdu and English versions omit this sentence. The

King James ver-

sion, however, still contains it.

|

St. Augustine, the great theologian and scholar of the fourth

centu-

ry wrote ten booklets on this epistle but did not include this

sentence

in any of them in spite of being a great preacher of the trinity

and

famous for having had many debates with the followers of Arius. Had

this been a part of the text, he would have used it to support the

trini-

tarian thesis and have quoted it. We personally think that the note

which he added in the margin of this verse, to connect it remotely

with the trinity, was found useful by the trinitarians and was

later

included by them in the text.

|

In the debate that I had with the author of Meezan-ul-Haqq he

admitted that this sentence was a later addition. Presuming that I

would be quoting some more examples of such distortions, he admit-

ted in the very beginning of the discussion that they acknowledged

the presence of distortion in the text at seven or eight places.

Horne

devoted more than twenty pages to examining this verse and at the

end gave a summary of his discussion, which we omit to save the

readers from an unnecessarily lengthy exposition. Henry and Scott own

compilers gave a summary of the conclusion of Horne which we

reproduce below:

|

Horne has presented the ARGUMENTs of both the groups;

we give a summary of his recapitulation. Those who claim

that this passage is false put forward the following ARGUMENTs.

|

1. This passage is not found in any of the Latin versions

written before the sixteenth century.

|

2. This text is missing from the other translations carefully

examined and printed in early times.

|

3. It was never referred to by the ancient theologians nor by

any historians of the church.

|

4. The fathers of the Protestant church either have excluded

it or called it doubtful.

|

Those who consider this verse genuine also have a num-

ber of ARGUMENTs:

|

1. This verse is found in the ancient Latin translation and in

|

r ùost of the ve i

2. This passage is present in the books of Greek doctrine, the

F prayer-book of the Greek church and the old prayer-book

of the English church. It was cited by some early Latin

theologians.

|

The ARGUMENTs presented in the second group makes us understand

the following two points. Firstly, before the availability of

printing

facilities it was possible for the copiers and opponents to

manipulate

the text to suit their whims. This is evident from the examples of

dis-

tortions inserted in the text cited above by the first group. The

passage

in question was removed from the Greek versions and from all other

translations except the Latin translation. Secondly, even the

faithful

Christians used to make deliberate alterations in the holy texts

for the-

ological reasons. When the faithful and the fathers of the faith

do not

hesitate to change the text, blaming the copiers and the people of

other sects cannot be justified. The records show that they did

not

miss any opportunity of altering the text before the invention of

the

printing press. In fact, they are still making alterations.

|

Distortion in Luther own Translation

|

The founder of the Protestant faith and great theologian, Martin

Luther, first translated the holy books into the German language.

He

did not include this passage in his translation. His translation

was

printed several times in his lifetime without this passage. In his

old

age, in 1546 when this translation was being reprinted, Luther,

fully

aware of the general practice of the Christians, felt it necessary

to

includc in his will regarding this edition that no one should make

any

changes it. They were not able by their nature to act upon his

will and

they included this passage in his translation less than thirty

years after

his death.

The first people to add this passage were the people of Frankfurt

when they printed this translation in 1574. Subsequently, either

from

the fear of God or for other reasons, they again excluded this

verse

from it. The trinitarians felt this exclusion very badly, and once

again

|

it was added to it by the people of Wittenberg in 1596 and by the

peo-

ple of Hamburg in 1599. Again the people of Wittenberg, for some

unknown reason, excluded it from the second edition. From then

onward, the Protestants accepted its inclusion in the text. In this

way

the Protestants unanimously acted against the will of their

spiritual

father. The famous unitarian scientist, Isaac Newton, wrote a

treatise

of nearly fifty pages where he proved that this and I Timothy 2:16.

are

both forged and distorted. The latter verse says:

|

And without controversy great is the mystery of godli-

ness: God was manifested in the flesh, justified in the Spirit,

seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles believed on in the

world, received up into glory.

|

Since the above verse also was helpful in establishing the concept

of trinity, it was added to the text by the enthusiasts.

|

Addition No. 31

|

The Book of Revelation contains the words:

|

I was in the Spirit on the Lord own day,l and heard behind

me a great voice, as of a trumpet, saying, I am Alpha and

Omega, the first and the last: and what thou seest, write in a

book.

|

Griesbach and Sholtz are in agreement on the point that the words,

"the first and the last" are not genuine and were added later. Some

translators have omitted them, and in the Arabic translations

printed

in 1671, and 1821, the words Alpha and Omega were also2 omitted.

|

Addition No. 32

|

Acts 8:37 says:

|

And Philipl said, if thou believest with all thine heart,

thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus

Christ is the Son of God.

|

This verse is also a later addition made by some enthusiast to sup-

port the trinity. Griesbach and Sholtz are both agreed on this

point.2

|

Addition No. 33

|

The Book of Acts contains the following:

|

And he said, who art thou Lord? And the Lord said, I am

Jesus whom thou persecutest: it is hard for thee to kick

against the pricks. And he trembling and astonished said,

Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said unto

him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what

thou must do.3

|

Griesbach and Sholtz agreed that the sentence "it is hard for thee

to kick against the pricks" is a later addition.

|

Addition No. 34

|

The Book of Acts chapter 10 verse 6 contains:

|

He lodgeth with one Simon, a tanner, whose house is by

the seaside. He shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do.

|

Griesbach and Sholtz are positive that the words "he shall tell

thee

what thou oughtest to do" are later addition4 and not genuine.

|

Addition No. 35

|

ù I Corinthians chapter 10 verse 28 says:

|

1. The disciple of Christ referred to said this to an Ethiopian on

the way to Gaza.

|

2. In the Urdu version this verse has a sign of doubt while the new

English ver-

5ion has ornitted it and the King James version own list of

alternative readings and ren-

der ngs includes the suggestion "omit verse".

|

3. Acts 9: 5-6.

|

4. This sentence does not eist in the new English versions.

|

But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice

unto idols, eat not for his sake that showed it and for con-

science" sake: for the earth is the Lord own and the fulness there-

of.

|

The last sentence, "for the earth is the Lord own and the fulness

there-

of", is not genuine and is an addition." Home, after proving this

verse

to be an addition, said on page 337 vol. 2:

|

Griesbach, after being sure of its being an addition,

excluded it from the text. The truth is that this sentence has

no support and is certainly an addition. Most probably it was

taken from verse 26.

|

Adam Clarke said about this sentence:

|

Griesbach excluded it from the text, and in fact it has no

authority.

|

Addition No. 36

|

The Gospel of Matthew contains:

|

A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth

forth good things.2

|

The word "heart" in this verse is an addition.3 Home, after proving

this, said on page 330 of vol. 2 of his book that this word had

been

taken from Luke 6:45.

|

Addition No. 37: Addition to the Lord own Prayer

|

We find in Matthew chapter 6 verse 13:

|

And lead us not into Temptation, but deliver us from evil:

|

For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for

ever.

|

The words "For thine is ..." etc.l up to the end of this verse are

an

addition The followers of the Roman Catholic sect are certain of

this

fact. It does not exist in the Latin version nor in any of the

translations

of this sect. The Catholics are very displeased at its addition,

and

strongly reproach those responsible for it. Ward, the Catholic,

said in

k his Book of Errors (printed in 1841) on page 18:

|

Erasmus greatly condemned this sentence. Bullinger also

said that this sentence had been added later and the name of

the includer is not yet known. Laurentius Valla and Lamen own

claim that this passage was omitted from the word of God has

no support of ARGUMENT. He should have reproached the peo-

ple who played with the word of God so daringly.

|

Other scholars have also rejected it. Adam Clarke, who has doubt

about its being a later addition, still admits that Griesbach and

Wenstein rejected this verse. According to the scholars of both the

Catholics and the Protestants, this sentence has been added to the

prayer of Christ. This shows that even such a famous prayer could

not

k escape from their practice of distortion.

|

, Addition No. 38

|

The Gospel of John chapter 7 verse 53 and the first eleven verses

of chapter 8 are later additions. Though Horne does not support

this2

|

; 1. The King James version contains this sentence while the new

English transla-

n has ornits it.

|

1. l hese verses describe a woman accused of adultery being brought

to the pres-

eDce of Christ and people demanding that she be stoned to death.

Christ decided that

e one without sin among them should throw e first stone at her. The

people, con-

cted by their own consciences, left the place one by one. Christ

allowed the woman

go and advised her not to sin again. The new English translation

omits this passage

m this place but at the end it has has been included with a

translator own note that

se verses have no definite place in the old scriptures. Some other

translations do

I not have this passage at all, while some others place it in Luke

after 21:38. Some

IB anslation5 have even placed it after John 7:36 or 7:53 or 21:24

(New English

|

But if any man say unto you, This is offered in sacrifice

unto idols, eat not for his sake that showed it and for con-

science" sake: for the earth is the Lord own and the fulness there-

of.

|

The last sentence, "for the earth is the Lord own and the fulness

there-

of", is not genuine and is an addition. Horne, after proving this

verse

to be an addition, said on page 337 vol. 2:

|

Griesbach, after being sure of its being an addition,

excluded it from the text. The truth is that this sentence has

no support and is certainly an addition. Most probably it was

taken from verse 26.

|

Adam Clarke said about this sentence:

|

Griesbach excluded it from the text, and in fact it has no

authority.

|

Addition No. 36

|

The Gospel of Matthew contains:

|

A good man out of the good treasure of the heart bringeth

forth good things.2

|

The word "heart" in this verse is an addition.3 Horne, after

proving

this, said on page 330 of vol. 2 of his book that this word had

been

taken from Luke 6:45.

|

Addition No. 37: Addition to the Lord own Prayer

|

We find in Matthew chapter 6 verse 13:

|

And lead us not into Temptation, but deliver us from evil:

|

For thine is the Kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for

ever.

|

The words "For thine is ..." etc.l up to the end of this verse are

an

addition. The followers of the Roman Catholic sect are certain of

this

fact. It does not exist in the Latin version nor in any of the

translations

of this sect. The Catholics are very displeased at its addition,

and

strongly reproach those responsible for it. Ward, the Catholic,

said in

his Book of Errors (printed in 1841) on page 18:

|

Erasmus greatly condemned this sentence. Bullinger also

said that this sentence had been added later and the name of

the includer is not yet known. Laurentius Valla and Lamen own

claim that this passage was omitted from the word of God has

no support of ARGUMENT. He should have reproached the peo-

ple who played with the word of God so daringly.

|

Other scholars have also rejected it. Adam Clarke, who has doubt

about its being a later addition, still admits that Griesbach and

Wettstein rejected this verse. According to the scholars of both

the

Catholics and the Protestants, this sentence has been added to the

prayer of Christ. This shows that even such a famous prayer could

not

escape from their practice of distortion.

|

Addition No. 38

|

The Gospel of John chapter 7 verse 53 and the first eleven verses

of chapter 8 are later additions. Though Horne does not support

this2

|

1. The King James version contains this sentence while the new

English transla-

tion has omits it.

|

1. These verses describe a woman accused of adultery being brought

to the pres-

ence of Christ and people demanding that she be stoned to death.

Christ decided that

the one without sin among them should throw the first stone at her.

The people, con-

victed by their own consciences, left the place one by one. Christ

allowed the woman

to go and advised her not to sin again. The new English translation

omits this passage

from this place but at the end it has has been included with a

translator own note that

these verses have no definite place in the old scriptures. Some

other translations do

not have this passage at all, while some others place it in Luke

after 21:38. Some

other translations have even placed it after lohn 7:36 or 7:53 or

21:24 (New English

Biblepage 184).

|

opinion, he still said on page 310 of vol. 4 of his commentary:

|

The following scholars do not acknowledge the genuine-

ness of this verse: Erasmus,l Calvin, Beza, Leclerc, Grotius,

Wettstein, Semler, Sholtz, Maurus, Haenlien, Paultnus,

Schmidt and many other authors mentioned by Wolf and

Koecher.

|

He further said:

|

Chrysostom and Theophylactus wrote commentaries on

this gospel but they did not include these verses in their com-

ments. Though Tertullian and Cyprian wrote essays on adul-

tery and chastity, they did not seek any support from these

verses. Had these verses existed in the versions they had, they

must have cited these verses in support.

|

Ward said:

|

Some ancient theologians raised objections with regard to

the beginning verses of chapter 8 of the Gospel of John.

|

Norton similarly decided that these verses were certainly a

later addition.

|

Addition No. 39

|

Matthew 6:18 contains:

|

And thy father which seeth in secret shall reward thee

openly.

|

The word "openly" in this verse is an addition. Adam Clarke under

his comments on this verse proved it and said:

|

Since this word had no authority, Griesbach, Grotius,

Bengel, and Mill excluded it ftom the text.

|

1. Erasmus (1466-1536), the farnous sixteenth centUry scholar; one

of the great

leaders of the Renaissance.

|

, Addition No. 40

|

Mark 2:17 contains the words "to repentance"" which is also a

E later addition. This was shown by Adam Clarke with sufficient

proofs

and he observed:

|

Griesbach omitted this and Grotius, Mill and Bengel fol-

lowed him.

|

Addition No. 41

|

Similarly Matthew 9:13 also contains the phrase "to repentance"

which is a later addition. Adam Clarke after establishing this

said:

|

Mill and Bengel suggested its exclusion, while Griesbach

has already excluded it from the text.

|

Addition No. 42

|

We find in Matthew:

|

Ye know not what ye ask. Are ye able to drink of the cup,

that I shall drink of, and to be baptized with the baptism that I

am baptized with? They say unto him, we are able. And he

saith unto them, Ye shall drink indeed of my cup and be bap-

, tized with the baptism that I am baptized with.2

|

In this verse the statement that "to be baptized with the baptism

that I am baptized with," is a later addition, and similarly the

state-

ment, "ye shall be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized

with,"

iS not genuine.

|

Adam Clarke, after establishing that both the verses are an addi-

; tion, said:

|

According to the rules set by the scholars for distinguish-

ing the wrong from the correct text, these two statements do

not seem to be a part of the original text.

|

Addition No. 43

|

The Gospel of Luke contains:

|

But he tumed and rebuked them and said, Ye know not

what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of man is not

come to destroy men own lives but to save them. And they went

to another village.l

|

The verse beginning with, "For the Son of man....", is not genuine

and was added later by an unknown writer. Adam Clarke observed

with regard to this verse:

|

Griesbach excluded this verse from the text. Most likely

this passage in old versions was only this much: "But he

tumed and rebuked them and said, Ye know not what manner

of spirit ye are of. And they went to another village."

|

OMISSIONS IN THE TEXT OF THE BIBLE

|

Omission No. 1: The Length of the Israelites" Stay in Egypt

|

The Book of Genesis contains this statement:

|

And he said unto Abram, Know of a surety that thy seed

shall be a stranger in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve

them; and they shall afflict them four hundred years.2

|

The statement "and shall afflict them four hundred years," and

another similar statement contained in verse 14 of the same

chapter,

which is, "When they shall serve and afterwards shall they come out

with great substance," both clearly denote that the land referred

to

|

here is the land of Egypt, because those who afflicted the

Israelites

and made them their servants and then were punished by God were

none but the Egyptians. It was from Egypt that they came out with

great wealth. This description does not fit any other place.

However,

Exodus 2:40 contradicts the above statement:

|

Now that sojournLng of the children of Israel, who dwelt

in Egypt was four hundred and thirty years.

|

The period of sojoum is different in the two verses. Either the

word "thirty" has been omitted from the first verse or added to the

lat-

ter. Besides, the period described by both verses is certainly not

cor-

rect for the following reasons.

|

Firstly, the Prophet Moses was the grandson of Levi on his moth-

er own side and great grandson on his father own side. On his mother own

side

he is the son of Jochebed, the daughter of Levi, while on his

father own

side he is the son of Amran, son of Kohath, son of Levi. This

implies

that Amran married his aunt, the sister of his father, as is indeed

understood from Exodus 6, and Numbers 26. Kohath, the grandfather

of Moses was bom before the Israelites came into Egypt, a fact

which

can be ascertained from Genesis 26:11. The period of the

Israelites"

stay in Egypt cannot therefore exceed 215 years.

|

Secondly, almost all the Christian commentators and historians are

unanimous on the point that the period of the Israelites" stay in

Egypt

is 215 years. The Arabic book Murshid at-Talibeen, written by a

Protestant scholar and printed in 1840, contains the chronology of

the

events from the beginning of the creation to the birth of Jesus.

Each

event is preceded and followed by a year. The preceding year

denotes

the number of years from the creation of the world while the

follow-

ing year signifies the number of years from that event to the birth

of

Jesus. On page 346 of this book, describing the stay of the Prophet

Joseph and his father and brothers in Egypt, it says:

|

2298: Joseph own and his father own stay: 1706.

|

2513: Crossing of the Red Sea by the Israelites and

the Drowning of Pharaoh: 1491.

|

Now a deduction of either of the smaller numbers from the

greater ones gives us 215, thus:

|

2513 - 2298 = 215

1706 - 1491 = 215

|

Thirdly Paul own letter to the Galatians says:

|

Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made.

He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to

thy seed, which is Christ. And this I say, that the covenant

that was confirmed before of God in Christ, the law which

was four hundred and thirty years after cannot disannul that it

should make the promise of none effect.l

|

This statement is in clear contradiction of the statement found in

Exodus, where the total period from the promise to the revelation

of

the Torah is described as four hundred and thirty years, while this

promise to Abraham was made much earlier than the coming of the

Israelites to Egypt, and the Torah was revealed to Moses long after

their exodus from Egypt. This implies that the total period of

their

stay in Egypt was much less than 430 years.2 Since this statement

was

erroneous it was corrected in the Greek and Samaritan versions with

these words:

|

And the sojourning of the children of Israel and their

forefathers who dwelt in Egypt and Canaan was four hundred

and thirty years.

|

That is, the word "forefathers" and "Canaan" were added to the

above text in both the versions. Adam Clarke under his comments on

this verse said on page 369 of volume one:

|

There is unanimous agreement on the fact that the mean-

ings of this verse are obscure and doubtful.

|

We may be allowed to contend that the contents of this verse

are not obscure and doubtful but they are certainly wrong, as we

intend to show very soon. The author further quoted from the

Samaritan version and said:

|

The reading of the text of Alexandrinus is similar to that

of the Sarnaritan version. Many leamed scholars have decided

that the Samaritan version is the most reliable, as far as the

five books of the Pentateuch are concemed. And it is an

established fact that the text of Alexandrinus is older and the

most authentic of au the Greek translations and Paul own state-

ment is not doubted by any one. Now this matter has been

decided by the witness of the above three versions. Besides

there are historical evidences to favour this opinion. Isaac was

bom 25 years after Abraham own coming to Canaan and Isaac

was 60 years old when Jacob was bom to him, and Jacob 130

years of age when he came to Egypt. All this adds up to 215

years, which is the total period of stay of the Israelites in

Egypt, in this way the total number of years becomes 430

years.

|

Henry and Scott own compilers also acknowledge that the total period

of the stay in Egypt is 215 years. Quoting from the Samaritan

version

they said:

|

There is no doubt that this text is correct and explains the

difficulties raised by the text.

|

The above shows that Christian scholars can find no explanation

for the above text of Exodus and have to adrnit its being

erroneous.

Paul own description as quoted above is also not free from error,

because

he counted the period from the time of the promise, which is one

year

prior to the birth of Isaac, as is known from Genesis 17:21

referred to

above:

|

But my covenant will I establish with Isaac which Sarah

shau bear unto thee at this set time in the next year.

|

The Torah was given to them three months after the exodus from

Egypt as is described in chapter 19 of Exodus. Now according to the

calculations of Adam Clarke this total period comes to 407 years

and

not 430 years. The same calculations are found in the books of

history

by Protestant writers which is contrary to what Paul claimed, that

is,

430 years. The book "Murshid at-Talibeen" says on page 345:

|

2107: God own covenant with Abraham, change of his name to

Abraham, Institution of circumcision. Lot own escape.

Death of Hadum, Amra, Adaira and Zebaim on account

of their misdeeds....1897.

|

Further on page 347 it records:

|

2514: Ordination of "the Laws" on Mount Sinai.. 1490.

Now the smaller number deduced from the larger gives

407.

2514-2107 = 407. 1897-1490 = 407.

|

Omission No. 2

|

The Book of Genesis states:

|

And Cain talked with Abel, his brother, and it came to

pass when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against

Abel, his brother, and slew him.2

|

The Samaritan, Greek, and other ancient translations describe it in

these words:

|

And Cain said unto Abel his brother, Rise let us go into

the field, and it came to pass that they were in the field etc.

|

The phrase, "let us go in the field is omitted in the Hebrew ver-

sion. Horne said on page 193 of vol. 2, of his commentary:

|

This is present in the Samaritan, Greek, and Syrian ver-

sions, as well as in the Latin edition printed in Vulgate and

Walton. Kennicott decided that it should be included in the

Hebrew version. No doubt this is a good description.

|

Further on page 338 of the same volume he said:

|

Sometimes the text of Greek version is more correct but it

is not found in the current Hebrew translations. For example

the Hebrew translations, printed or handwritten manuscripts,

are defective with regard to this verse. And the translator of

the English authorised version could not understand this

verse. He therefore translated, "and Cain talked to his brother

Abel". This defect has been made up in the Greek version.

This version became similar to the Samaritan, Latin, Syrian

and Akola translations, and also to the two commentaries in

the two Chaldean languages, and according to the sentence

copied by Philo.

|

Adam Clarke said the same as was said by Home. This passage

was included in the Arabic translation of 1831 and 1848.

|

Omission No. 3

|

The book of Genesis 7:17 of the Hebrew version contains:

|

And the flood was forty days upon the earth.

|

The same sentence appears in many Latin and Greek translations:

|

And the flood was forty days and nights upon the earth.

|

Horne said in his first volume:

|

The word "nights" ought to be added in the Hebrew

version.

|

Omission No. 4

|

Genesis 35:22 in the Hebrew version reads as follows:

|

And it came to pass when Israel dwelt in that land that

Reuben went and lay with Bilhah, his father own concubine and

Israel heard it.

|

The compilers of Henry and Scott said:

|

The Jews admit that something from this verse has been

certainly omitted. The Latin version has supplemented the

words with, "he was evil in his sight," to compensate for the

omission.

|

This is clear example of omission in the text as admitted by the

Jews which is hardly surprising in view of their normal practice of

changing their holy texts.

|

Omission No. 5

|

Horsley commenting on Genesis 44:5 said on page 82 of volume

one of his commentary:

|

At the beginning of this verse in the Greek translation the

following sentence has been added, "Why hast thou robbed

me of my measure."

|

According to him the above sentence was omitted in the Hebrew

version.

|

Omission No. 6

|

The Book of Genesis chapter 50 verse 25 contains:

|

And ye shall carry up my bones from hence.

|

The Samaritan, Latin and Greek translations and other old versions

have it in these words:

|

And ye shall carry up my bones with ye.

|

The words "with ye" have been omitted from the Hebrew version.

|

Horne said:

|

Mr. Boothroyd has inserted these omitted words in his

new translation of the Bible and he has done right.

|

Omission No. 7

|

Exodus 2:22 contains:

|

And she bare him a son, and he called his name

Gershom,l for he said, I have been stranger in a strange land.

|

The text of the Greek, Latin and other old translations is followed

by the following additional statement:

|

And a second time also she bare him a son and he called

his name Eleazar, for he said the lord of my father helped me

and saved me from the sword of Pharaoh.

|

Adam Clarke, quoting the above passage from the translations said

on page 310 of volume one:

|

Houbigant has included this passage in his Latin transla-

tion and claimed that the proper place of this passage was

here, while none of the Hebrew versions, printed or

manuscript, contains this. It is present in all the authentic

translations.

|

Omission No. 8

|

The book of Exodus 6:20 says:

|

And she bare him Aaron and Moses and Mary, their

sister.

|

The words "their sister" have been omitted in the Hebrew version.

Adam Clarke after reproducing the text of the Greek and Samaritan

version said:

Some great scholars think that these words were present

in the Hebrew version.

|

Omission No. 9

|

Numbers chapter 10 verse 6 has:

|

When ye blow an alarm the second time the camps that

lie on the south side shall take their joumey.

|

And at the end of this verse in the Greek version it says:

|

When ye blow a third time then the camps that lie on the

west side shall take their journey. And when ye blow a fourth

time then the camps that lie on the north side shall take their

joumey.

|

Adam Clarke said on page 663 of volume 1 of his commentary:

|

The west and the north camps are not mentioned, but it

seems that they used to make their journey at the blowing of

an alarm. It proves that the Hebrew text at this place is defec-

tive. The Greek translations added the following sentence,

"And when ye blow a third time the camps on the west side

shall take their joumey, and when ye blow a fourth time that

are on the north side shall take joumey."

|

Omission No. 10

|

Job 42:17 says:

|

So Job died, being old and full of days.

|

The Hebrew version ends at this sentence, while the Greek version

contains the following additional sentence:

|

He shall resume life a second time with those whom the

Lord shall recover.

|

It has also been supplemented with short description of Job own

genealogy and other circumstances. Calmet and Harder claim that

this

supplement is part of the revealed text. This opinion is favoured

by

Philo and Polyhistor. It was also acknowledged by the people of

Origen own time. Theodotion also included this supplement in his

Greek

translation. This proves that the Hebrew version has been distorted

by

the omission of the above supplement. Protestant scholars are,

howev-

er, unanimous on the point that the above supplement is a later

addi-

tion and not genuine. The compilers of Henry and Scott own commen-

tary said:

|

Apparently it is a forged description, though it was writ-

ten some time before Christ.

|

We may be allowed to ask, if the above passage belongs to the

period before Christ, how did the ancient Christians believe it to

be

the word of God right from the time of the Apostles up to the year

1500, because they acknowledged these translations as genuine, and

claimed that the Hebrew version was distorted.

|

Omission No. 11

|

Psalm 14 of the Latin, Arabic, Ethiopic and Greek translations

contains the following:

|

Their throat is an open sepulchre, with their tongues they

have used deceit; the poison of asps is under their lips. Whose

mouth is full of cursing and bittemess, their feet are swift to

shed blood. Destruction and misery are in their ways and the

way of peace have they not known. There is no fear of God

before their eyes.

|

The above description cannot be found in the Hebrew version. It

is, however, found in Paul own letter to the Romans. Now either the

Jews

discarded it from the Hebrew version or the Christians added it in

their translations to support Paul own description. In any case it is

a dis-

tortion either in the form of an omission or in the fomm of an

addition.

Adam Clarke said under his comments on the above verse:

|

After this verse in the Vatican version of the Ethiopic

translation and in the Arabic translation verses have appeared

which are present in Paul own letter to the Romans 3:13-18.

|

Omission No. 12

|

Isaiah 40:5 in the Hebrew version says:

|

And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh

shall see it together for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it.

|

While the Greek translations contain these words:

|

And the glory of the Lord shall be revealed and all flesh

shall soon see to the salvation of our God for the mouth of the

Lord hath spoken it.

|

Adam Clarke quoting the above passage of the Greek translations

said on page 785 of vol. 4 of his book:

|

I think that this passage is genuine.

|

He further said:

|

This omission in the Hebrew version is very old and even

older than the Latin, Chaldean and Syrian translations. This

passage is present in all the versions of the Greek translations.

Luke also acknowledged it in chapter 3 verse 6.1 I possess a

very old translation where this verse is missing.

|

Home said in chapter 8 of vol. 2 of his book:

|

Luke 3:6 is written according to the Latin translation.

Noth (Loth) included it in his translation of the book of Isaiah

because he thought it was original.

|

The compilers of Henry and Scott suggested that:

|

It is essential to add the words "the salvation of our God"

after the words "shall see". Chapter 53 verse 10 of the Greek

translation should be seen.

|

According to the above commentators the Hebrew text has been

distorted by omitting the above verse and Adam Clarke thinks that

this distortion is very old.

|

Omission No. 13

|

Adam Clarke said commenting on chapter 64 verse 5 of the Book

of Isaiah:

|

I believe that the copier is responsible for the omission in

this verse. This distortion is very old. Since the translators of

the past were not able to comprehend the meaning of the

verse as has been the case with their successors.

|

Omission No. 14

|

Home said in his commentary on page 477:

|

The Gospel of Luke has omitted a complete verse of

chapter 11 from between verses 33 and 34. It is therefore nec-

essary to add part of Matthew 24:36 or Mark 13:32 so that

Luke may become similar to the other two Gospels.

|

Again he said in a marginal note:

|

All the scholars and commentators ignored this defect in

Luke own text, until it was observed by Hales. The above shows

clearly that a complete verse has been omitted by Luke which

must be added to it. The verse according to Matthew is this:

"But of that day and hour knoweth no man; no, not the angels

of heaven; but my father only. "

|

Omission No. 15

|

Acts 16:7 says:

|

But the Spirit suffered them not.

|

Griesbach and Sholtz said that the correct text is:

|

But the spirit of Jesus suffered them not.

|

According to them the word Jesus was omitted. Later, this word

was added to the text in the Arabic versions of 1671 and 1821. Now

the text in these versions reads:

|

But the spirit of Jesus suffered theml not.

|

Omission No. 16

|

The Gospel of Matthew is not Matthew own . The present Gospel of

Matthew which is ascribed to him, and happens to be the first

Gospel,

and is considered to be the earliest, was certainly not written by

Matthew. The original Gospel written by him was destroyed long long

ago. All the ancient Christians and a number of later scholars are

unanimous on the point that the original Gospel of Matthew which

was in the Hebrew language was destroyed because it had been dis-

torted by some of the Christian sects.

|

The Christians do not possess any authority to prove its

authentici-

ty and indeed the name of its author is not yet known. Jerome, the

most renowned and celebrated scholar among the ancient writers,

admitted it. They have only conjectures with regard to its

translator

which obviously cannot be accepted as an ARGUMENT. A book cannot

be ascribed to a person simply on the basis of unsupported calcula-

tions. Now the claim made by Protestant scholars that Matthew, him-

self, translated it is not valid unless they present some

acceptable

ARGUMENT to prove it. Now we will produce some witnesses to prove

our claim. The Encyclopaedia Britannica vol.l9 says:

|

Every book of the New Testament was written in Greek

except the Gospel of Matthew and the Epistle to the Hebrews.

It is certain, on the ground of strong ARGUMENTs, that these two

books were written in the Hebrew language.

|

Lardner stated in vol. 2 on page 119:

|

Papias observed that Matthew had written his Gospel in

Hebrew. Later on everyone translated it according to their

own ability.

|

The above implies that there are many writers who have translated

this Gospel. Now unless the writer of the present Gospel is

definitely

known and it is proved through irrefutable ARGUMENTs that the

writer

was a man of inspiration, this book should not be, and cannot be,

included among the revealed books. We do not even know the name

of its translator let alone whether he was a man of inspiration.

Further

Lardner said on page 170 of the same volume:

|

Irenaeus wrote that Matthew wrote his Gospel for the

Jews in their language at the time when Paul and Peter were

preaching in Rome.

|

Further he said on page 574 of the same volume:

|

There are statements of Origen, first written by Eusebius,

that Matthew gave the Gospel to the Jews in the Hebrew lan-

guage; secondly that Matthew wrote his Gospel first for the

Hebrews; thirdly that Matthew wrote the Gospel for the

Hebrews who were waiting the birth of a man who was

promised to the progeny of Abraham and David.

|

Again he said on page 95 of volume 4 that Eusebius had written

that Matthew, after his sermons to the Hebrews who were deciding to

go to other communities, wrote his Gospel in their language and

gave

it to them. And on page 174 of the same volume he says that Cyril

said that Matthew wrote the Gospel in the Hebrew language.

And on page 187 of the same volume he said:

|

Epiphanius writes that Matthew wrote the Gospel in the

Hebrew language. He is unique in using this language in writ-

ing the New Testament.

|

Further on page 439 he wrote:

|

Jerome wrote that Matthew wrote the Gospel in the

Hebrew language for believing Jews in a Jewish land. He did

not combine the truth of the Gospel with the law.

|

Again on page 441 he said:

|

Jerome noted in his list of historians that Matthew wrote

his Gospel for believing Jews in the Hebrew script in the land

of Jews. It is not yet proved that it was translated into Greek,

neither is the name of its translator known. Besides, it must

be noted that the copy of his Hebrew Gospel which was col-

lected by Pamphilus with great labour is still present in the

library of Syria. I obtained a copy of this Gospel with the help

of the assistants in the district of "Barya". They also had this

version with them.

|

Further he writes on page 501 of the same volume:

|

Augustine said that out of the four Evangelists, only

Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language while the

others wrote theirs in Greek.

|

And on page 538 of the same volume he said:

|

Chrysostom writes that it is said that Matthew wrote his

Evangel on the request of believing Jews in the Hebrew lan-

guage.

|

And on page 1371 of volume 5 he writes:

|

Isidore said that only Matthew out of the four evangelists

wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language while others wrote

theirs in Greek.

|

Horne said in volume 4 of his commentary that:

|

Bellarmine, Grotius, Causabon, Walton, Tomline, Cue,

Hammond, Mill, Harwood, Owen, Calmet, Michaelis,

|

Irenaeus, Origen, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Jerome and

other ancient and modem writers have followed the view of

Papias that this Gospel was written in the Hebrew language.

|

1 And by "other" he refers to Gregory Nazianzen, Abed, Theophy-

lactus. Euthymius, Eusebius, Athanasius, Augustine and many others

who have been named by Watson and Lardner in their books. D"Oyly

and Richard Mant own commentary contains the following:

|

There was great controversy in the past over the question

of the language in which this Gospel was originally written,

but many of the ancient writers determined that Matthew had

written his Gospel in the Hebrew language and this is there-

fore now an established point of view.

|

The compilers of Henry and Scott own commentary said:

|

The disappearance of the Hebrew version was due to the

fact that the Ebionites, who disbelieved the divinity of Christ,

made changes in this version. Then after the fau of Jerusalem

it disappeared.

|

Some writers think:

|

The Nazarenes or the Jewish proselytes altered the

Hebrew Gospels, and the Ebionites discarded many sentences

from it. Eusebius quoted Irenaeus saying that Matthew wrote

his Gospel in the Hebrew language.

|

Reuss observed in his Histoire de l"Evangile:

|

Anyone who says that Matthew wrote his Gospel in

Greek is wrong because Eusebius in his history and many

other theologians of Christianity explicitly mentioned that

Matthew wrote his Gospel in the Hebrew language, and not in

Greek.

|

Norton has written a voluminous book in which he proved that the

Pentateuch is not a genuine book and not the one written by Moses.

|

He acknowledged the Evangel after admitting the presence of many

distortions in the Gospels. This is why he is not very popular

among

the Christians. Since he is a Christian and has quoted many of the

ancient writers, it is quite in order to quote at least one passage

from

him. He writes on page 45 of his book printed in 1837 in Boston in

a

marginal note:

|

People believe that Matthew wrote his Gospel in the

Hebrew language, because all the ancient writers referring to

this subject are all unanimous on this point. I leave aside the

writers who are not considered authentic, and I assert that

Papias, Irenaeus, Origen, Eusebius and Jerome admitted the

fact that this Gospel was written in Hebrew. There is none

among the ancients who say anything contrary to this. This is

a great witness, indeed, because they, too, were as much prej-

udiced religiously as the people of modem times. Had there

been any room for any doubt in what the ancients said, their

opponents led by their prejudices, would have said that the

Greek Gospel was the original Gospel and not a translation.

We should not reject this ancient and unanimous witness,

especially when it does not deprive us of anything. It is there-

fore necessary that we maintain the belief that Matthew wrote

his Gospel in the Hebrew language. Up to this day I could not

find any objection calling for research on this subject. On the

contrary I have found valuable witnesses among the ancients

to the effect that the Hebrew version of this Gospel, be it gen-

uine or distorted, was with the Christians who were of Jewish

race.

|

The above statements unambiguously prove that Matthew wrote

his Gospel in the Hebrew language and in Hebrew script. The ancient

writers are unanimous on this point. Their opinion in this matter

is

final as was acknowledged by D"Oyly and Richard Mant. They also

admitted that the Hebrew version was in existence up to the time of

Jerome. It is also clear from the above that the name of its

translator is

not yet known. Home, in spite of admitting the above opinion, said

that it is most probable that Matthew wrote it in two languages, in

|

Hebrew and in Greek. This is unacceptable because he has not pro-

duced any authority for his assumption.

|

The opinion of the ancients is also strengthened by the fact that

atthew was one of the Aposdes who was an eye-witness of Christ own

life and a direct listener to him. Now had he been the author of

dhe

present Gospel there must have been an indication somewhere in dhe

Gospel that he is relating his own observations. He would have used

the first person somewhere in the Gospel for himself as was the

prac-

tice of the ancients. The Aposdes used the first person for

themselves

which is evident from the letters that are included in the New

Testament, indicating that they are written by them.

|

Have you not seen dhe writings of Luke. He wrote his Gospel and

the Book of Acts up to chapter 19, dlrough what he heard from

others.

He uses the first person when referring to himself. For instance

when

he accompanies Paul on his joumeys and writes those circumstances

in chapter 20 he refers to himself in the first person. If anyone

refutes

this by referring to dhe Pentateuch and the Gospel of John, we

would

simply say dhat these two books are of doubtful authenticityl as we

have shown in the first part of this book. The obvious cannot be

denied unless dhere is a strong ARGUMENT against it. We also under-

stand from the statement of the compilers of Henry and Scott dhat

this

Gospel, in the early period of Christianity, was not considered to

be

authentic. In dhat period dhe Christians were in the habit of

changing

the texts of dheir sacred books, (as we have seen earlier). Now

when

the original text could not be saved from distortions, how can one

believe that a translation whose author is not even known can have

remained unchanged? Faustus, the celebrated scholar of dhe Mani-

chaeans, said:

|

The Gospel which is ascribed to Matthew is not his

writing.

|

1. That is if they claim that Moses has not used the first person

for hirnself in the

Pentateuch we would say that on the basis of sound ARGUMENTs we do

not acknowl-

edge that the present Torah was written by Moses.

|

Professor Germain said:

|

The whole of this Gospel is false.

|

This Gospel was with the Marcionites but the first two chapters

were missing from it. They think that these two chapters were added

to it later. The Ebionites are of the same opinion. The Unitarian

schol-

ars and Father William have rejected both these chapters.

|

Omission No. 17

|

Matthew 2:23 contains:

|

And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth, that it

might be fulfilled which was spoken by the Prophets. He shall

be called a Nazarene.

|

The words, "which was spoken by the Prophets" in the above is

one of the famous errors of this Gospel, because it is not found in

any

of the known books of the Prophets. We would say what the Catholic

scholars have said in this matter, that this was present in the

books of

the Prophets but the Jews, out of their enmity to the Christians,

removed all those passages. This is another exa nple of omission;

that

a certain sect should destroy holy books simply for personal

reason.

Manfred, a Catholic scholar, wrote a book called The Questions of

the

Question printed in London in 1843, in which he said:

|

The books which contained this description (quoted by

Matthew) have been destroyed, because in any of the present

books of the Prophets we do not find the statement that Jesus

would be called "Nazarene."

|

Chrysostom said in volume 9 of his book:

|

Many books of the Prophets have disappeared not

because the Jews carelessly lost them, but rather because out

of their dishonesty and perversion they burnt these books to

ashes.

|

, This statement is very near to the truth. We must keep in mind

what Justin said in his polemic against Trypho:

|

The Jews excluded many books from the old Testament

so that the New Testament would appear not to conform with

the Old Testament. This shows that many books have been

destroyed.

|

The above leads us to conclude firstly, that the Jews have

destroyed many books of the Prophets and secondly, that it was easy

to distort holy texts in the past. We have seen that by their

burning

these books they completely obliterated their existence. In view of

|

their dishonest attitude towards their holy books it is just

possible that

they might have changed the texts of their books which they thought

could be helpful to the Muslims.

|

Omission No. 18

|

Matthew 10:11 contains:

|

And Josiah begat Jeconiah and his brethren, about the

time they were carried away to Babylon.

|

This shows that Jeconiah and his brothers are the sons of.Josiah

and that they were bom at the time of their exile to Babylon. All

the

infommation given here is erroneous. Firstly because Jeconiah is

the

son of Jehoiakim, son of Josiah, that is, he is the grandson of

Josiah

and not his son. Secondly Jeconiah had no brothers. His father,

how-

ever had three brothers. Thirdly because Jeconiah was not bom at

the

time of exile to Babylon, he was eighteen years old at the time of

exile. Adam Clarke said:

|

Calmet has suggested that the eleventh verse should be

read thus: "Josiah begat Jehoiakim and his brethren and

Jehoiakim begat Jechoniah about the time they were carried

to Babylon."

|

The above implies that Calmet has suggested the addition of the

name of Jehoiakim in the verse, in other words this name has been

omitted from this verse. Even then the third objection remains

unan-

swered.

|

We have produced almost a hundred examples of distortions in the

form of alterations additions and omissions in the above three sec-

tions. There are many more examples of such distortions in the

Bible

which we have not produced here to avoid making the present work

unnecessarily long. This much is more than enough to prove the

pres-

ence of distortion in the Bible in aU the three forms: alteration,

addi-

tion, and omission.

|

REFUTATION OF MISLEADING PROTESTANT

STATEMENTS REGARDING THE AUTHENTICITY

OF THE BIBLICAL TEXT

|

At the beginning of this section we should point out that mislead-

ing statements are often made by the Protestant scholars to

misguide

the general reader with regard to the authenticity of the Christian

texts. We intend to provide our readers with answers to five out of

many such attempts to mislead.

|

First Contention

|

Protestant scholars sometimes try to convince people that the

claim of distortion in the Bible is made only by the Muslims and

that

no such claim is made by anyone else. The fact is that the ancient

and

later writers of both the Jews and the Christians have claimed the

presence of distortions in the Bible more frequently than the

Muslims.

Before producing witnesses to prove our claim we must mention par-

ticularly two terms which are frequently used in their books about

the

history of the holy books. The two words are "errata" and "various

readings" (variations in reading). Home said on page 325 of vol 2:

|

The best difference between "errata", an error of a copier,

and "various readings", a variation in the text, is that

described by Michaelis who said, "When there is difference

between two or more descriptions only one of them can be

true; the rest wiU be either deliberate distortion or an error of

the copier. It is reaUy difficult to separate right from wrong. If

there remains any doubt, it is caUed variation of the text, and

when we are certain that the copier has written it wrong we

call it "errata."

|

In short there is no great difference between the two temms. A

vari-

ation in the text is nothing but distortion according to generally

accepted terminology. Now any admission to the presence of such

variations would obviously be an admission to the presence of

distortion. According to the findings of Mill the number of such

variations

in the text of the Bible is thirty thousand, and according to

Griesbach

it is one hundred and fifty thousand and according to Sholt the

num\_

ber of such variations is innumerable and unknown.

|

The Encyclopaedia Britannica under the entry, "Scripture," in vol.

19 includes the statement of Wettstein that the number of such

varia-

tions in the Bible is one million. With the above in mind, we now

p-

ceed to reproduce the opinions of many varied authentic sources

regarding this matter.

|

Observations of Non-Christian Scholars

|

Celsus was a great pagan scholar of the second century who wrote

a book refuting Christianity. A famous German scholar Eichhorn

reproduced the following statement of Celsus:

|

The Christians have changed their Gospels three or four

times to the extent that the contents of the Gospels have

become distorted.

|

This is clear evidence coming from a non-Christian scholar, con-

firming the deliberate distortions made in the Gospels. There are

peo-

ple in European countries who do not believe in prophethood and

divine revelation. If we were to try and collect their statements

with

regard to the distortions it would require a separate volume. We

con-

fine ourselves to the presentation of only two. Anyone curious to

know more should refer to their books which are easily available

all

over the world. One of their scholars, Parker said:

|

The Protestants claim that the Old and the New Testa-

ments have been preserved and protected from the slightest

damage through an eternal and everlasting miracle, but this

claim is not strong enough to stand against the great army of

variations present in the Bible. The number of these is not

less than thirty thousand.

|

He seems to have based his remark on Mill own findings. He avoided

other statements which describe this number as being up to one mil-

f lion. The author of Ecce Horno printed in London in 1813 said in

the

supplement to his book:

|

This is the list of the books which are ascribed to Jesus by

the ancient Christians. Some of them are attributed to the

|

Disciples and other followers:

|

The Books of Jesus

|

The books that are ascribed to Jesus are seven in number.

|

1. The letter that was written to Achars, King of Odessia.

|

2. Epistle of Peter and Paul.

|

3. The book of Parables and Sermons.

|

4. The Psalms, a collection of his cryptic teachings to the

disciples and followers.

|

5. The book of Jugglery and Magic.

|

6. The book of Jesus and Mary.

|

7. The Episde that fell from heaven in the 6th century AD.

|

The Books of Mary

|

The books that are ascribed to Mary are eight in number.

|

1. Her letter to Ignatius.

|

2. Her letter to Siciliane.

|

3. The Book of Mary.

|

4. The biography of Mary and her Sayings.

|

5. The book of Christ own miracles.

|

6. The book of questions put to her by the elders and the young.

|

7. The book of Solomon own ring.

|

The Books of Peter

|

The books ascribed to Peter are eleven in number.

|

1. The Gospel of Peter.

|

2. The Acts of Peter.

|

3. The Revelation of Peter I.

|

4. The Revelation of Peter II.

|

5. His Episde to Clement.

|

6. The discourse of Peter and Epian.

|

7. The Teaching of Peter.

|

8. The Serrnon of Peter.

|

9. The Mode of Peter own Prayers.

|

10. The book of Peter own travels.

|

11. The book of Peter own inferences.

|

The Books of John

|

The books ascribed to lohn are nine.

|

1. The Acts of John.

|

2. The Gospel of John.

|

3. The book of John own travels.

|

4. The sayings of John.

|

5. His Epistle to Andrew.

|

6. The book of Mary own death.

|

7. The story of Christ and his descent from the cross.

|

8. The Apocryphon of John.

|

9. The Book of John own prayers.

|

The Books of Andrew

|

The books ascribed to Andrew are two.

|

1. The Gospel of Andrew.

|

2. The Acts of Andrew.

|

The Books of Matthew

|

The books ascribed to Matthew are two.

|

1. The Gospel of Childhood.

|

2. The Mode of Matthew own Prayers.

|

The Books of Philip

|

There are two books ascribed to Philip.

|

1. The Gospel of Philip.

|

2. The Acts of Philip.

|

There is also the Gospel of Bartholomew ascribed to the Disciple

|

Bartholomew

|

- The Books of Thomas

|

The books that are ascribed to Thomas are five.

1. The Gospel of Thomas.

|

2. The Acts of Thomas.

|

3. The Gospel of Christ own childhood.

|

4. The book of Thomas own travels.

|

5. The book of Thomas own revelation.

|

The Books of James

|

The books ascribed to James are three.

|

1. The Gospel of James.

|

2. The book of James.

|

3. The book of of James own travels.

|

The Books of Matthias

There are three books ascribed to Matthias who is said to have

|

been admitted among the disciples.

|

1. The Gospel of Matthias.

|

2. The traditions of Matthias.

|

3. The acts of Matthias.

|

The Books of Mark

|

The books that are ascribed to Mark are three.

|

1. The Gospel of Egyptians.

|

2. The Prayers of Mark.

|

3. The Book of Pishan Barhas.

|

The Books of Barnabas

|

Barnabas was a disciple of the Apostles, a descendant of Levi. His

name was Joseph, and was called Barnabas because he sold his farm

and gave the money to the Apostles for preaching. The word

signifies

own on of guidance".

|

There are two books ascribed to Barnabas.

|

1. The Gospel of Bamabas.

|

2. The Epistde of Bamabas.

|

The Gospel of Theodotion is ascribed to Theodotion.

|

The Books of Paul

|

The number of books ascribed to Paul, apart from those included

in the New Testament, is fifteen.

|

1. The Acts of Paul.

|

2. The Acts of Thecla.

|

3. The Epistle to the Laodiceans.

|

4. The Third Epistle to the Thessalonians.

|

5. The Third Episde to the Corinthians.

|

6. The Epistde of the Corinthians to Paul and his reply to them.

|

7. His Epistde to the Ionians and their reply to him.

|

8. The Apocalypse of Paul.

|

9. The Second Revelation of Paul.

|

10. The lsion of Paul.

|

11. The Ascent of Paul.

|

12. The Gospel of Paul.

|

13. The Sermon of Paul.

|

14. The book of Spells of Serpents.

|

15. The book of Acts of Peter and Paul.

|

The author of Ecce Homo also said:

|

When the falsity of the Gospels, the Revelations, and the

Epistles is so evident, how can it be ascertained that the gen-

uine books are those which are acknowledged by the Prote-

stants, especially with the fact in mind that even these books

also had many alterations and additions before the invention

of printing machines. The difficulties are really serious.

|

Observations of Heretical Christian Scholars

|

The Christian sect of the Ebionites belongs to the time of Paul and

flourished in the first century. The Ebionites strongly opposed

Paul

|

and considered him an apostate. Although they acknowledged the

Gospel of Matthew they claimed that the present Gospel, attributed

to

Matthew by the followers of Paul, is quite different from the

original

Gospel. They also claimed that the first two chapters of the Gospel

did not belong to it. According to them these two chapters and many

other verses of this Gospel were later additions. The famous

historian

Bell said with regard to these people:

|

This sect acknowledged only the Pentateuch of the Old

Testament and despised the names of David, Solomon, Jere-

miah and Hezekiel. They accepted only the Gospel of

Matthew from the New Testament but they changed even this

Gospel in many places and excluded its first two chapters.

|

Similarly the Marcionites were one of the ancient sects of

Christianity. They rejected all the books of the Old Testament and

denied their being divinely revealed. Likewise they disacknowledged

all the books of the New Testament except the Gospel of Luke and

the

ten epistles of Paul. This gospel, too, was considered by them to

be

different from the onewe know today. The historian Bell said:

|

This sect used to reject all the books of the Old Testament

and only accepted the Gospel of Luke from the New

Testament and even of this Gospel they used to reject the first

two chapters. They also accepted the ten epistles of Paul but

rejected many parts that they did not like in these letters.

|

Lardner showed in volume 8 of his commentary with regard to al-

terations made by this sect that they rejected many parts of the

Gospel

of Luke. The parts of Luke own Gospel which were distorted or omitted

by this sect are the first two chapters, the event of the Christ own

baptism

by John, the genealogy of Jesus in chapter 3, the tempting of Jesus

by

Satan, his entry into the temple, his reading the book of Isaiah in

chapter 4, verses 30, 31, 32, 49, 50 and 51 of chapter 11, the

words

"but the sign of Jonas, the prophet," verses 6, 8 and 20 of chapter

12,

verses 1-6 of chapter 13, verses 11-32 of chapter 15, verses 31, 32

and

33 of chapter 18, verses 28-46 of chapter 19, verses 9-18 of

chapter 20, verses 8, 21 and 23 of chapter 21, verses 16, 35, 36, 37, 50,

51 of

chapter 22, verse 43 of chapter 23, and verses 26 and 28 from

chapter

24. The above details were given by Epiphanius. Dr. Mill added that

they also omitted verses 38 and 39 of chapter 4. In volume 3 of his

commentary Lardner quotes, through Augustine, the words of

Faustus, a great scholar of the Manichaeans in the fourth century:

|

Faustus says: I totally refute the things that your fore-

fathers have deceitfully added in the New Testament, marring

its beauty, because it is an established fact that the New

Testament was neither written by Christ nor by his Disciples.

The author is an unknown person, who has attributed his

work to the Disciples fearing that people would not accept

him as an eye-witness of these accounts. Thus he defamed the

Disciples by writing books that are full of errors and contra-

dictions.

|

It can be said without fear of denial that the above scholar, even

though he belongs to a heretical sect, is absolutely correct in his

above three claims. We have already reproduced Norton own opinion

regarding the falsity of the Pentateuch and his claim that the

present

Gospel of Matthew is not in fact the original book written by him,

but

only a translation which has itself been altered and distorted.

|

The above is enough to have an idea of the views of non-Christian

scholars and those of Christians who are considered heretics by the

majority of other Christians.

|

Observations of Christian Theologians

|

We reproduce below the opinions and statements of celebrated and

widely trusted scholars and theologians of the Christian world.

|

Observation No. 1: Adam Clarke

|

Adam Clarke said on page 369 of vol. 5 of his commentary:

|

It is customary that the number of the writers on the lives

|

of great men has always been large. The same is true of Jesus

and the Apostles; that is to say the number of narrators of

their lives is also great but many of the statements they make

are erroneous. They used to write fictional events as if they

were facts. They also made mistakes, deliberate or accidental,

in other descriptions, especially the historians of the land

where Luke wrote his Gospel. For this reason the Holy Spirit

imparted appropriate knowledge to Luke so that the faithful

might know the true accounts.

|

This gives us to understand that prior to Luke own Gospel there were

many false gospels present replete with errors and mistakes. The

above statement is a plain admission of the dishonesty of their

authors. His words that they made deliberate or accidental mistakes

is

enough evidence of this fact.

|

Observation No. 2: The Apostle Paul

|

In his Epistle to the Galadans Paul said:

|

I marvel that ye are so soon removed from him that called

you into the grace of Christ unto another gospel; which is not

another but there be some that trouble you, and would pervert

the gospel of Christ.l

|

The above statement of Paul brings out three important facts,

first-

ly that there was a gospel called the Gospel of Christ in the time

of

apostles; secondly that there was another gospel that was different

and

contrary to the Gospel of Christ; and thirdly that there were some

peo-

ple who wanted to distort and change the Gospel of Christ, even in

the

time of Paul, not to speak of subsequent periods when there was

noth-

ing left of this Gospel but its name. Adam Clarke under his

comments

on the above verse said in vol. 6 of his commentary:

|

It is established that many minor gospels had become

common in the early centuries of Christianity. The abundance

of such false and incorrect accounts led Luke to write his r

Gospel. We read about more than seventy such gospels. Some

parts of these gospels are still in existence and available.

Many such gospels were collected and published in three vol-

umes by Fabricius. Some describe the obligatory nature of the

laws of Moses, the validity of circumcision and imperative-

ness of the Gospel.

|

The above implies that many spurious gospels were present before

the compilation of the Gospel of Luke and Paul own letter to

Galatians. It

also proves that Paul referred to a properly compiled Gospel and

not

to the meanings that he had conceived in his mind, as sometimes is

contended by the Protestants.

|

Observation No. 3: The Gospel of Christ

|

The fact that a gospel called the Gospel of Christ existed in the

time of the Apostles is certainly true and was also testified to by

Eichhom and many other German scholars. Similarly scholars like

Leclerc, Grabe, Michael, Lessing, Niemeyer and Marsh also agree

with this opinion.

|

Observation No. 4: Another Statement of Paul

|

In his Second Episde to the Corinthians Paul said:

|

But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off occasion

from them which desire occasion; that wherein they glory,

they may be found even as we.

|

For such are false apostles deceitful workers, transform-

ing themselves into the apostles of Christ."

|

The above statement of Paul is a clear admission of the fact that

there were many false apostles present in his time. Adam Clarke

under his comments of this verse said:

|

They falsely claimed to be the Apostles of Christ while in

fact they were not apostles. They used to deliver sermons and

take pains in worship but they aimed at nothing but their per-

sonal interests.

|

We read the following in the First Epistle of John:

|

Beloved, believe not every spirit, but try the spirits whe-

ther they are of God, because many false prophets are gone

out into the world3

|

John too joined Paul in admitting the presence of false prophets in

eir time. Adam Clarke made the following comments on this verse:

|

In the past every teacher used to claim that he received

inspiration from the Holy Ghost, because every true prophet

received inspiration. The word own pirit" at this place signifies

the man claiming that he was under the effect of the spirit. Put

them therefore to test. Such preachers should be examined

with ARGUMENTs. His phrase "many false prophets" refers to

those who were not inspired by the Holy Ghost especially

from among the Jews.

|

The above is enough to show that there were many false claimants

to prophethood at that time.

|

Observation No. 5: The Pentateuch

more

|

In addition to the five known books of the Pentateuch there are six

books that are similarly attributed to Moses. These are:

|

1. The Book of Revelation.

|

2. The Small Book of Genesis.

|

3. The Book of Ascension.

|

4. The Book of Mysteries.

|

5. The Book of Testaments

|

6. The Book of Confession.

|

The second of the above books existed in the fourth century in

Hebrew and Jerome and Cedrenus quoted from it in their books.

Origen said:

|

Paul copied from this book in his letter to the Galatians

5:6. Its translation existed up to the sixteenth century. The

Council of Trent declared it false in that century and it contin-

ued to be considered so from that time on.

|

It is surprising that they can acknowledge a certain book as

authentic revelation and then, after using it for centuries,

suddenly

stop liking it and declare it to be false. The holy books are

treated by

them just like political decisions, being changed at their whim.

The

third of the above books was similarly acknowledged by the

ancients.

Lardner said on page 521 of the second volume of his commentary:

|

Origen claims that Judah copied verse 9 of his letter from

this book.

|

This book is also considered as false like aU other books in the

list,

but it is strange that passages borrowed from these books and

inserted

into the present book still continue to be considered as revealed.

Horne said:

|

It is thought that these false books were forged quite near

the beginning of Christianity.

|

This scholar has blamed the people of the first century for this

forgery.

|

Observation No. 6: Mosheim own Admission

|

The historian Mosheim said on page 65 in vol. 1 of his History

printed in 1832 under his description of the scholars of the second

century:

|

Among the followers of Plato and Pythagoras2 it was

|

1. Plato, the famous Greek philosopher and the teacher of

Aristotle. His books on

Democracy and Politics are famous (430 - 347 BC).

|

2. PyLhagoras, a Greek philosopher known as the father of

mathematics.

|

considered not only admissible but creditable to tell a lie and

deceive others in the cause of truth. As is understood from the

ancient books, the first to indulge in this practice were the

Jews of Egypt, in the time before Christ. This unholy act was

later on borrowed by the Christians, a fact which is clear from

the many books that were falsely attributed to great personali-

ties.

|

We can understand from this why a great number of false books

were written and falsely attributed to others in the name of, and

in the

cause of, truth and religion.

|

Observation No. 7: Watson and Eusebius

|

Eusebius said in chapter 18 of the fourth volume of his History:

|

Justin the Martyr related many of the prophecies of Christ

and claimed that the Jews excluded them from the Holy

Scriptures.

|

Watson also said on page 32 vol. 2 of his book:

|

I have no trace of doubt about the passages that Justin

quoted in his polemic against a Jew, that, in the time of Justin

and Irenaeus, they were part of the Hebrew and Greek ver-

sions of the Bible, while today they no longer exist.

Especially the text that Justin claimed was part of the Book of

Jeremiah. Sylbergius in his annotation of Justin, and Dr.

Grabe in his annotation of Irenaeus, pointed out that this

prophecy was before Peter when he wrote the text of chapter

4 verse 6 of his epistle.

|

Horne said on page 62 of the fourth volume of his commentary:

|

Justin proved that Ezra said to the people, "he Passover

is the feast of our Lord, the Saviour. If you keep the Lord

superior to the Passover and keep your faith in him, the earth

will flourish for ever. If you do not hear and do not keep faith

in him you will be ridiculed by other nations."

|

The above statements are enough to prove that Justin blamed the

Jews for excluding many of the prophecies about Jesus from the Holy

Books, and that this claim is also supported by other scholars-

These

prophecies were part of the holy books at the time of Irenaeus and

Justin while they are no longer there today. According to Watson

the

distortion of the holy books is proved because of the additions in

the

Hebrew and Greek versions.

|

Observation No. 8: Lardner

|

Lardner observed on page 124 of the fifth volume of his commen-

tary:

|

At the time when Anastasius reigned in Constantinople

he ruled that the Holy Gospels were not correct since their

authors were not known so they were corrected a second

time.

|

The above implies that up to the time of the above emperor the

authenticity of the Gospels was doubted, otherwise he would not

have

ordered them to be corrected on the ground that their authors were

not

known. He believed them to be inspired books and therefore tried to

remove the contradictions found in them. This also disproves the

claim of the Protestants that no ruler or king of any time ever

intruded

into the affairs of the Church.

|

Observation No. 9

|

It has been pointed out earlier in this book that Augustine and

other ancient Christians used to blame the Jews for distorting the

Pentateuch in order to invalidate the Greek translation, because of

their enmity towards the Christians. Hales and Kennicott also

support-

ed this view. Hales proved the authenticity of the Samaritan

version

with irrefutable ARGUMENTs. Kennicott said that the Jews made

deliber-

ate alterations to the Pentateuch and opposed the view that the

Samaritans changed it.

|

Observation No. 10

|

Kennicott proved the authenticity of the Samaritan translation and

manY scholars have said that his ARGUMENTs are infallible and

correct.

They believe that the Jews changed it out of their enmity towards

the

Samaritans.

|

Observation No. 11

|

We have already pointed out earlier that Adam Clarke openly

admitted that the historical books of the Old Testament had been

changed in many places and that it would be useless to try to find

any

explanation for the changes.

|

Observation No. 12

|

t We have shown earlier in this book that Adam Clarke adopted the

view that the Jews changed the Hebrew and the Greek texts at

chapter

64 verse 2 of the Book of Isaiah and that such distortions are also

found at some other places.

|

Observation No. 13

|

As we have pointed out earlier Horne admitted that twelve verses

in the books of the Old Testament were changed by the Jews.

|

Observation No. 14

|

We have shown earlier that the Catholic Church is unanimously

agreed on the authenticity of the seven apocryphal books we listed.

They also acknowledge the Latin translation as being inspired and

genuine.

|

Protestant theologians, on the other hand, claim that those books

have been distorted and should be rejected. They also claim that

the

|

; Latin translation underwent innumerable alterations and additions

from the fifth to the fifteenth century and that the copiers of

this trans-

lation took great liberties with it. They inserted many sentences

from

|

one book of the Old Testament into another and included the

marginal

notes in the main text of the book.

|

Observation No. 15

|

As has been already stated, Adam Clarke, following the example

of Kennicott, adopted the opinion that in the time of Josephus the

Jews intended to "enhance the beauty of the books by including

spuri-

ous prayers, new episodes and songs". For example from the Book of

Esther, the episode relating to wine, women and truth was added to

the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, now known as the First Book of

Ezra. The song of the three children was added to the Book of

Daniel

and there are many more examples.

|

These alterations, additions and other changes in the sacred books,

made in the name of refinement, are enough to show that such

changes were not objectionable to the Jews. They made as many

changes as they liked as is clear in the light of the statement we

quot-

ed in observation No. 6 above which allowed them religiously to

make changes in the sacred books for the cause of the truth.

|

Observation No. 16

|

We have already cited the statement of Adam Clarke with regard

to the five books of the Pentateuch where he admitted that the

majori-

ty of Christian scholars think that the Samaritan Version of the

Pentateuch is the most correct of all the versions.

|

Observation No. 17

|

It has been already shown that the supplement which is found at

the end of the book of Job of the Latin translation is false and

spuri-

ous according to the Protestants, while, in fact, it was written

before

Christ, was a part of this translation in the time of the Apostles

and

was held to be genuine by the ancients.

|

Observation No. 18

|

We have already quoted the statement of Chrysostom witnessing

that the Jews had lost or destroyed many books out of their

dishonesty

and carelessness and that some of them were destroyed and bumt by

them. This view is upheld and acknowledged by the Catholics.

|

Observation No. 19

|

Horne said in the second volume of his commentary with regard to

the Greek translation:

|

This translation is very old. It was considered authentic

and was very popular among the ancient Christians. It was

recited in the churches of both groups. The Christian elders,

both Latins and Greeks, all copied from this version. Every

subsequent translation acknowledged by the Christian

Churches, save the Syrian version, has been prepared from

this version. For example, the Arabic, the Armenian, the

Ethiopian, and the old Italian and Latin translations, which

were in vogue before Jerome. And this is the only translation

which is taught up to this day in Greek and Eastern Churches.

|

Further he said:

|

According to our opinion, this was translated in 285 or

286 BC.

|

He also added:

|

It is an obvious ARGUMENT, proving the great popularity of

this translation, that the authors of the New Testament quoted

many sentences from this it. The Christian elders of the past,

with the exception of Jerome, had no knowledge of the

Hebrew language. In copying the texts, they followed only

the people who wrote the books with inspiration. Although

they enjoyed the status of great renovators of Christianity

they did not know Hebrew which is the basic source of all the

sacred books. They put their trust in this translation and

|

acquired deep knowledge of it. The Greek church held it as a

sacred book and had great esteem for it.

|

Again he said:

|

This translation continued to be recited in the Greek and

Latin churches and was referred to for authenticity. It was

also greatly trusted by the Jews and they recited it in their

synagogues. Later, when the Christians started to derive their

argurnents against the Jews from this translation, the Jews

commenced their criticism against it and said that it was not

in accordance with the Hebrew version and that many verses

from this translation had been removed at the beginning of

the second century. They adopted Aquila own translation in its

place. As this translation remained in vogue among the Jews

up to the end of the flrst century and was equally used by the

Christians, there were many copies of it. This translation too,

was corrupted by the copiers and scribes by the inclusion of

marginal notes and explanatory remarks in the main text.

Ward, the great scholar of the Catholics, remarked in his book

printed in 1841 (page 18): "The heretics of the East have dis-

torted it."

|

The above statement of a great Protestant scholar is enough to con-

firm that the Jews deliberately changed the Pentateuch and that

they

distorted it out of their enrnity towards the Christian faith, as

is admit-

ted by hirn in his statement. This leaves w room for denial. The

sarne

is admitted by Catholic scholars. This implies that both the

Protes-

tants and the Catholics have admitted the presence of deliberate

dis-

tortions in the Pentateuch. Now, in the light of the above

admission

we may be allowed to ask what there is to assure us that the Jews

might have not changed the Hebrew version which was with them

especially when it was not known to the Christian world.

|

When the above translation, which continued to be in vogue up to

the fourth century and was recited in all the Eastem and Western

churches, was so daringly changed without fear of censure from

other

people or punishment from God what was there to stop them from

|

nging the Hebrew version when they had nothing to fear? It makes

no difference if this distortion was made by the Jews out of their

ani-

osity to the Christian faith, which is the view of Adarn Clarke and

Home. in spite of all his partiality, and which is also

acknowledged by

Augustine or due to their enmity towards the Samaritans as was

decided by Kennicott, or because of their antagonism towards each

other. Deliberate manipulation also occurred at the hands of

believing

Christians simply out of opposition to other Christians who, in

their

opinion, were not correct. They did it only to spread the "truth".

They

had religious permission to modify the sacred texts for religious

rea-

sons.

|

The Witness of a Jevish Scholar Converted to Islam

|

A Jewish scholar embraced Islam in the period of Sultan Bayazid

of Turkey.l He was given the Islamic name Abdu own -Salam. He wrote a

booklet named Risalatu"l-Hidyah (The Book of Guidance) repudiat-

ing the Jews. In the third section of this book he said:

|

The most celebrated of all the commentaries on the

Pentateuch (Torah) is the one known as the Talmud, which

was written in the period of Ptolemy who reigned some time

after the period of Nebuchadnezzar. This commentary con-

tains the following story. It happened that once Ptolemy asked

some Jewish scholars to bring the Pentateuch into his pres-

ence. The scholars were frightened, because the king disbe-

lieved in some of its injunctions. Seventy scholars gathered

together, and what they did was change those things that he

did not believe in. Now when they admit to having done this,

how can one trust a single verse of such a book?

|

In the presence of the statement of the Catholic scholar who said

that the heretics of the East changed the translation which was in

vogue in the churches of the East and the West and was followed by

|

E " Sultan Bayazid of Turkey, son of the famous caliph Moharnmad,

the conqueror

(relgned from 1482 to 1512 AD).

|

the Catholic churches up to as late as 1500, as is pointed out by

Horne, the Catholics cannot save themselves from the accusation of

the Protestants that they, the Catholics, have changed the Latin

trans-

lation which was in vogue in their Church. Do the Catholics have

any

way to refute this claim?

|

Observation No. 20

|

The Rees Encyclopaedia, under the entry of "Bible" in vol. 4, con-

tains this statement:

|

Presenting the ARGUMENTs in favour of those versions of

the Old Testament that were written from 1000 to 1400, he

said that all the versions written in the seventh and the eighth

centuries had been destroyed by the order of the Jewish

Council because they were contrary to their own versions. In

view of this event Watson also said that the versions which

were compiled six hundred years ago are not available and

the versions written seven hundred or eight hundred years

ago, do not exist at all.

|

This admission coming from Dr. Kennicott, the most trusted

author in respect of the books of the Old Testament, should be

noted.

We are quite sure of the fact that the extirpation of the early

versions

under the orders of the Jewish Council must have happened two years

after the appearance of the Holy Prophet Muhammad. This implies

that even at the time of the appearance of the Holy Prophet their

sacred books were in a condition, and the environment such, to

allow

distortions and alterations to be made in them. In fact it was

always

possible prior to the invention of the printing press. Even after

the

appearance of printing machines, they made alterations in the text

of

their books, for we have shown earlier in this chapter that

Luther own

translation was changed by his followers."

|

1. A comparison of Deuteronomy 33:2, in the Urdu version printed in

1958 with

any other translation prior to it will sufficiently prove this

claim.

|

Observation No. 21

|

Horsley said in his commentary (vol. 3, page 282) in his introduc-

tion to the book of Joshua:

|

It is quite definite and beyond all doubt that the sacred

text has been distorted. It is evident from the incompatibilities

found in various versions. Only one out of many contradict-

ing statements can be true. It is almost certain that sometimes

the worst kind of descriptions have been included in the print-

ed text. I could not find any ARGUMENT to support the claim

that the distortions found in the single book of Joshua exceed

the distortions found in all the books of the Old Testament.

|

He also said on page 275 of the same volume:

|

It is absolutely true that the copies of the Hebrew version

possessed by the people after the invasion of Nebuchadnez-

zar, or even a little before it, were more defective than the

ones that appeared after the correction of Ezra.

|

Observation No. 22

|

Watson said on page 283 of volume 3 of his book:

|

Origen complained about these differences and tried to

attribute them to various causes like the negligence of the

copiers, and the carelessness and ill-intention of the scribes.

|

Observation No. 23

|

Adam Clarke, in the introduction to the first volume of his com-

mentary, said:

|

There were innumerable versions of the Latin translation

before Jerome some of which contained serious distortions

and had passages alarmingly contradictory with each other, as

Jerome had been proclaiming.

|

Observation No. 24

|

Ward admitted on pages 17 and 18 of his book printed in 1841:

|

Dr. Humphrey has pointed out on page 178 of his book

that the whims of the Jews have so much distorted the books

of the Old Testament that it is easily noticed by readers. He

added that the predictions concerning Christ were totally

eliminated by the Jews.

|

Observation No. 25

|

Philip Guadagnolo, a priest, wrote a book named Khaylat in refu-

tation of the book written by Ahmad Sharif son of Zain"ul-"Abidin

Isfahani printed in 1649. He observed in part 6:

|

Great distortion is found in the Chaldean version, particu-

larly in the book of Solomon Rabbi Aquila, known as

Onqelos, who copied the whole of the Pentateuch. Similarly

the Rabbi son of Uziel copied the Book of Joshua, the Book

of Judges, the Books of Kings, the Book of Isaiah and those

of other Prophets. And Rabbi Joseph, the blind, copied the

Psalms and the Books of Job, Ruth, Esther and Solomon. All

these copiers distorted the text of these books. We Christians

preserved them, so that the blame for distortion must be laid

at the door of the Jews, though we do not believe those false

descriptions.

|

Observation No. 26

|

Horne said on page 68 of volume 1 of his book:

|

We must acknowledge that there are verses present in the

Pentateuch which are later additions.

|

Further on page 445 of volume 2 he observed:

|

There is a lesser number of distorted places in the

Hebrew version.

|

This number is nine as we have already pointed out.

|

Observation No. 27

|

A petition was submitted to King James I complaining that the

Psalms included in the book of prayer were incompatible with those

found in the Hebrew version. They are different from the Hebrew

ver-

sion in having additions, omissions and alterations in not less

than

two hundred places.

|

Observation No. 28

|

Carlyle remarked:

|

The English translators have distorted the sense, obscured

the truth, misguided the ignorant and confused the simple text

of the books. They prefer darkness to light and falsehood to

the truth.

|

Observation No. 29

|

Broughton, one of the members of the Church council, suggested

that there should be a new translation. According to him, the

current

translation was full of errors. He declared before the Church that

the

famous English translator had distorted the text in as many as

eight

thousand four hundred and eighty places, that he was responsible

for

making people convert to other faiths, and that he deserved eternal

punishment in the fires of Hell.

|

Observations nos. 27, 28 and 29 have been borrowed from Ward own

book which contains many more such statements.

|

observation No. 30: Horne own View of Biblical Distortion

|

Home explained causes for the presence of the various readings

found in the books of the Bible in chapter eight of volume 2 of his

book. He said that there are basically four causes of distortion

which

are as follows:

|

The First Cause:

|

As a result of the copier own mistake or oversight which includes the

following possibilities:

|

(1) The copier wrote by dictation and at places where he could not

understand it properly neglectfully recorded it according to his

own understanding.

|

(2) The similarity of the Hebrew and Greek letters confused the

copier and he wrote the one in place of the other.

|

(3) The copier might have mistaken the signs written above the let-

ters for the letters themselves and included them in the text or

misunderstood the text and wrongly made corrections in it.

|

(4) In the process of writing, the copier realised his error quite

late

in the process. He did not wish to cancel what he had written

and now included what had been omitted without changing

what he had already written.

|

(5) The copier forgot to write something and then, realising what

had happened, he included what he had omitted earlier, shifting

the passage from one place to another.

|

(6) The copier overlooked the line he was writing and wrote the

next line in its place thus omitting a portion from the text.

|

(7) The copier misunderstood an abbreviation and elucidated it

according to his own understanding.

|

(8) The main cause of the presence of various readings is the igno-

rance and carelessness of the copiers who also inserted the

marginal notes into the main text through their ignorance.

|

The Second Cause:

|

The second cause of the variation in readings was the shortcom-

ings and deflciencies of the original COw from which the copier

pre-

pared a new copy. This too, might have occurred in many forms. For

instance, the signs of the letters might not have been completely

legi-

ble and could not therefore be recorded or the letters of one page

might have soaked through the page and become imprinted on another

page and then have been taken as part of that page. Sometimes an

omitted sentence was written in the margin without any sign and the

copier, not knowing where to write it, included it in a wrong place

making the text inconsistent.

|

The Third Cause:

|

The third cause of various readings of the texts is the correction

of

certain words based on the assumptions of the copier. This also

might

have happened in many ways. Sometimes the copier misunderstood

the correct text as being defective or grammatically incorrect

while it

was not wrong being rather the mistake of the author himself.

Sometimes the copier not only corrected the text grammatically but

also refined its language or omitted words that he thought were not

needed or excluded one or more synonyms that, in his opinion, had

no

distinct meanings to convey.

|

The most frequent occurrence is of additions in the text caused by

mixing the text with the sentences written against them in the

margin.

This kind of distortion is particularly noted in case of the

Gospels and

also accounts for the abundance of additions found in the epistles

of

Paul, so that the passages he borrowed from the Old Testament might

accord with the Latin translation. Some people amended the whole

New Testament to correspond with the Latin translation.

|

The Fourth Cause:

|

Self-indulgence and egotism have been a main cause of these

deliberate distortions, no matter whether the one responsible for

them

belonged to the faithful or to the heretics. No one has been so

much

reproached and disapprobated as Marcion among the past heretics. It

has also been confirmed that some deliberate changes in the text

were

made by those belonging to the faithful. Later on, these

alterations

were accepted as preferable either because they supported some com-

monly believed conception or because they helped remove some

objection.

|

Home provided many specific examples of all the above four

causes which we leave to avoid prolongation. Some examples of the

distortions made by the faithful, however, will be of interest and

we

|

include some of them here.

|

(1) Luke chapter 22 verse 43" was deliberately omitted, as the

faith-

ful thought it to be against Christ own divinity to be strengthened

by an angel.

|

(2) The words "before they came together" have been omitted from

Matthew 1:18,2 and the words, "her first born son"3 have been

excluded from chapter 1 verse 25 of the same Gospel, in order

to remove any possible doubt about the Irginity of Mary.

|

(3) The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, chapter 15 verse

5

contained the word "twelve"4 which was changed to "eleven" to

free Paul from the accusation of having made a false statement,

as Judas Iscariot had died before it.

|

(4) Some words have been omitted from the Gospel of Mark chap-

ter 13 verse 32.5 Some priests also rejected them as they

thought they supported Arian thought.

|

(5) Some words have been added to Luke 1:35 in its Syrian, Greek

and Ethiopian translations.6 Words have also been added in the

copies of many priests in order to refute the Eutychian sect who

denied the deistic nature of Christ.

|

In short, Horne specified the presence of au the possible forms of

distortions in the texts of the sacred books. The above specific

examples prove the fact that the texts of the biblical books have been

changed through additions, omissions and deliberate alterations by

the

faithful as weu as by heretics. Similarly we may not be wrong if we

claim that Christians, who were deeply committed to the trinity and

not willing to ignore it for their interests, might have changed

some

passages after the appearance of Islam simply because they were in

accordance with Islamic teachings as they had done before against

different sects of Christianity.

|

Second Contention

|

The Witness of Christ and his Apostles

|

Another subterfuge frequently employed by the Christians in their

attempt to uphold their claim of unsullied Divine Revelation for

the

Bible is their claim that Christ testified to the truth of the

books of the

Old Testament and, if they had truly been distorted by the Jews,

Christ would have blamed them for it.

|

The First Answer

|

As an answer to this misconception we may be allowed first to

point out that the authenticity of the Old and the New Testament

has

never been proved through a constant chain of reliable reporters,

a

fact which we discussed earlier in this book in sufficient detail.

Therefore all these books, in our opinion, are dubious and

uncertain

and thus any quotation from these books is not acceptable unless it

can be proved through undeniable sources that a particular

statement

really was made by Christ because it is always possible that the

verse

in question may be a later addition added by the "faithful" at the

end

of the second century or in the third century in order to refute

the

Ebionites, Marcionites or the Manichaeans. Or these additions might

have been included later on because they supported some commonly

held belief. These sects had rejected all, or at least most, of the

books

of the Old Testament as we showed when mentioning the Marcionites

earlier. Bell stated in his history with regard to the belief of

the

|

Marcionites:

|

This sect believed in the existence of two gods, one, the

creator of good, and the other, the creator of evil. They

believed that the books of the Old Testament were given by

the God of evil. They all disbelieve the New Testament.

|

Lardner said in this regard on page 486 of vol. 8 of his commen-

|

1 , .

|

This sect claims that the God of the Jews is not the father

of Jesus, and that Jesus was sent to abolish the law of Moses,

since it was against the Evangel.

|

He also said in vol. 3 of his commentary with regard to the

Manichaeans:

|

The historians are in complete agreement that the Mani-

chaeans never believed in the books of the Old Testament. It

is written in the Acts of Archelaus that it was their belief that

Satan deceived the Prophets of the Jews. It was Satan that

spoke with them in the name of God. They derived their argu-

ment for this belief from John, 10:8 where Christ says, "All

that ever came before me are thieves and robbers."

|

The Second Answer:

|

Even if we put aside the question of its being an addition, the

claim does not prove the truth of all the books, because the

statement

does not specify the number and names of the books of the Old

Testa-

ment. In this case there is no way to ascertain that the books

which

were in vogue among the Jews were thirty-nine in number, as is

acknowledged by the Protestants of our time or forty-six as is

acknowledged by the Catholics and in any case these books include

the Book of Daniel which was not acknowledged as authentic by the

Jews contemporary with Christ. They do not even accept Daniel as a

Prophet, except Josephus, the historian, who said in his book:

|

We do not have thousands of books containing contradic-

tory material, we have only twenty-two which talk of past

events and are considered by us as inspiration. The first five

of these are the books of Moses which describe the events

from the beginning of the creation to the death of Moses and

there are thirteen other books that were written by other

Prophets, describing the period after the death of Moses to the

time of Ardashir. The remaining four books consist of prayers

and eulogies.

|

The above witness does not in any way prove the truth of the cur-

rent books. According to Josephus the total number of books is

seven-

teen excluding the five books of the Pentateuch, while according to

the Protestants there are thirty-four books and the Catholics

believe

that there are forty-one books other than the Pentateuch. No one

knows which of the books were included in the seventeen books,

because this historian ascribed two more books to Ezekiel other

than

his famous book. It seems quite logical to believe that these two

books, which are now extinct, were included in the seventeen books

in his time.

|

Apart from this, it has been already shown that Chrysostom and

other Catholic scholars admitted that the Jews had destroyed many

sacred books, some being tom up and others bumt, out of their per-

version. The books of the Old Testament that we are going to

enumer-

ate are the part of the Old Testament which cannot be denied by any

of the Catholic and the Protestant scholars in view of the

ARGUMENTs

that follow. It is therefore possible that some of these books

might

have been included in the seventeen books referred to by Josephus.

|

The Missing Books of the Old Testament

|

The following books, which we find mentioned in the books of the

present Old Testament, have disappeared from it:

|

(1) The Book of the Wars of the Lord:

|

This book is mentioned in Numbers 21:14 and has been dis-

cussed by us earlier in this book. Henry and Scott own commen-

tary has this statement:

|

Presumably this book was written by Moses for the

guidance of Joshua and descnbed the demarcation of

the land of Moab."

|

(2) The Book of Jasher:

|

This book is mentioned in Joshua 10:13. We have discussed it

earlier. It is also mentioned in II Samuel, 1:18.

|

(3-5) There were three books of the Prophet Solomon, the first

contained one thousand and five Psalms, the second described the

his-

tory of the creation, and the third consisted of three thousand

Pro-

verbs. We find this last book mentioned in I Kings,2 Some of these

Proverbs are still in existence. Adam Clarke under his comments on

I

Kings 4:32 said:

|

The Proverbs currently attributed to Solomon, are nine

hundred or nine hundred and twenty-three, and if we accept

the claim of some scholars that the first nine chapters of the

book are not from Solomon the number is reduced to only

about six hundred and fifty. Psalm 127 in which the name of

Solomon appears is not from Solomon, it being rightly

claimed by some scholars that it was written by the Prophet

David for the guidance of his son, Solomon.

|

He further said with regard to the history of creation:

|

Scholars are very much aggrieved at the disappearance of

the history of the world own creation.

|

(6) The Book of the Manner of the Kingdom:

This was written by Samuel as mentioned in I Samuel 10:25:

|

Then Samuel told the People the manner of the King-

dom, and wrote it in a book and laid it up before the Lord.

|

(7) The History of Samuel the Seer.

|

1. This land was to the East of the Dead Sea.

2. "And he spoke three thousand Proverbs." I Kings 4:32

|

(8) The History of the Prophet Nathan

|

(9) The Book of Gad the Seer

|

All the above three books are mentioned in I Chronicles.l

Adam Clarke remarked on page 1522 of Vol. 2 of his book that

these books were extinct.

|

(10) The Book of Shemaiah. the Prophet

|

(11) The Book of Iddo. the Seer:

Both the above books are mentioned in II Chronicles 12:15.2

|

(12) The Prophecy of Ahijah.

|

(13) The Visions of Iddo the Seer

|

These two books are mentioned in II Chronicles 9:29.3 The

book of Nathan and Iddo are also mentioned in this verse.

Adam Clarke said on page 1539 of vol. 2 of his book:

|

All these books have become non-existent.

|

(14) The Book of Jehu the son of Hanani

|

This is mentioned in II Chronicles 20:34.4 Adam Clarke said

on page 561 of vol. 2 of his book:

|

This book has been completely lost, though it exist-

ed in the time of compilation of the Second Book of

Kings.

|

(15) The Book of Isaiah the Prophet

This book consisted of complete accounts of Uzziah.

|

Presumably this book was written by Moses for the

guidance of Joshua and described the demarcation of

the land of Moab."

|

(2) The Book of Jash.:

|

This book is mentioned in Joshua 10:13. We have discussed it

earlier. It is also mentioned in II Samuel, 1:18.

|

(3-5) There were three books of the Prophet Solomon, the first

contained one thousand and five Psalms, the second described the

his-

tory of the creation, and the third consisted of three thousand

Pro-

verbs. We find this last book mentioned in I Kings,2 Some of these

Proverbs are still in existence. Adam Clarke under his comments on

I

Kings 4:32 said:

|

The Proverbs currently attributed to Solomon, are nine

hundred or nine hundred and twenty-three, and if we accept

the claim of some scholars that the flrst nine chapters of the

book are not from Solomon the number is reduced to only

about six hundred and fifty. Psalm 127 in which the name of

Solomon appears is not from Solomon, it being rightly

claimed by some scholars that it was written by the Prophet

David for the guidance of his son, Solomon.

|

He further said with regard to the history of creation:

|

Scholars are very much aggrieved at the disappearance of

the history of the world own creation.

|

(6) The Book of the Manner of the Kingdom:

This was written by Samuel as mentioned in I Samuel 10:25:

|

Then Samuel told the People the manner of the King-

dom, and wrote it in a book and laid it up before the Lord.

|

(7) The History of Samuel the Seer.

|

(8) The History of the Prophet Nathar

|

(9) The Book of Gad the Seer

|

All the above three books are mentioned in I Chronicles.l

Adam Clarke remarked on page 1522 of Vol. 2 of his book that

these books were extinct.

|

(10) The Book of Shemaiah. the Prophet

|

(11) The Book of Iddo. the Seer:

Both the above books are mentioned in II Chronicles 12:15.2

|

(12) The Prophecy of Ahijah.

|

(13) The Isions of Iddo the Seer

|

These two books are mentioned in II Chronicles 9:29.3 The

book of Nathan and Iddo are also mentioned in this verse.

Adam Clarke said on page 1539 of vol. 2 of his book:

|

All these books have become non-existent.

|

(14) The Book of Jehu the son of Hanani

|

This is mentioned in II Chronicles 20:34.4 Adam Clarke said

on page 561 of vol. 2 of his book:

|

This book has been completely lost, though it exist-

ed in the time of compilation of the Second Book of

Kings.

|

(15) The Book of Isaiah the Prophet

This book consisted of complete accounts of Uzziah.

|

It is mentioned in II Chronicles 26:22."

|

(16) The Book of Isions of Isaiah:

|

This contained complete accounts of Hezekiah and is men-

tioned in II Chronicles 32 32.2

|

(17) The Lamentation of Jeremiah:

|

This consisted of Jeremiah own lamentation for Josiah that is

described in II Chronicles 35:25.3

|

(18) The Book of Chronicles:

|

This is mentioned in Nehemiah 12:23.4 Adam Clarke said on

page 1676 of volume 2 of his book:

|

This book is not included in the present books. This is

another book which does not exist today.

|

(19) The Book of Covenant of Moses:

We find it mentioned in Exodus 24:7.5

|

(20) The Book of the Acts of Solomon:

|

The mention of this book appears in I Kings, 11:14.

|

We already know that Josephus ascribed two more books to

Ezekiel in addition to his famous book. Josephus is a trusted name

among the Christians. This takes the total number of the missing

books to twenty-two. The Protestants have no way of refuting the

existence of these books. Thomas Inglis said in his book in Urdu

entitled. Mira"atus Sidk (The Mirror of the Truth) printed in 1856:

|

There is unanimous agreement on the fact that the num-

ber of the books that have been lost or have disappeared from

the sacred books is not less than twenty.

|

The Third Answer

|

As a third answer to the false Christian claim regarding the

witness

of Christ and his Apostles for the truth of the sacred books, we

may

point out that; even if we acknowledge the presence of the current

books during the lifetime of Christ and that Christ did indeed

witness

to the truth of these books, this only confirms the existence of

these

books at that time, without confirming the truth of their

attribution to

their authors and without verifying the truth of each and every

pas-

sage contained by them. Even if Christ and his Apostles did report

something from these books it would not necessarily signify their

absolute truth. However, in the case of Jesus, it would clearly

have

shown that a particular injunction of those books was from God,

given that his statement could be proved to be reauy his through an

unbroken chain of reporters. This is not a contention posited only

by

the Muslims, for the Protestants also have adopted this opinion.

Paley,

the great scholar of the Protestants observed in chapter 3 of his

book

printed in London in 1850:

|

There is no doubt that our Saviour confirmed that the

Pentateuch was the Book of God. It is improbable that its ori-

gin and existence could be without God. Especially because

the Jews, who were expert in religious matters and beginners

in other matters like war and peace, did firmly adhere to

monotheism. Their concept of God and His attributes is

remarkable compared to other peoples who were committed

to innumerable Gods. It is also certain that our Saviour

acknowledged the prophethood of the most of the copiers of

the Old Testament. It is the duty of all us Christians to

observe these limits.

|

The claim that each and every verse of the Old Testament

is true and inspired, and that there is no need for investigation

of their authors, invites unnecessary difficulties and trouble.

These books were commonly read by the Jews of the time of

our Saviour. They were believed in and acted upon by them,

and the Apostles used to turn to them for guidance. This atti-

tude of the Jews allows us to reach only one conclusion that

the truth and divinity of a prophetic statement is confirmed

only when Christ specifically witnessed to its being from

God. Otherwise it only proves that these books were com-

monly acknowledged in that period.

|

In this case our sacred books would be the best witness

for the Jewish Scriptures. It is, however, necessary to under-

stand the nature of this witness. Its nature is different from

what I have sometimes described. Every incident has a partic-

ular common cause and nature which provides strength for its

proof, even if it apparently looks to be different but, in fact,

comes out to be the same when all aspects are closely viewed.

For example James said in his epistle:1

|

Ye have heard of the patience of Job, and have seen

|

the end of the Lord.

|

We know that the truth of the book of Job has been a mat-

ter of great controversy among Christian scholars. This wit-

ness of James confinns only the fact that this book was pre-

sent and acknowledged by the Jews. Similarly Paul said in his

second epistle to Timothy:2

|

Now as Jannes and Jambres withstood Moses, so

|

these also resist the truth.

|

These two names are not found in the Old Testament and

we do not know if Paul reported them from one of the apoc-

ryphal books or knew of them through tradition. Had this

event been written Paul would have reported it from the text

and would have not made himself the pivot of the truth of this

event, to the extent that the truth of his letter became depen-

dent on the question of whether Jannes and Jambres opposed

Moses or not.

|

The object of my contention is not to show that there is

no testimony superior to that of Jannes and Jambres or Job

regarding the history of the Jews. I see this matter from

another perspective. What I mean is, that a particular verse of

the Old Testament being recorded by the evangelists does not

prove it to be so true as to distrust the ARGUMENTs coming from

extemal sources. It is not correct to take it as a principle that

every word of Jewish history is true. This would makes all

their books unreliable. I must stress this point because Walter

and his disciples used to take shelter in the Jewish writings

and then raised objections against Christianity. Some of their

objections are based on the fact that they misinterpreted the

meanings of the texts, while some of their objections are sim-

ply founded on exaggeration. But the main cause of their

objections is the misconception that any witness of Christ and

the ancient teachers confirming the prophethood of Moses

and other Prophets is a witness to the truth of each and every

verse of the Old Testament, and that it is obligatory for the

Christians to support everything written in the Old Testament.

|

Varied Opinions on the Truth of Some Books of the Bible

|

The Book of Job

|

The above statement clearly confirms our previous claims. Paley own

LL remark that there is great controversy among the Christian

scholars

with regard to the authenticity of the book of Job, is, in fact, a

refer-

ence to a great dispute among the scholars in this regard. Jewish

L Scholars such as Semler, Michaelis, Leclerc and Stock said Job

was a

; pseudonym and that such a man never really existed and that his

book is nothing but a collection of false and unreal stories. On the

other

hand Calmet and Vantil claimed that Job was a real person who lived

at that time.

|

Those who recognise him as a real person place him in various

historical periods. There are seven different opinions:

|

(1) Some scholars claim that he was a contemporary of the Prophet

Moses.

|

(2) Some others put him in the period of Judges" after the death of

Joshua.

|

(3) Some People argue that he lived in the time of Ahasuerus or

Ardashir, the Kings of Persia.

|

(4) Another opinion puts him in the period prior to the visit of

Abraham to Canaan.

|

(5) Some hold him to have lived at the time of Jacob.

|

(6) Others claim him to have been a contemporary of Solomon.

|

(7) Some scholars said that he lived in the time of King

Nebuchadnezzar.

|

Home said that all these opinions showed weakness.

|

Similarly there are differing opinions concerning Job own place of

birth, "Ghota".2 There are three opinions, with regard to the geo-

graphical location of this place. Burckhardt, Spanheim, Calmet and

others believe that it was a place in the Arabian peninsula.

Michaelis

and llgen3 place it near Damascus. Lowth, Magee, Hales and Chodac

said "Ghota" was the second name of Adom.

|

The same differences exist with regard to the author. There are

varied opinions about him. He was a Jew; he was Job; he was Solo-

mon; he was Isaiah; or he was an unknown person who was a contem-

porary of King Mansar. According to some ancient writers the book

was written by Moses in the Hebrew language. Origen claims that it

was translated from Syrian to Greek. Similar disagreement is found

about the last portion of the book. We discussed this earlier.

|

All this is sufficient proof that their claim for the authenticity

of

their books is not based on reports from authentic sources. They

can

nowhere show a sequence of reporters going back to the author of

even a single verse of their books. Most of their claims are

founded

simply on surmises and false deductions. Theodore, the fifth

century

priest, condernned this book. Ward, on the other hand, reported the

following remark of Luther, the founding leader of the Protestant

faith

who said:

|

This book is merely a fable.

|

In view of the above statements this book cannot be considered as

inspired.

|

The Book of Esther

|

We have shown that the book of Esther remained rejected and dis-

approved of until the year 354. Even the name of its author is not

def-

initely known. Melito and Athanasius also disapproved of it, while

Amphilochius expressed suspicions about its authenticity.

|

The Song of Solomon

|

The condition of the Song of Solomon is no different to that of the

Book of Job. Theodore, the priest, equally condemned and rejected

this book while Simon and Leclerc have denied its authenticity.

Wett-

stein and other later writers said that it was a vile song and

should

therefore be discarded from the sacred books. Semler said that

there is

a definite indication that this book is a fiction. Ward quoted

Castellio

suggesting that its exclusion from the sacred books is necessary.

|

If the witness of Christ and his Apostles implied proof of the

authenticity of each and every part of the Old Testament, the above

serious differences would not have existed among ancient and modem

writers. In view of the above, Paley own statement produced above is

the most factual and final. Besides, we have already pointed out that

Judaeo-Christian scholars are agreed on the fact that Ezra made

mis-

takes in the First Book of Chronicles, and this book, too, is one

of

those for which Christ, in their opinion, gave witness. So even if

they

reject the findings of Paley what can they say about these mistakes

of

Ezra?

|

The Fourth Answer

|

If we assume for a moment that the testimony of Christ and his

Apostles was enough to prove the authenticity of each and every

part

of these books, it does not make any difference for, as we have

already proved, these books were changed and distorted after the

time

of the Christ and his Apostles. Among the ancient Christians,

Justin,

Augustine and Chrysostom held the same opinion and all the Catholic

and the Protestant scholars like Sylbergius, Grabe, Whitaker,

Leclerc

and Watson clearly admitted that these books were changed by the

Jews after the time of the Apostles. All this has been sufficiently

proved in earlier pages of this book. The question is whether the

dis-

torted versions of these texts, to which they admitted, were

present at

the time of Christ and his Apostles or not? The fact is that their

authenticity in both cases remains unproved and doubtful and this

is

what we claim to have demonstrated.

|

As for their ARGUMENT that Christ would have accused the Jews for

inserting distortions in the texts had they been involved in it, we

must

remind them that the ancient Christians, themselves, used to change

the texts of the sacred books, and we may add that many of the pre-

sent distortions were made in their own period and the Aposdes used

to blame them in vain for it. Apart from this historical evidence,

it

was not, at all, necessary for Christ to accuse them, as we have

seen

earlier that Christ and his Aposdes blamed neither Samaritans nor

the

Jews for making distortions in their versions. What we mean to say

is,

that the Hebrew and Samaritan versions are so seriously different

from each other that one of them must be distorted. Had it been

neces-

sary for Christ to distribute blame, he must have blamed one or the

|

other of the two groups. This difference between the two versions

has

been a point of controversy among the groups of scholars. Dr.

Kennicott and his followers favour the Samaritans while most

Protestants support the Jews.

|

We do not find any evidence that Christ or his Apostles have ever

cast blame on either group. Christ did not say anything in this

regard

even when a Samaritan woman asked a question specifically about

this matter. He remained silent on this occasion. His silence

provides

support. if not proof, for the the Samaritan version. Dr. Kennicott

based his ARGUMENT on Christ own silence and favoured the Samaritan

version.

|

Third Contention

|

It is often contended that the Jews and the Christians were as

truth-

ful and honest as the Muslims claim to be. Being honest they cannot

be accused of having distorted their text. The imbecility of this

con-

tention must be quite evident to the readers in the presence of

what

they have so far read in earlier pages, with regard to admissions

made

by ancient and modem writers to the effect that the sacred books

have

certainly been changed. Especiauy when they are religiously allowed

to alter and change certain passages in the name of propagating the

truth.

|

Fourth Contention

|

In order to remove the blame of distortion from their books they

often claim that "the copies and versions of the sacred books were

so

much circulated in both the East and the West that it was as

impossi-

ble to change them." This contention also is as laughable as the

third

one. Because, in the presence of unambiguous admissions of distor-

tions by the Judaeo-Christian scholars, this contention is of no

help to

them.

|

The Judaeo-Christian books can never be compared to the Holy

Koran as far as their history and authenticity is concemed. This

is

because the biblical books were in such a state before the

invention of

printing that they could easily be tampered with. Their popularity

was

not to the extent that could prevent distortion. We have already

seen

how the heretics of the East and the Jews manipulated the text of

the

Latin translation which was the best known in both the East and the

West. Admissions of both Catholics and Protestants to this effect

have

already been cited. On the other hand, the Holy Koran, right from

the

time of its revelation, has been known to, and acted upon by, thou-

sands of people in every age. In addition to its preservation in

book

form it has been kept preserved in the hearts of thousands of

people

throughout the ages.

|

The Holy Koran was not, even for a single day, in a state that any

change in it would physically have been possible. The preservation

of

the whole of the Holy Koran by memorising it is still practised

throughout the Islamic world. There are always thousands of people

present in Koranic schools who have memorised all of the Holy

Koran along with its complete intonadons as practiced by the Holy

Prophet himself. Any one can verify this fact for himself. For

exam-

ple, there are one thousand "Huffaz" 1 present in the university of

al-

Azhar in Cairo alone. There is no village and town in Egypt where

Huffaz are not found.

|

There is, however, no tradition of memorising the sacred books in

the Judaeo-Christian world. There are only rare examples of this

prac-

tice. The Christian population of the world is larger than the

liIuslim

population and they are financially in a better position but in

spite of

this we have never heard of any hafiz of the Old or the New

Testament. There is only the Prophet Ezra who was supposed to have

memorised the Pentateuch. It is the miracle of the Holy Koran that

even today there are many hundred thousand people who treasure the

Holy Koran in their hearts. This ever-living miracle of the Holy

Koran can be seen any where in the Islamic world.

|

As proof of this there is an account of an English officer who

visit-

ed a Koranic School in Saharanpur in India and saw the children

busy learning the Holy Koran by heart. The officer asked the

teacher

what book it was. Discovering that it was the Holy Koran, he asked

how many of those children had memorised the Holy Koran com-

pletely. The teacher pointed to a few of them. The officer asked

one of

them to come forward and held the Holy Koran himself and asked

him to recite from various places. The student recited the portions

exactly as was written with all its intonations. He was very

astonished

at this and remarked that he was witness to the fact that no other

book

of the world could claim the status of being as original and

authentic

as the Holy Koran for a child of twelve or thirteen years of age

was

able to write it down without making a mistake.

|

Historicity of the Bible

|

History has recorded a vast quantity of indisputable evidence to

show that none of the original revelations except the Holy Koran

have not been able to save themselves from the cruel hands of

politi-

cal turmoil. We would like to produce some historical evidence to

prove this claim:

|

First Evidence:

|

The Prophet Moses handed over the Torah (the Pentateuch) to the

scholars and chiefs of the Israelites during his lifetime and

command-

ed them to keep it safe in the Ark of the Covenant.l It used to be

taken

out of the ark every seven years at the time of the Passover. The

Torah

was kept safe in the ark for some time and the people acted upon it

in

the first century after Moses, but subsequently they changed its

injunctions. Committing apostasy and subsequently returning to

Judaism was their usual practice.2 This state of affairs remained

unchanged up to the reign of the Prophet David. In his time there

was

some improvement in their attitude which lasted up to the beginning

of Solomon own period.l During the subsequent historical calamities

and

great turmoil the Pentateuch was lost. The time of its

disappearance is

not known with certainty. When the Prophet Solomon opened the ark,

he found only two stone tablets in it. These two tablets of stone

con-

tained only the Ten Commandments. This is described in I Kings 8:2:

|

There was nothing in the ark save the two tablets of

stone, which Moses put there at Horeb, when the lord made a

covenant with the children of Israel when they came out of

|

the land of Egypt.

|

Then towards the end of the reign of Solomon. there started a

sequence of great changes which are confirmed by the sacred books

and after his death even greater turmoil took place. The Children

of

Israel were separated and divided. Now there existed two separate

kingdoms. Jeroboam became the king of ten tribes and his domain

was named the Kingdom of Israel, while Rehoboam the son of

Solomon became the king of two tribes, his land was named the

Kingdom of Judah. Jeroboam, just after his ascension to the throne,

became an apostate and tumed to idol worship, with the result that

all

his people took to idol worship.

|

Those who still followed the law of the Pentateuch had to migrate

to the kingdom of Judah. In this way all these tribes continued to

be

infidels and idol worshippers for two hundred and fifty years. Then

there came punishment from God through the invasion of the king of

Assyria,2 who imprisoned them and then deported them to various

countries. Only a small group of people were left who later on

estab-

lished social relations with the Assyrians and started marrying

them.3

|

The new generation bom as a result of these mixed relations came

to be known as Sarnaritans. In short, right from the time of

Jeroboam

up to the end of the Kingdom of Israel, these people had no contact

with the Pentateuch and its injunctions. For all those years the

exis-

tence of the Torah was not known to them.

|

Nor was the condition of the Kingdom of Judah very different

from that of the Kingdom of Israel. They had twenty kings in three

hUndred and seventy two years. The number of apostate kings was

more than those who were believers. Idol worship had become a com-

mon practice in the period of Rehoboam. Idols were placed under

every tree in order to be worshipped. Then, in the reign of Ahaz,

idol

worship became the practice of the ruler himself and he, "shut up

the

doors of the House of the Lord and he made altars in every comer of

Jerusalem.""l

|

Prior to this the House of the Lord had been destroyed and ruined

twice. First the king of Egypt captured it and plundered the women

of

the House of the Lord as well as the royal ladies. The second time

was when the apostate king of Israel raided it and did the same

with

the women of the House of the Lord and the ladies of the royal

palaces. Infidelity and idolatry reached its climax in the reign of

Manasseh when the majority of the people converted to idolatry. He

built altars for the idols right in the courtyard of the temple and

the

hng even shifted the particular deity that he worshipped to the

temple

precincts.2 Circumstances remained unchanged in the reign of Amon

the son of Manasseh.3 However, when Josiah the son of Amon

ascended to the throne, he sincerely repented and tumed to God with

the result that his officials started reviving the law of Moses and

tried

to obliterate all traces of idolatry and infidelity. There was no

trace of

existence of the Pentateuch for as long as seventeen years after

his

ascension to the throne.4

|

Discovery of the Pentateuch in the Reign of Josiah

|

It was in the eighteenth year of Josiah own accession5 that the high

priest Hilkiah suddenly claimed that he had found a copy of the

Pentateuch in the temple. He handed it down to the scribe Shaphan.

This copy was read to King Josiah. Josiah having discovered the

con-

tents of the book, was very shocked and aggrieved conceming the

opposite practice of the Israelites for all those years and rent

his

clothes. We find this mentioned in II Kings chapter 22, and Chroni-

cles chapter 34. The statement of Hilkiah is not acceptable, nor is

the

copy discovered by him in any way reliable for reasons that we will

discuss below.

|

We know from history that the temple of the Lord had been totally

destroyed twice prior to the reign of Ahaz. Subsequently it was

turned

into a place of idol worship. The keepers and worshippers used to

enter the temple frequently. It seems inconceivable that a copy of

the

Pentateuch, which was present in the temple all that time, could

have

remained unnoticed by the people for as long a period as seventeen

years. Especiauy when all the officials of Josiah own Kingdom were

striving hard to bring about the revival of the law of Moses, and

the

priests were continually in the House of the Lord, going through

every inch of it.

|

The truth is that this copy was invented by Hilkiah himself. When

he saw that king Josiah and au the people were inclined to the law

of

Moses and were trying to revive it, he started writing down the

verbal

tradition that he came to hear and remembered or was conveyed to

him by others, with little regard for its reality and authenticity.

It took

him seventeen years to complete it. Then after its completion he

found an opportunity to attribute it to Moses. And it is not

surprising

that that this was done for the sake of truth because, as we know,

this

kind of falsehood was allowed, indeed encouraged, by their faith as

we have discussed earlier.

|

From Josiah to Nebuchadnezzar

|

Even if we ignore what we have just said and accept that the copy

of the Pentateuch found by Hilkiah in the eighteenth year of

Josiah own

ascension was original, it takes us nowhere. This copy of the

Penta-

teuch was followed and acted upon for only thirteen years. After

the

|

death of Josiah, his son Jehoahaz ascended to throne and he also

devi-

ated from the law of the Pentateuch and became an apostate.

Infidelity

came back to rule again. The king of Egypt then conquered the land

of Judah and imprisoned Jehoahaz. The throne was given to his

broth-

er. He too was an apostate. His son took ovcr as king after his

death.

He also, like his father and uncle, was an apostate. Nebuchadnezzar

invaded Jerusalem and captured him and his people. The temple and

royal treasury were plundered by him. The nephew of the king was

entrusted with the kingdom and he also was an apostate.

|

In the light of the above, one is naturally drawn to conclude that

the original Pentateuch was lost before the period of Josiah. The

copy

that was discovered by Hilkiah in his reign was not reliable and

authenticated and, in any case, remained in vogue for only thirteen

years. We do not find any sign of its continued existence.

Apparently

apostasy and infidelity found its way into their lives after the

death of

Jehoahaz and the Pentateuch had ceased to exist prior to the

invasion

of Nebuchadnezzar. Taking it granted that somerare copies of the

Pentateuch still existed, the calamitous invasion of Nebuchadnezzar

eliminated all possibilities of its existence.

|

The Second Evidence

|

The king,l who was entrusted with the rule of Judah by Nebuchad-

nezzar, rebelled against him. Nebuchadnezzar invaded Jerusalem a

second time, imprisoned the king, slaughtered his children before

his

eyes which were gouged out.2 And in the words of Chronicles he:

|

...had no compassion upon young man or maiden, old

man or him that stooped for age: he gave them all into his

hand. And all the vessels of the house of God, great and

small, and the treasures of the house of the Lord, and the trea-

sures of the king and of his princes; all these he brought to

Babylon.3

During this calamity the Pentateuch and all the books written

before it were absolutely destroyed. This is also admitted by the

scholars of the Christian world as has been shown earlier in this

book.

|

The Third Evidence

|

When the prophet "Ezra" recompiled the books of the Old Testa-

ment, as is claimed by the Christians, they were subjected to

another

disaster at the hands of Antiochus, a king from Europe who, after

con-

quering Jerusalem, bumt and tore up all the available copies of the

books of the Old Testament. The following is from I Maccabees chap-

|

Never a copy of the Divine law but was tom up and

bumed; if any were found that kept the sacred record or

obeyed the Lord own will, his life was forfeit to the king own edict.

Month by month such deeds of violence were done.l

|

This calamity befell them one hundred and sixty-one years before

the birth of Christ and lasted for a period of three and a half

years.

These events were described by Josephus and historians of the

Christian world. All the copies of the Old Testament written by

Ezra

were absolutely destroyed as we discussed at the beginning of this

book. The following remarks are quoted from the Catholic, John

Mill:

|

When the correct copies of these books appeared through

Ezra, these too were lost during the invasion of Antiochus.

|

John Mill further remarked:

|

In this case the these books cannot be considered authen-

tic without the witness of Christ and his apostles to them.

|

We may remind the readers that we have sufficiently explained the

situation regarding the witness of Christ and of his apostles.

|

The Fourth Evidence

|

After this persecution by Antiochus, the Jews were subjected to

many more historical calamities at the hands of other kings who

destroyed whatever was left of the writings of Ezra. One famous

event is the invasion of the Roman emperor, Titus. This was a

painful

event of Jewish history and happened thirty-seven years after the

ascension of Christ. In this incident hundreds of thousands of Jews

were killed by sword, fire or hunger. Josephus described this event

in

great detail. Ninety-seven thousand Jews were enslaved and sold in

other countries.

|

The Fifth Evidence

|

The ancient Christians, from the very beginning, were not very

much inclined towards the Hebrew version of the Old Testament. The

majority of them believed it to have been distorted by the Jews.

They

trusted and acknowledged the Greek version, especially up to the

end

of the second century. The same version was also followed by the

Jews up to the end of the flrst century. Since the Christians had

a nat-

ural indifference towards the Hebrew version, there were few

copies,

and those were mostly with the Jews. We have already discussed this

in detail under the heading of the first contention.

|

The Sixth Evidence

|

All the versions of the sacred books that were written in the

seventh or eightth centuries were destroyed and obliterated by the

Jews simply because they were not in accordance with the copies

that

they possessed. This is why the scholars entrusted with the work of

e revision of the Old Testament could not obtain even a single copy

written in these two centuries. The result was that the Jews

possessed

only the copies that they thought were correct. They could easily

have

changed the texts of these copies without any fear of being found

out

or criticised.

|

The Seventh Evidence

|

The early history of the Christians was one of distress and trials,

especially in the first three hundred years when they were

subjected to

great afflictions and faced massacre at many hands.

|

First Calamity

|

The first calamity they faced was in the year 64 in the reign of

the

emperor, Nero.l Peter, the apostle, his wife and Paul2 were

murdered

in this event in Rome. To express faith in Christianity was a great

offence at that time. This state of affairs remained unchanged

until the

emperor own death.

|

Second Calamity

|

This event took place in the reign of the emperor Domitian, who,

like the emperor Nero, was known for being hostile to the Christian

faith. He issued an order to kill the Christians which was followed

by

such a great massacre of the Christians that the existence of

Chris-

tianity was endangered. John, the apostle, was exiled and Philip

Clement was murdered.

|

Third Calamity

|

Another great trial of the Christians started in the year 101 at

the

hands of the emperor Trajan3 and continued for eighteen years.

Ignatius, the bishop of Corinth, Clement, the bishop of Rome, and

Simon, the bishop of Jerusalem, were all murdered.

|

Fourth Calamity

|

A great massacre of the Christians was recorded by history starting

in 161 at the hands the emperor Marcus Antonius. This homicidal

period lasted for ten years. A great number of the Christians were

killed in the East and the West.

|

Fifth Calamity

|

This event took place in the period of the emperor Septimius

Thousands of Christians were killed in the land of Egypt alone

Similarly in France and Carthage the Christians were massacred bar

barously. to the extent that the Christians thought that the time

of the

Antichrist had arrived.

|

Sixth Calamity

|

In 237 the Emperor Maximus started killing the Christians. The

majority of the Christian scholars were killed at his orders, as he

esti-

mated that it would be easier for him to rule them after the

elimina-

tion of their scholars. The Popes Pontian and Fabian were killed.

|

Seventh Calamity

|

This terrible calamity of the Christians started in 253, in the

period

of the emperor Decius who had firmly resolved to root out the

Christian faith and obliterate all signs of its existence. He

issued

orders to his governors to fulfil his intention. A great number of

Christians had to abandon their faith. Egypt, Africa, Italy and

cities of

the East were the main centres of this calamity.

|

Eighth Calamity

|

This trial of the Christians started in 274. The emperor Aurelian

also issued orders for killing the Christians but was killed before

much damage to the lives of the Christians had taken place.

|

Ninth Calamity

|

Another general massacre of the Christians started in 302. The

|

whole land was red with blood. The city of Phrygia was burnt to

ashes, leaving no single Christian alive.

|

Tenth Calanity

|

Diocletian, the famous Roman emperor who reigned from 284-

305, persecuted the Christians because he felt that the increasing

power of the Church endangered his kingdom.

|

If the above historical events are true, they leave little

possibility

of the sacred books having been preserved. It was also an ideal

situation for people who wanted to change or alter the text. We

have

already shown that there were many heretical sects present in the

first

century who were busy making alterations in the texts.

|

The Eighth Evidence

|

The emperor Diocletian intended to obliterate every trace of the

existence of the sacred books. He tried hard to achieve this goal

and

issued orders to demolish churches, burn all the books, stop the

Christians from worshipping in the form of a congregation. These

orders were carried out. The churches were levelled and all the

books

that he could find after an extensive search were bumt. Any

Christian

who was suspected of possessing a book was punished and tortured.

This deprived the Christians of congregational worship. The details

of

these events can be found in the books of history. Lardner said on

page 22 of the seventh volume of his book:

|

Diocletian passed orders that churches be abolished and

books be burnt.

|

He further said:

|

Eusebius has given an eye-witness accounts of the event

in a painful tone, saying, "I have seen with my own eyes the

demolition of the churches and the burning of the sacred

books in public places."

|

We do not claim that in these events all the sacred books were

completely lost. What these events confirm is the fact that the

exis-

tence of the copies of the sacred books remained very limited in

num-

ber and, of course, many correct versions were completely losL

|

The possibility cannot be denied that a certain book could have

been totally lost and that some other book have been published in

its

name, since such occurrences were quite possible before the

existence

of the modern printing press. We have just shown that the copies

writ-

ten in the seventh and eighth centuries ceased to exist. Adam

Clarke

said in the introduction of his commentary:

|

The original of the exegesis that is attributed to Tatian has

|

been completely lost, and the book which is ascribed to him

now is doubtful to the scholars, and they are absolutely right

in their doubts.

|

Watson said in the third volume of his book:

|

The exegesis attributed to Tatian was present in the time

|

of Theodoret and was recited in every church. Theodoret

abolished all its copies so that it could be replaced with the

Evangel.

|

This shows how it was easy for Theodoret to abolish all the copies

of a certain book and how another could be substituted in its name.

There can be no doubt that Diocletian was more powerful than the

Jews and stronger than Theodoret. It would not, therefore, be

surpris-

ing if some books of the New Testament were completely destroyed

at the hands of Diocletian or ceased to exist during other

calamities

before him, and if other books were substituted in their names, as

we

have seen in the case of the exegesis of Tatian.

|

This assumption, when seen in the light of the statement giving

them religious licence to change the holy texts for the sake of the

truth, is quite feasible and logical.

|

The historical events described above are the main cause for the

non-existence of any authority supporting the books of the Old and

New Testaments. Neither the Jews nor the Christians possess

anything

|

to prove the truth of their scriptures. As we said earlier, when we

asked some contemporary Christian scholars to produce authenticated

proofs for the truth of their books in our famous public debate,

they

had to admit that, due to the calamities of the Christians in the

first

three hundred and thirteen years of their history, all such proofs

had

been destroyed. We also tried to find authorities to support the

truth of

the Biblical books but all our efforts ended in despair as what we

found was no more than conjecture, which does not help prove the

truth of these books.

|

The Fifth Contention

|

Sometimes the Christians make statements to the effect that the

copies of the sacred books written in the period prior to the emer-

gence of Islam are still in existence and that the present books

are in

accordance with them. This statement, in fact, consists of two

sepa-

rate claims, first that those versions were written before the

emer-

gence of Islam and second that the present books are identical

copies

of them. We intend to show that both claims are false and

incorrect.

|

Let us first remind ourselves of the clear statement of Dr.

Kennicott and others that the Jews themselves destroyed all the

copies

of the sacred books written in the seventh aand eighth centuries,

and

that no copy of the Hebrew version written in these two centuries

could be obtained. There were no copies to be found in any period

preceding the tenth century. The oldest copy that Dr Kennicott was

able to get was the Codex Laudianus which he claimed was written in

the tenth century while de Rossi situated it in the eleventh

century.

Van der Hooght published a copy of the Hebrew version with a claim

that it was the most correct of all the Hebrew versions. One can

guess

the profusion of errors that this copy contained.

|

The Ancient Versions of the Bible

|

Let us now examine the position of the Latin version. There are

three versions that are considered among the Christians to be the

old-

est: the Codex Alexandrinus, the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex

|

Ephraemi- The first is in London. It was this copy that was used

for

the first revision or correction of the present books. The second

is in

Italy and was used for the second revision. The third one is in

Paris

and bears the title "The Old Testament". It does not, however,

contain

the books of the Old Testament.

|

We can easily ascertain the position of all three versions through

the witnesses provided by history.

|

The Codex Alexandrinus

|

In volume 2 of his book, Horne said describing the Codex

Alexandrinus:

|

This copy consists of four volumes. The first three vol-

umes contain the canonic as well as the apocryphal books of

the Old Testament. The fourth volume consists of the New

Testament and the First Epistle of Clement to Corinthians and

the unacknowledged Book of Psalms which is attributed to

Solomon.

|

Further he specified:

|

Before the Book of Psalms it has an epistle of Athanasius.

This precedes the prayers that are recited in everyday rituals

offered every hour. Then there are fourteen psalms related to

the faith. The eleventh of these psalms is an eulogy to Mary.

Some of these psalms are false, while others are derived from

the Gospels. The ARGUMENTs of Eusebius are written on the

book of Psalms while his legislative notes are inscribed on the

Gospels. Some scholars have been exaggerated in its praise

while others disapproved of it in equally exaggerated fashion.

Wettstein is considered to be its chief opponent.

|

The question of its antiquity has also been debated. Grabe and

Sholtz estimated that it was written towards the end of the fourth

cen-

tury while Michaelis claimed that it was the oldest copy available

and

no other copy could be older than it because it contained the

Epistle

of Athanasius. Woide, on the other hand, situates it in the tenth

centu-

|

ry. He also surmised that this was one of the copies that were

collect-

ed in 615 in Alexandria for the Syrian translation. Dr Semler

thinks

that it was written in the seventh century. Montfaucon said that

none

of these copies, including the Codex Alexandrinus, can be said with

certainty to have been written prior to the sixth century.

Michaelis

claimed that it was written after Arabic had become the language of

Egypt. This places it one or two hundred years after the Muslim

con-

quest of Alexandria. The basis of his claim is that the copier

inter-

changed M and B with each other according to the Arabic rules of

recitation. Woide concluded that since it is subdivided into

chapters

and various sections and bears the canonical notes of Eusebius it

can-

not be older than the fourth century. Spohn raised the following

objec-

tions against the ARGUMENTs forwarded by Woide:

|

(1) The epistles of Paul (included in this copy) have not been

divided into chapters and sections when this division was made

in 396.

|

(2) It contains the epistles of Clement when the reading of these

letters was prohibited by the councils of Laodicea and Car-

thage. Sholt deduced from this that it was written prior to 364.

|

The Codex Vaticanus

|

Horne said describing the Codex Vaticanus:

|

The introduction to the Greek translation printed in 1590

|

includes the claim that this codex was written sometime prior

to 388. Montfaucon and Bianchini placed it in the fifth or

sixth century. Dupin put it in the seventh century while Hug

places it at the beginning of the fourth century and Marsh sit-

uates it towards the end of the fifth century. He has concluded

that no other two copies are so completely different from each

other as the Codex Alexandrinus and this codex.

|

He also said:

|

Dr. Kennicott also deduced that neither this codex nor the

Codex Alexandrinus has been copied from the version of

|

Origen nor from the copies of it prepared in the period imme-

diately after it. Both were copied from a version that does not

bear any sign of the Origen version.

|

The Codex Ephraemi

|

Horne, describing the Codex Ephraemi, observed in the same vol-

ume:

|

Wettstein considers it to be one of the copies that were

collected in Alexandria for the revision of the Syrian transla-

tion but there is nothing to support this opinion. He inferred

this opinion from the marginal note that appeared against

verse 7 of chapter 8 of the Epistle to Hebrews, saying that this

version was prepared before 544 but Michaelis refuted this

ARGUMENT, only saying that it was an ancient version. Marsh

has suggested that it was written in the seventh century.

|

The above is more than enough to convince us that no definite

proof exists to specify the year of the compilation of these

versions.

The scholars have only made calculations and conjectures about the

date of their origin on the basis of some indefinite indications

which

they have found in their books. These vague calculations obviously

cannot authenticate any of the sacred books. Most of the ARGUMENTs

cited above are of the kind that do not stand up to reason.

Semler own

statement with regard to the Muslim domination over Egypt is unac-

ceptable, as the language of a country could not possibly take over

in

such a short time. Alexandria was conquered by the Muslims in the

seventh century, in the twentieth year of lijra. Michaelis,

however,

forwarded strong ARGUMENTs placing its writing in the tenth

century.

Woide own opinion that it was written in the tenth century seems

quite

logical because it was in this century that the practice of

distorting the

sacred texts became commonplace. Another indication of this is the

fact that this copy contains three books that are not genuine,

indicat-

ing that it must belong to a period in which it was difficult to

distin-

guish between true and false which definitely applied to the tenth

cen-

tury.

This proves the falsity of the claim that these books were written

|

before the emergence of Islam. The other claim is also disproved by

the fact that the Codex Alexandrinus contains books that are not

gen-

uine and that it has been condemned by some scholars, Wettstein

being foremost among them, and that no other two copies are so com-

pletely different from each other as are the Codex Vaticanus and

the

Codex Alexandrinus.

|

Now if, for a moment, we grant that the above three versions were

written prior to the appearance of Islam, it does not make any

differ-

ence to our contention, because we have never said that the sacred

books were not distorted in the period preceding Islam and that all

the

distortions were only made after it. What we contend is that these

books existed prior the period of Islam but they did not possess an

unbroken chain of authority to prove their authenticity. They were

certainly distorted even before the time of Islam. The presence of

a

number of books in the pre-lslamic period does not, therefore, help

prove their authenticity. The presence of the above three versions

in

that period, if ever proved, would only add to the number of the

books

distorted by earlier generations.

|

ABROGATION IN THE BIBLE

|

The word "abrogation" literally signifies annulment, nullification

or cancellation. In Muslim terminology, however, it means the

expira-

tion of the period of the validity of a practical injunction. The

occur-

rence of abrogation is related only to injunctions that are not

eternal

and are equal with regard to the possibility of their existence or

non-

existence.

|

Abrogation can never be taken to mean that God commanded or

prohibited something and then thought better of it and decided to

can-

cel His former command. This is impossible because it involves at-

tributing ignorance to God. May God forbid. Similarly it is not

possi-

ble for God to command or prohibit something and then without any

change in time, subject or conditions to abrogate His injunction

since

that would lead to attributing imperfection to God. God is free of

any

imperfection whatsoever.

|

What the abrogation signifies is that Allah knows that a certain

injunction will remain valid for people up to certain time and then

cease to be applicable. When that specific time is reached, a new

command is sent which seems to either abrogate or change the former

injunction but which, in fact, does nothing but mark the expiration

of

its validity. Since the former command did not have a specific

period

of validity attached to it, we take the new injunction as a

cancelation

of the former.

|

For example, you might command one of your servants to do a

certain job with the intention of asking him to do some other job

after

one year, without, however, disclosing your intention to him. After

the completion the year, when you ask him to do the other job, he

might well think that you have changed or amended your orders, even

though you have not, in fact, made any changes in your plans. Like

all

other changing phenomena around us, these apparent changes or

amendments in the divine injunctions are the part of divine wisdom

whether we know its significance or not.

|

The False Nature of the Biblical Changes

|

Keeping the above definition in view, we can confidently assert

that none of the historical events of the Old or New Testament have

undergone abrogation, but rather some of these events have been

changed and fabricated. The following are a few examples out of

many of such events:

|

1. The event describing the alleged adultery of the Prophet Lot

with his two daughters and their subsequent pregnancy. This

false description appears in chapter 19 of the Book of Genesis.

|

2. Judah, the son of the Prophet Jacob is described as having com-

mitted adultery with the wife of his son who then gave birh to

the twin brothers Pharez and Zarah. It may be noted that the

Prophets, David, Solomon and Jesus are the descendants of this

supposedly illegitimate son, Pharez. This description can be

found in chapter 38 of Genesis and the genealogy of Christ in

chapter 1 of Matthew.

|

3. The Prophet David is similarly described as having committed

adultery with the wife of Uriah, making her pregnant, then

killing her husband Uriah deceitfully and finally marrying her.

This description appears in chapter 11 of II Samuel.

|

4. The Prophet Solomon is accused of becoming an apostate by

converting to idol-worship in his old age and erecting temples

for the idols. This appears in I Kings chapter 11.

|

5. The Prophet Aaron is similarly accused of making a golden

calf-god for the Israelites and building altar for it and subse-

quently turning to its worship. This is mentioned in Exodus

chapter 32.

|

We would like to re-emphasize that all the above historical events

are false and fabricated and have certainly never been abrogated as

all

historical events fall outside of the possibility of abrogation.

Similarly

we refute the claim of abrogation for the Book of Psalms as it is

a col-

lection of prayers. We do not think that the Book of Psalms

abrogated

the Torah and was itself abrogated later by the Evangel, as has

been

|

falsely claimed by the Christian author of Meezan Haqq who has

wrongly asserted that this is claimed by the Holy Koran and its

com-

mentaries.

|

Our disbelief in the laws of the Biblical books is based on the

fact

that they lack authenticity and are of a dubious nature and because

of

the fact that they have certainly been corrupted and distorted by

peo-

ple through the ages as we have proved earlier in this book.

|

We may, however, state that injunctions which fall into categories

other than those defined above have the possibility of abrogation.

Therefore it is valid to posit that some of the injunctions

enjoined by

the Torah and the Evangel have been abrogated by the Holy Koran.

We never claim, however, that the laws of the Torah and the Evangel

have been abrogated by the Koran as a whole. It is not possible

because we see that there are certain injunctions of the Torah that

cer-

tainly have not been abrogated by the Holy Koran; for example,

false

witness, murder, adultery, sodomy, theft and perjury are all

prohibited

in Islam as they are in the law of Moses. Similarly the obligation

to

respect one own parents, and respect for the property and honour of

one own

neighbour, and the prohibition of matrimonial relations with

father,

grandfather, mother, uncle and aunt are common to the law of Moses

and the law of the Koran. They are therefore clearly not

abrogated.

|

Similarly there are certain evangelic injunctions that certainly

have

not been abrogated. For example we find in the Gospel of Mark:

|

Hear O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord: And thou

shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy

soul, and with all thy mind and with thy strength. And the

second is like namely this, thou shalt love thy neighbour as

|

thyself."

|

Both the above injunctions are also emphatically enjoined by

Koranic law as well. They have certainly not been abrogated.

Besides, abrogation is not unique to Islamic law. It is also found

in the

previous laws as well. Abrogation may be categorised into two main

|

kinds. Firstly certain injunctions enjoined by earlier Prophets may

be

abrogated by the laws of a succeeding Prophet. Secondly, abrogation

may occur in the law of the same Prophet with regard to some previ-

ous injunction. There are innumerable examples of both the kinds of

abrogation in the Old and New Testaments. We would like to present

a few example of each in the following pages.

|

Biblical Examples of the First Kind of Abrogation

|

First Example: Marriage between Brothers and Sisters

|

The marriage between brothers and sisters was admissible in the

law of the Prophet Abraham. The wife of the Prophet Abraham was

his sister as is understood from his own statement in Genesis

20:12:

|

And yet indeed she is my sister, she is the daughter of my

father but not the daughter of my mother and she became my

wife.

|

Later marriage with one own sister whether the daughter of one own

father or the daughter of one own mother was absolutely prohibited

and

became equal to adultery and anyone who did it accursed and liable

to

execution.

|

We read the following statement in Leviticus 18:9:

|

The nakedness of thy sister, the daughter of thy father or

daughter of thy mother, whether she be bom at home or bom

abroad; even their nakedness thou shalt not uncover.

|

Making comments on this verse D"Oyly and Richard Mant

remarked:

|

Such a marriage is equal to adultery.

|

We also find the following statement in Leviticus 20:17:

|

And if a man shall take his sister, his father own daughter or

his mother own daughter, and see her nakedness, and she sees his

nakedness; it is a wicked thing; and they shall be cut off in the

|

sight of their people: he hath uncovered his sister own naked-

ness; he shall bear his iniquity.

|

Another similar statement we find in Deuteronomy 27:22:

|

Cursed be he that lieth with his sister, the daughter of his

father or the daughter of his mother.

|

Now in view of the above statements, we are forced to deduce that

matrimonial relations between brother and sister were admissible

under the law of Adam and Abraham (peace be on them), otherwise it

would mean that all human beings are illegitimate and their parents

adulterers, to be cursed and liable to be killed. Besides a Prophet

can

in no way be imagined to have committed such a shameful act. There-

fore we must accept that such marriage was admissible in the law of

both these Prophets and then that this possibility was later on

abrogat-

ed by subsequent Prophets.

|

A Distortion By the Arabic Translator

|

The translation of Genesis 20:12 has been changed quite outra-

geously by the Arabic translator who rendered it in these words:

|

She is my father own relative not my mother own .

|

Apparently this alteration was made to avoid any accusation of

wrong action on the part of the Prophet Abraham in respect of his

marriage to Sarah, as a father own relatives include the daughters of

his

uncles and aunts and the daughters of his brothers and sisters and

many other relations.

|

Second Example: Sanction to Eat Various Animals

|

Genesis 9:3, according to the Arabic translation printed in 1625,

contains this commandment of Allah to the prophet Noah:

|

Every moving thing that liveth shall be meat for you;

|

even as the green herb have I given you all things.l

|

This allows us to understand that the meat of all the animals was

admissible just like the vegetables, while in the law of Moses we

find

many animals like pigs etc. to have been prohibited as is clear

from

Leviticus2 chapter 2 and Deuteronomy chapter 14.

|

Third Example: Two Sisters as Wives

|

The Prophet Jacob was married to two sisters at the same time

who were the daughters of his aunt, their names being Leah and

Rachel. This is mentioned in Genesis chapter 29.3 We find that all

such marriages are prohibited in the law of Moses. The book of

Leviticus 18:18 contains this statement:

|

Neither shalt thou take a wife to her sister to vex her, to

|

uncover her nakedness, beside the other in her lifetime.

|

It is clear that marrying two sisters must have been permitted in

the law of Jacob, otherwise we would be forced to say that all the

descendants of such a marriage were illegitimate, when we all know

that all the Israelite Prophets, Jesus included, are the

descendants of

Jacob.

|

Fourth Example: Marriage With Father own Sister

|

We have already mentioned that Imran, the father Moses, married

Jechobed who was his father own sister, when such marriages were for-

bidden in the Law of Moses as is known from Leviticus 18:12:

|

Thou shalt not uncover the nakedness of thy father own sis-

|

ter, She is thy father own near kinswoman.

|

1. This passage has been taken from the King Ja nes version which

is exactly in

accordance with the quote of our author from the Arabic.

|

2. "And the swine, though he divides the hoof and be cloven footed,

yet he

cheweth not the cud he is unclean to you, of their flesh shall ye

not eat."

|

3. See particularly verses 23 to 30.

|

Another statement to this effect is also found in chapter 20 verse

19 of

the same book." This again leads us to conclude that such marriages

had religious sanction prior to the law of Moses which later

abrogated

them. Otherwise it would again force us to consider the Prophets

Moses and Aaron and their sister Mary to be illegitimate and would

also mean that none of them could enter the congregation of God for

up to ten generations afterwards as is known from Deutero-nomy

23:3. If blessed people like them are precluded from entering the

con-

gregation of the Lord, who else would be able to enter it?

|

Fifth Example

|

We find the following statement in the Book of leremiah:

|

Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will make a

new covenant with the house of Israel and with the house of

Judah; not according to the covenant that I made with their

fathers, in the day that I took them by the hand to bring them

out of the land of Egypt; which my covenant they brake,

although I was a husband unto them, saith the Lord.2

|

It is not difficult to see that the words, "I will make a new

covenant,"

in the above verse refer to a new divine law that was going to be

sent

to abrogate the existing laws. According to Paul own claim in his

Epistle

to the Hebrews, the new covenant referred to in the above verse is

none other than the law of lesus.3 According to this admission of

Paul, the Law of Jesus abrogated the law of Moses.

|

The above five are common to the Jews and the Christians as

examples of the presence of abrogation in the Bible.

|

There are also many examples which are specifically related to the

Christians. The following are some of them.

|

Sixth Example: Sanction of Divorce

|

It was permissible in the Law of Moses for a man to divorce his

wife for any reason and also for a divorced woman to remarry

another

man as soon as she left her first husband own home. This can

ascertained

from chapter 24 of euteronomy. In Christian law, however, a man is

not auowed to divorce his wife until she is found to have committed

adultery, and besides, Christian law precludes marriage with

divorced

women, considering it a crime equal to adultery.

|

The Gospel of Matthew chapter 19 verse 15 contains the fouowing

statement of Jesus which he made while replying to the objections

of

the Pharisees on this matter:

|

He saith unto them, Moses, because of the hardness of

your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives, but from

the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you who so ever

shau put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shau

marry another committeth adultery, and who so marrieth her

which is put away doth comrnit adultery.

|

One can easily understand from the above statement that abroga-

tion occurred twice regarding this injunction, once in the law of

Moses and once in the law of Jesus. We also understand from the

above statement that sometimes an injunction is introduced only to

meet the demands of the circumstances prevailing in certain time

though the injunction itself may not be good.

|

Seventh Example

|

There were many animals whose meat was not permissible accord-

ing to the law of Moses while later, by Christian law, this

prohibition

was abrogated. And according to the judgement of Paul this permis-

sion was further generalised to include almost all animals. Paul own

Epistle to the Romans 14:14 contains this statement:

|

I know, and am persuaded by the Lord Jesus, that there is

nothing unclean of itself, but to him that esteemeth anything

|

to be unclean, to him it is unclean.

|

Further he said in his Epistle to rltus 1:15:

|

Unto the pure au things are pure but unto them that are

defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure, but even their minds

and conscience is defiled.

|

These two principles, that something should be unclean only to

those who consider it unclean and that everything should be clean

and

permissible to the believers, are quite strange. They imply that

the

Israelites were not clean enough to have permission to eat all

animals,

as the Christians can. Paul made a conscious effort to publicise

this

permission to consume the meat of au animals. He said in his letter

to

Timothy 4:4:

|

For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be

refused; if it be received with thanksgiving, for it is sanctified

by the word of God and prayer. If thou put the brethren in

remembrance of these things thou shalt be a good minister of

Jesus Christ.

|

Eighth Example: Precepts of the Feast and the Sabbath

|

Au the injunctions related to feast days, that are contained in

chap-

ter 23 of Leviticus, were made etemal obligations for the people by

the law of Moses. There are many words in verses 14, 21, 31 and 41

of this chapter that explicitly indicate the etemal nature of this

injunc-

tion:

|

It shau be a statute for ever throughout your generations

in au your dweuings."

|

This etemauy binding statute was abrogated later on by Paul.

|

Besides this, the law of Moses made the observance of the Sabbath

an etemal obligation. No one was pemmitted to do any work whatsoev-

|

er on that day and anyone deviating from this etemal law was liable

to

execution. There are many places in the books of the Old Testament

where the etemal nature of this injunction is emphatically empha-

sized; for example Genesis 2:3, Exodus 20:8-11, Exodus 23:12 and

34:21, Leviticus 19:3 and 23:2, Deuteronomy 5:12-15, Jeremiah 17,

Isaiah 56 and 58, chapter nine of Nehemiah and chapter 20 of

Ezekiel.

The following passage is from Exodus 31:13-17:

|

Speak thou also unto the children of Israel, saying, Verily

my sabbaths ye shall keep; for it is a sign between me and

you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am

the Lord that sanctify you. Ye shall keep the sabbath there-

fore; for it is holy unto you. Everyone that defileth it shall

surely be put to death: for whosoever doth any work therein,

that soul shall be cut off from among his people. Six days

may work be done; but in the seventh is the sabbath of rest,

holy to the Lord; whosoever doth any work in the sabbath

day, he shall surely be put to death. Wherefore the children of

Israel shall keep the sabbath to observe the sabbath through-

out their generations for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign

between me and the children of Israel for ever: for in six days

the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he

rested, and was refreshed.

|

Exodus 35:2-3 contains the following statement:

|

Six days shall work be done, but on the seventh day there

shall be to you an holy day; a sabbath of rest to the Lord:

whosoever doeth work therein shall be put to death. Ye shall

kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the sabbath

day.

|

The following event is described in Numbers 15:32-36:

|

And while the children of Israel were in the wildemess,

they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath day.

And they that found him gathering sticks brought him unto

Moses and Aaron, and unto all the congregation. And they

|

put him into ward, because it was not declared what should be

done to him. And the Lord said unto Moses, The man shall be

surely put to death; all the congregation shall stone him with

stones without the camp. And all the congregation brought

him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he

died.

|

We know that the Jews in the time of Jesus used to annoy and trou-

ble him and wanted to kill him for his disregard for the Sabbath.

To

justify their disbelief in the prophethood of Jesus, one of their

argu-

ments was that Jesus used to work on the day of the Sabbath. We

read

the following statement in the Gospel of John 5:16:

|

And therefore did the Jews persecute Jesus and sought to

slay him because he had done these things on the Sabbath

day.

|

The Gospel of John 9:16 also contains the following:

|

Therefore said some of the Pharisees, This man is not of

God, because he keepeth not the sabbath day.

|

It should be noted that all the injunctions mentioned in examples

seven, eight and nine were abrogated by Paul, as is understood from

his letter to Colossians 2:16:

|

Let no man therefore judge you in meat, or in drink, or in

respect of an holyday, or of the new moon or of the sabbath

days: Which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is

of Christ.

|

Under the comments on this verse the commentary of D"Oyly and

Richard Mant goes:

|

Burkitt and Dr. Whitby said that the Jews had three kinds

of feasts, annual, monthly and weekly,l then all of them were

|

1. The annual feast of the Jews is called the "Passover" the

monthly feast was cel-

ebrated by offering sacrifices at the sight of the new moon while

the weekly celebra-

tion was the observance of the Sabbath.

|

abrogated, even the Sabbath.

|

Under his comments on the same verse Bishop Horsley said:l

|

The Sabbath of the Jewish Church has ceased to exist.

The Christians did not take to the childish practices of the

Jews in their Sabbath observance.

|

Henry and Scott said in their commentary:

|

When Jesus abrogated the conventional law2 no one has

any right to blame other people for not observing it.

Beausobre said that had it been obligatory for all to observe

the Sabbath and binding upon all the nations, its abrogation

would have not been possible, although it has now in fact

been abrogated. Similarly it would have been obligatory for

the Christians throughout their generations.

|

Paul own claim that these injunctions were not correct is not in

accor-

dance with the text of the Torah, as God specified that the animals

prohibited for them are unclean and that:

|

Ye shall therefore sanctify yourselves, and ye shall be

Holy; for I am Holy.3

|

The main reason for the "feast of unleavened bread" is:

|

And this day shall be unto you for a memorial and ye

shall keep it a feast to the Lord throughout your generations.4

similarly the reason for the Feast of Tabernacles is described as

fol-

lows:

|

That your generations may know that I made the children

of Israel to dwell in booths, when I brought out of the land of

Egypt.2

|

The reason for the Sabbath has been described in many places as

fol-

lows:

For in six days the Lord made heaven and earh, the sea,

and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day. Therefore

the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it.3

|

Ninth Example: The Obligation of Circumcision

|

The obligation of circumcision was everlasting and perpetual in

the law of the Prophet Abraham, (peace be on him), as can be under-

stood from Genesis, 17. This injunction remained as an obligation

for

the descendants of the Prophets Isaac and Ismail and continued to

be

so in the law of Moses as well. We find this injunction in

Leviticus

12: 13:

|

And in the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be

|

circumcised.

|

Jesus hirnself was also circumcised as is clear from the Gospel of

Luke.4 The Christians still commemorate the day of his circumcision

by offering a special prayer. This obligation continued to be

observed

until after the ascension of Christ. It was later abrogated by the

Apostles of Christ. This is unarnbiguously mentioned in chapter 15

of the Book of Acts and we are going to discuss it under example no.

12

|

Paul emphatically advocated its abrogation. He writes in his

Epistle to the Galatians, chapter 5:

|

Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised,

Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every

man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole

law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you

are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we

through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.

For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor

uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love."

|

And the same letter contains the following statement:

|

For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything

nor uncircumcision. but a new creature.2

|

Tenth Example: Precepts of Sacrifice

|

There were a number of injunctions regarding the offering of sacri-

fices that were etemal and everlasting in the law of Moses and that

have been abrogated by Christian Law.

|

Eleventh Example: Regulations of the High Priest

|

There were many injuncdons that were specially assigned to the

family of Aaron, like the dress for ritual services and priesthood

etc.

These injunctions were of a perpetual nature but were declared as

abrogated in Christdan Law.

|

T velfth Example: The Abrogation of the Law of Moses

|

The Apostles, after great deliberation, declared almost all the

injunctions of the Torah as abrogated except the following four

pre-

cepts: the prohibidons on sacriflces offered to idols, the

consumption

|

of blood and animals killed by strangling, and fomication. These

things are mentioned in chapter 15 of the Book of Acts. We quote

some of them:

|

For as much we have heard that certain which went out

from us have troubled you with words, subverdng your souls,

saying, ye must be circumcised and keep the law: to whom

we gave no such commandment.

|

After some lines it also says:

|

For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay

upon you no greater burden than these necessary things, that

ye abstain frm meats offered to idols, and from blood, and

from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye

keep yourselves ye shall do well.2

|

The prohibidon of the above things was kept unchanged simply so

that Jews, who were new converts to Chrisdanity, should not react

to

this abrogation, as they sdll held the injunctions of the Torah

dear to

them. After some dme, when Paul was sure that this prhibidon was

no longer necessary, he abrogated the first three injunctions as we

have discussed under the seventh example, and now all the Protes-

tants have a consensus of opinion on it. Since there is no specific

pun-

ishment for fomication mendoned by Chrisdan law, this too is to all

intents and purposes abrogated. In short, Chrisdan law has

abrogated

all the pracdcal injuncdons of the law of Moses, be they of etemal

nature or otherwise.

|

Thirteenth Example: Abandonment of the Torah

|

Paul said in his letter to the Galatians:

|

I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I,

but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the

the Book of Acts and we are going to discuss it under example no.

12.

Paul emphatically advocated its abrogation. He writes in his

Epistle to the Galatians, chapter 5:

|

Behold, I Paul say unto you, that if ye be circumcised.

|

Christ shall profit you nothing. For I testify again to every

man that is circumcised, that he is a debtor to do the whole

law. Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you

are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace. For we

through the Spirit wait for the hope of righteousness by faith.

For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth anything nor

uncircumcision; but faith which worketh by love.l

|

And the same letter contains the following statement:

|

For in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth anything

nor uncircumcision, but a new creature.2

|

Tenth Example: Precepts of Sacrifice

|

There were a number of injunctions regarding the offering of sacri-

fices that were eternal and everlasting in the law of Moses and

that

have been abrogated by Christian Law.

|

Eleventh Example: Regulations of the High Priest

|

There were many injuncdons that were specially assigned to the

family of Aaron, like the dress for ritual services and priesthood

etc.

These injunctions were of a perpetual nature but were declared as

abrogated in Chrisdan Law.

|

Twelfth Example: The Abrogation of the Law of Moses

|

The Apostles, after great deliberation, declared almost all the

injunctions of the Torah as abrogated except the following four

pre-

cepts: the prohibidons on sacrifices offered to idols, the

consumption

|

of blood and animals killed by strangling, and fomication. These

things are mentioned in chapter 15 of the Book of Acts. We quote

some of them:

|

For as much we have heard that certain which went out

from us have troubled you with words, subverting your souls,

saying, ye must be circumcised and keep the law: to whom

we gave no such commandment."

|

After some lines it also says:

|

For it seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, to lay

upon you no greater burden than these necessary things, that

ye abstain from meats offered to idols, and from blood, and

from things strangled, and from fornication: from which if ye

keep yourselves ye shall do well.2

|

The prohibidon of the above things was kept unchanged simply so

that Jews, who were new converts to Chrisdanity, should not react

to

this abrogation, as they sdll held the injunctions of the Torah

dear to

them. After some tdme, when Paul was sure that this prohibidon was

no longer necessary, he abrogated the first three injunctions as we

have discussed under the seventh example, and now all the Protes-

tants have a consensus of opinion on it. Since there is no specific

pun-

ishment for fomication mendoned by Christian law, this too is to

all

intents and purposes abrogated. In short, Christian law has

abrogated

all the pracdcal injuncdons of the law of Moses, be they of etemal

nature or otherwise.

|

Thirteenth Example: Abandonment of the Torah

|

Paul said in his letter to the Galatians:

|

I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I,

but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the

flesh, I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me and

gave himself for me. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if

righteousness come by the Law,l then Christ is dead in vain.2

|

Dr. Hammond has commented on this verse as follows:

|

That is, giving his soul for me he relieved me from the

law of Moses.

|

And in his comments on verse 21 he said:

|

It is why he chose this freedom. I do not trust the law of

Moses for salvation and do not consider it necessary because

it would invalidate the Evangel.

|

Dr. Whitby said under his comments on verse 20:

|

Had it been the case, it would have been unnecessary to

purchase salvation through death, nor would such a death

have been of any use.

|

Pyle said:

|

Had the Jewish laws been necessary for our salvation and

redemption it would have been unnecessary for Jesus to sacri-

fice his life; and if this law remains essential for our salva-

tion, the death of the Christ would not be sufficient for it.

|

All the above statements are enough witness to the fact that the

law of Moses has been completely abrogated.

|

Fourteenth Example: The Law of Moses under the Curse

|

Chapter 3 of the same letter contains the following statements:

|

For as many as are of the works of the law are under the

|

curse.l

|

But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of

God.2

|

And the law is not of faith.3

|

Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law being

made a curse for US.4

|

Lardner says on page 487 of volume 9 of his commentary:

|

On this occasion the apostle is generally understood to

mean that the law of Moses was abrogated or at least lost its

validity after the crucifixion of Christ.

|

Further on the same page he has:

|

The apostle clearly elucidated that the result of Jesus"

death is the abrogation of the prescribed laws.

|

Fifteenth Example: The Law Abrogated by Faith

|

Paul own letter to Galatians clearly says:

|

Wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto

Christ that we might be justifled by faith. But after that faith

is come we are no longer under a schoolmaster.5

|

This statement of Paul says unambiguously that after belief in

Jesus the injunctions of the Torah are no longer needed. The

commen-

tary of D"Oyly and Richard Mant contains the fouowing statement of

Dean Stanhope:

The regulations of the law were abrogated after the death

of Jesus and after the spread of the evangelic revelation.

|

Sixteenth Example: The Law must be changed

|

Paul said in his Epistle to the Hebrews:

|

For the priesthood being changed there is made of neces-

sity a change also of the law.l

|

This verse shows that a change of priesthood essentially changes

the previous law. Under the same principle the Muslims are

justified

in their contention that Christian law has also been abrogated (by

the

appearance of the Holy Prophet, peace be be on him). The following

statement appears in the commentary of D"Oyly and Richard Mant:

|

The Law has been certainly abrogated with regard to the

injunction of sacrifices and cleanliness.

|

Seventeenth Example

|

In chapter 7 verse 18 of the same Epistle we find:

|

For there is verily a disanulling of the commandment

going before for the weakness and unprofitableness thereof.

|

This verse is unambiguous in saying that the main cause of abro-

gation of the law of Moses was that it was weak and unprofitable.

The

commentary of Henry and Scott contains the following statement:

|

The law and the priesthood that were unable to be per-

fected were abrogated, and the new priesthood and mercy

rose to give perfection to the righteous.

|

Eighteenth Example: The Torah was Defective

|

Paul says in his letter to the Hebrews:

|

For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should

no place have been sought for the second."

|

Further in verse 13 he says:

|

A new covenant he hath made the first old. Now that

which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away.

|

The above statement implies that the injunctions contained in the

Pentateuch (Torah) are old and defective and therefore should be

abrogated. D"Oyly and Richard Mant quoted the following comments

of Pyle on the verse quoted above:

|

It is evidently clear that the will of God is that he should

abrogate the old and defective with the new or better mes-

sage. It therefore abrogates the Jewish faith and ordains the

Christian faith in its place.

|

Nineteenth Example

|

Paul own Epistle to the Hebrews 10:9 has:

|

He taketh away the first, that he may establish the second.

|

Again the following statement of Pyle was quoted by D"Oyly and

Richard Mant in their commentary with regard to verses 8 and 9:

|

The apostles made deductions from these two verses and

declared that the sacrifices of the Jews were not enough. For

this reason Christ chose death for himself to make up for this

lack and by the one action he abrogated the validity of the

other.

|

Conclusions

|

Any sensible reader of the above examples and statements will

inevitably arrive at the following conclusions:

|

1. The abrogation of some precepts in a preceding law is not limit-

ed to Islamic law alone. The occurrence of abrogation of pre-

ceding laws is quite normal.

|

2. All the injunctions of the law of Moses, be they etemal or

other-

wise, were abrogated by the law of Jesus.

|

3. Paul own writings also speak of abrogation with regard to the

whole Torah together with its injunctions.

|

4. Paul proved that a change of priesthood also necessitates a

change of law.

|

5. Paul claimed that everything that becomes old has to vanish

away. This allows us to contend that the law of Jesus being

older than the law of Muhammad (peace be on both of them)

must be abrogated. It should be noted that Paul and other

exegetes, in spite of their admission that the injunctions of the

Torah were ordained by God, used discourteous and improper

words for them.

|

6. According to our definition of abrogation there is nothing wrong

and objectionable about the injunctions of the Torah being

abrogated.l However the statements indicating etemality and

insisting that they should be enforced through the generations

put some injunctions beyond the scope of abrogation and make

their abrogation objectionable. We are free from this objection

because, firstly we do not believe the present Pentateuch to be

the original word of God or written by Moses as we have pro-

duced scores of proofs to show, secondly, as we have shown,

the present Pentateuch has been subjected to great distortions

and alterations, and thirdly, according to Christian belief, God

may regret and be ashamed of some of his acts and feel regret-

ful about some of his previous orders, causing him to change

them afterwards. Similarly he is imputed with making everlast-

ing promises and then not fulfilling them as is asserted by some

of the books of the Old Testament. The Muslims are absolutely

free from such impure and polluted thought.

|

As far as their interpretations with regard to the words of

etemalityl are concemed, they cannot be justified and accepted

for the obvious reason that the words must be taken to mean

what they say.

|

The Second Kind of Abrogation in the Bible2

|

First Example

|

God asked Abraham to slay his son and offer him as a sacrifice to

the Lord, but this injunction was abrogated before being practised.

The whole story of this event is related in chapter 22 of Genesis.

|

Second Example: Promise of Priesthood Abrogated

|

I Samuel 2:30 contains the following statement of a prophet to

Eli,3 the Priest:

|

Wherefore the Lord God of Israel saith, "I said indeed

that thy house and the house of thy father, should walk before

me for ever: but now the Lord saith, "Be it far from me; for

that honour me I will honour, and they that despise me shall

|

be lightly esteemed.

|

Further in verse 35 it says:

|

And I will raise me up a faithful Priest.

|

God first made promise that the priesthood would remain in the

family of Eli the Priest, and in the family of his father, but in

the latter

statement he transferred the promised priesthood to a new priest.

The

commentary of D"Oyly and Richard Mant contains the following

statement of Patrick:

|

God abrogated the injunction promising the priesthood to

Eli and his family. The priesthood was then given to Eleazar

the elder son of Aaron. Then it was given to Tamar, the

younger son of Aaron. For the sins of Eli own sons the priest-

hood was transferred to the family of the priest, Eleazer.

|

This implies that the above promise of priesthood was abrogated

twice in the law of Moses and it was abrogated a third time with

the

coming of the law of Jesus. The priesthood did not remain in the

fam-

ily of Eleazar nor in the family of Tamar either. The promise made

to

Eleazar is described in chapter 25 of the Book of Numbers in the

fol-

lowing words:

|

Behold, I give unto him my covenant of peace: and he

shall have it and his seed after him, even the covenant of an

everlasting priesthood.l

|

It should not come as a surprise to learn that according to Judaeo-

Christian thought, God may go against his everlasting promise. The

books of the Old Testament contain statements claiming that God

repents and regrets after having done a certain thing. For instance

Psalm 88 contains David own address to God in these words:

|

Thou hast made void the covenant of thy servant: Thou

hast profaned his crown by casting it to the ground.

|

And Genesis 6:6-7 contains the following statement:

|

And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the

earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I will

|

destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth,

both man and beast, and the creeping things, and the fowls of

the air, for it repenteth me that I have made them.

|

Verse 6 and the last phrase of verse 7, "It repenteth me..." are

clear

in implying that God is regretful about what He has done. Psalm

106:44 contains the words:

|

Nevertheless he regarded their affliction when he heard

their cry: and remembered for them his covenant and repent-

ed according to the multitude of his mercies.l

|

I Samuel 15:11 contains God own statement in these words:

|

It repenteth me that I have set up Saul to be king: for he is

tumed back from following me, and hath not performed my

commandments.

|

Further in verse 35 of the same chapter we find:

|

Samuel mourned for Saul: and the Lord repented that he

had made Saul king over Israel.

|

In view of the above statements containing "God own repentance"

and "his regrets" about creating man and making Saul the king of

Israel, the possibility of "God own repentance" on making Jesus a

Prophet cannot be ruled out as Jesus" "claim of being God

incarnate"

is a greater sin than the disobedience of Saul. God, according to

the

above statement, did not know that Saul would not perfor n his com-

mandments, similarly it makes it possible that God might have not

known that Jesus would "claim to be God" after becoming a Prophet.

We neither believe in the possibility of God own repentence nor do we

accept that Jesus made any claim to godhood. We believe that God is

absolutely free from such imperfections and Jesus is very far from

malcing such false daims.

|

Third Example: Baking Bread With Dung

|

Ezekiel 4:10 contains the following injunction:

|

And thy meat which thou shalt eat, shall be by weight,

twenty shekels a day.

|

And in verse 12 it says:

|

And thou shalt eat it as barley cakes, and thou shalt bake

it with dung that cometh out of man.

|

Further in verses 14 and 15 it contains:

|

Then said I, Ah Lord God; behold, my soul hath not been

polluted: for from my youth up even till now, have I not eaten

of that which dieth of itself, or is tom in pieces; neither came

there abominable flesh into my mouth. Then He said unto me,

Lo, I have given thee cow own dung for man own dung, and thou

shalt prepare thy bread therewith.

|

According to this statement God first commanded Ezekiel to pre-

pare his bread with the filth of man then after Ezekiel own

supplications

he abrogated His first commandment and changed it by allowing

cow own dung in place of man own .

|

Fourth Example: The Place of Sacrifice

|

We read in Leviticus 17:3,4:

|

What man soever there be of the house of Israel, that kil-

leth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the camp, or that killeth it out

of the camp and bringeth it not unto the door of tabemacle of

the congregation, to offer an offering unto the Lord before the

tabemacle of the Lord; blood shall be imputed unto that man;

he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among

his people.

|

In contrast to this we find this statement in Deuteronomy 12:15:

|

Thou mayst kill and eat flesh in all thy gates, whatsoever

thy soul lusteth after, according to the blessing of the Lord,

thy God which he hath given thee.

|

Further in verses 20 to 22 it says:

|

When the Lord thy God shall enlarge thy border, as he

hath promised thee, and thou shalt say, I will eat flesh,

because thy soul longeth to eat flesh; thou mayest eat flesh,

whatsoever thy soul lusteth after. If the place which the Lord

thy God hath chosen to put his name there be too far from

thee, than thou shalt kill of thy herd and of thy flock, which

the Lord hath given thee, as I have commanded thee, and thou

shalt eat in thy gates whatsoever thy soul lusteth after. Even

as the roebuck and the hart is eaten, so thou shalt eat them:

the unclean and the clean shall eat of them alike.

|

The above statement abrogates the commandment of God con-

tained in Leviticus quoted earlier. Home, after quoting these

verses,

said on page 619 of the first volume of his book:

|

Apparently these two places are contradictory to each

other, but keeping in view the fact that according to the cir-

cumstances of the Israelites changes in the law of Moses were

usual, and the law did not preclude changes.

|

Further he said:

|

In the fortieth year of his migration and prior to his com-

ing to Palestine, Moses abrogated this injunction through the

injunctions of Deuteronomy and pemmitted them after coming

to Palestine to eat the goats and cows wherever they liked.

|

This commentator admits the presence of abrogation in these vers-

es and also is convinced that changes were made in the law of Moses

according to the changing circumstances. In the light of this how

can

they justify themselves raising objections against other religions

for

minor changes and why do they insist that abrogation necessarily

attributes ignorance to God?

|

Fifth Example: The Workers of the Tabernacle

|

Numbers 4:3,23,30,35,39,43 and 46 make us understand that the

number of the workers in the Tabemacle should not be less than

twenty-five or more than fifty, while 8:24-25 of the same book say

that this number should not be less than two or more than fifty.

|

Sixth Example: The Sin Offering of the Congregation

|

Leviticus 4:14 says:

|

The congregation shall offer a young bullock for the sin.

|

Numbers chapter 15 contains:

|

All the congregation shall offer.... one kind of the goats

for a sin offering.

|

The first injunction is abrogated by the second.

|

Seventh Example

|

From Genesis chapter 6 God own commandment is understood to be

that two living creatures of every sort should be carried in Noah own

Ark, while from chapter 7 it is understood that seven of every

clean

beast, and two of every unclean beast are to be taken.l Further in

the

same chapter we are informed that two of each kind were taken into

the Ark. This statement in this way was abrogated twice.

|

Eighth Example: Hezekiah own Illness

|

II Kings 20:1-6 says:

|

In those days was Hezekiah sick unto death. And the

Prophet Isaiah, the son of Amoz came to him and said unto

him, Thus saith the Lord. Set thine house in order; for thou

|

shalt die, and not live. Then he tumed his face to the wall, and

Prayed unto the Lord, saying, I beseech thee O Lord, remem-

ber now how I have walked before thee in truth and with a

perfect heart, and have done that which is good in thy sight.

And Hezekiah wept sore. And it came to pass, afore Isaiah

was gone out into the middle court, that word of the Lord

came to him, saying, "Tum again and tell Hezekiah the cap-

tain of my people, Thus saith the Lord, the God of David, thy

father, I have heard thy prayer, I have seen thy tears: behold, I

will heal thee: On the third day thou shalt go up unto the

house of the Lord. And I will add unto thy days fifteen years.

|

Ninth Example: The Mission of the Twelve

|

The Gospel of Matthew 10:5 has:

|

These twelve Jesus sent forth, and commanded them say-

ing, go not into the way of the Gentiles, and unto any city of

the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of

the house of Israel.

|

The Gospel of Matthew contains the following statement of Christ

with regard to his own mission in chapter 15 verse 24:

|

I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of

Israel.

|

These show that Jesus sent his disciples only to the Israelites.

The

Gospel of Mark, however, 16:15 has recorded Jesus as saying:

|

Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to every

creature.l

|

According to Mark this statement was made by Christ just before

his ascension to Heaven. Hence this abrogated the former statement.

|

Tenth Example: Command to Observe the Law of Moses

|

The Gospel of Matthew chapter 23 verse 1 contains the words:

|

Then spoke Jesus to the multitude, and his disciples say-

ing, The scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses" seat: all there-

fore whatsoever they bid you obsene, that observe and do.

|

This statement is clear in implying that they are being commanded

to obey what the Pharisees say, and there is no doubt that the

Pharisees insist on the observance all the practical injunctions of

the

Torah and particularly the injunctions that are of an etemal

nature,

when in fact all of them were abrogated by Christian law, as we

have

demonstrated in detail when discussing the first kind of

abrogation.

|

It is strange that Protestant scholars often reproduce these verses

as

an ARGUMENT against the abrogation of the Torah. This means that

they

should be killed for not keeping the Sabbath, since the law of

Moses

declared that such men must be killed. We have discussed this in

detail under the first kind of abrogation.

|

Eleventh Example

|

We have already shown under the thirteenth example of the first

kind of abrogation that the Apostles abrogated all the practical

injunc-

tions of the Torah except four injunctions out of which three were

abrogated later by Paul.

|

Twelfth Example

|

Luke 9:56 contains the following statement of Jesus:

|

For the son of man is not come to destroy men own lives, but

to save them.

|

lohn 3:17 and 12:47 also contain the same statement but Paul own

Second Epistle to the Thessalonians 2:8 contains this statement:

|

And then shall that Wicked be revealed, whom the Lord

shall consume with the spirit of his mouth and shall destroy

|

with the brightness of his coming.

|

The latter statement obviously abrogates the former injunction.

|

In vlew of the above examples of the presence of both kinds of

abrogation in the Old and New Testaments, the claim made by the

Judaeo-Christian scholars, that there is no possibility of

abrogation in

the Bible, is proved false and incorrect beyond any doubt. We may,

however, repeat that with the change of time, place and the circum-

stances of the subject, certain changes in legal injunctions are

quite

logical and even necessary in order to meet the new requirements of

the subject of the Law. Certain injunctions may be useful and

proper

for the people at one time, and unnecessary and inappropriate at

another.

|

THE INNOVATION OF THE TRINITY

|

The Impossibility of the Doctrine of Trinity

|

At the beginning of this section we would like to make the follow-

ing twelve points which, we are sure, will help the reader have

easy

access to the truth.

|

First Point: Who is God?

|

The books of the Old Testament bear witness to the fact that God

(Allah) is one, the Everlasting, the Undying. He has absolute power

over everything and can do anything He likes. He has no equal. None

is similar to him neither in essence nor in attributes. He is

indepen-

dent of physical form or features. These facts are so abundandy

found

in these books that no examples are needed.

|

Second Point: The Prohibition of Worshipping Anything Other

than Him

|

This prohibition is clearly mentioned in many places of the

Pentateuch, for example in Exodus, chapters 20 and 34. We even find

it mentioned in Deuteronomy chapter 13 that any Prophet or anyone

receiving inspiration were to ask people to worship other than God

alone, even in a dream, he should be killed no matter how many

mira-

cles he performed. Similarly anyone encouraging his friends or

rela-

tives to look to other gods must be stoned to death. Chapter 17 of

the

same book declares that anyone found guilty of worshipping other

gods, man or woman, shall be stoned to death.

|

The Third Point: The Attribution of Physical Features to God

|

There are many verses of the books of the Old Testament that

mention different limbs, physical form and features in connection

with God.

|

For example Genesis 1:26,27 and 9:6 mentions God own face and

other limbs. Isaiah 50:17 contains a description of the head of

God.

|

while in Daniel 7:9 the head and hair of God are mentioned.

A list of some passages containing descriptions of physical fea-

|

tures and limbs etc. in connection with God is given below:

|

1. Genesis, 1:26:27 and 9:6 Face and other Limbs.

2. Isaiah 59:17 Head.

3. Daniel 7:9 Head and Hair.

4. Psalms 43:3 Face, Hand and Arm.

5. Exodus 33:23 Face and Neck.

6. Psalms 33:15 Eyes and Ears.

7. Daniel 9 Eyes and Ears.

8. I Kings 8:29 The Eyes.

9. Jeremiah 16:17,32; 19 The Eyes.

10. Job 34:21 The Eyes.

11. Proverbs: 5:21; 15:3 The Eyes.

12. Psalms 10:4 The Eyes & Lashes.

13. Psalms 17:6,8,9,10 The Ear, Foot, Nose & Mouth.

14. Isaiah 30:27 Lips and Tongue.

15. Deuteronomy 33 Hands and Foots.

16. Exodus 31:18 Fingers.

17. Jeremiah4:19 Belly and Heart.

18. Isaiah 21 Back.

19. Acts 20:28 Blood.

|

There are two verses in the Pentateuch that speak of God as being

metaphysical i.e. free from form and features. Deuteronomy 4:12

|

says:

|

And the Lord spake unto you out of the midst of the fire;

ye heard the voice of the words, but saw no similitude; only

ye heard a voice.

|

Further in verse 15:

|

Take ye therefore good heed unto yourselves; for ye saw

no manner of similitude on the day that the Lord spake unto

|

you in Horeb out of the midst of the fire.

|

Since the above two verses correspond to human reason, they do

not require explanations as do the others listed above.

|

Similarly there are verses in the Bible that relate God to space.

Such verses are present in both the Old and the New Testaments.

Some of them are listed below:

|

Exodus: 25:8; 29:45, 46

Numbers: 5:3; 35:34

Deuteronomy: 26: 15

II Samuel: 7:5,6

I Kings: 8:30,32,34,36,39,45,49

Psalms: 9:11;10:4; 25:8; 67:16; 73:2; 75:2; 98:1;

134:21

Joel 3:17,21

Zachariah: 8:3

Matthew: 5:45,48; 6:1,9,14,26; 7:11,21;10:32,33;

3:50; 15:12; 16:17; 18:10,14,19,35; 23:9,22

|

All the above verses connect God to space.l There are very few

verses in the Old and New Testaments that describe God as being

beyond space and time. Two examples are Isaiah 66:1,22 and Acts

7:48.3 Since these few verses are acceptable to human reason, and

in

accordance with rational ARGUMENTs, they do not require any

explana-

tion. The other verses ascribing space to God, however, require

inter-

pretation. The Judaeo-Christian scholars also agree with us that

such

verses require some explanation.

|

Fourth Point: Metaphorical Meanings of the Words

|

It has been confirmed above that God has no physical form and

features. We find confirmation also in the New Testament that God

cannot be seen. The Gospel of John 1:18 has:

|

No man hath seen God at any time.

|

This proves that any being, visible to human eyes, cannot be God.

If the word "God" is used for a visible being one should not be

mis-

guided by it. It may be explained here that the word God used for

any

one but God would be a metaphor or a figurative use of the word.1

There is no doubt that there may be some proper reason for using

such words for beings other than God. The following example will

make it more clear. We find such words used in the Pentateuch for

the

angels only because they demonstrate God own glory more than do any

other creatures. Exodus 23:20 contains the following statement of

God:

|

Behold I send an angel before thee, to keep thee in the

way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared.

Beware of him, and obey his voice. Provoke him not; for he

will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him.

|

Further in verse 23 it says:

|

For mine angel shall go before thee, and bring thee in

|

unto the Amorites, and the Hittites and the Perizzites, and the

Canaanites, the Hivites and the Jebusites; and I will cut them

off.

|

In the above statement the words, "I send an angel before thee" and

"mine angel shall go before thee", are sufficient to prove that the

mov-

ing post of the cloud in the day and the moving post of fire at

night,

guiding the Israelites in their way, was none but an angel2 of God.

|

Deifying words have been used for this angell simply for the above

reason.

|

The Attribution of Divinity to Other than God Himself in the

Bible

|

This occurs profusely in the Bible in connection with angels, man,

even Satan and inanimate things. In some places explanations have

been given but at other times the metaphorical significance is so

obvi-

ous that it leaves no room for doubt or misunderstanding. I would

like

to give some specific examples of this occurring in the Bible.2

|

We will not reproduce the whole text, but only the part directly

related to the point in question. Genesis 17:14 says:

|

And when Abram was ninety years old and nine, the Lord

|

appeared to Abram and said unto him, I am the Almighty

God; walk before me, and be thou perfect. And I will make

my covenant between me and thee, and will multiply thee

exceedingly. And Abram fell on his face: and God talked with

him, saying, "As for me behold my covenant is with thee, and

thou shalt be a father of many nations.

|

Further in verses 7-9 we find:

|

And I will establish my covenant between me and thee

and thy seed after thee in thy generations, for an everlasting

covenant, to be a God unto thee, and to thy seed after thee,

the land wherein thou art a stranger, all the land of Canaan,

for an everlasting possession, and I will be their God.

|

Verses 15,18,19 and 22 of this chapter contain the words, "And

God said unto Abram", "And Abram said unto God," etc. It is clear

that the word "God" is being used for the one talking to Abraham,

|

F while in fact, the talker was an angel of God which is confirmed

by

, the last sentence (of verse 22) that is, "God went up from

Abraham."

Here the words Lord and God have been used for the angel, even the

angel himself has used these words saying, "I am Almighty God", "I

will be their God."

|

Similarly these words are also used in chapter 18 of Genesis for

the angel that appeared to Abraham along with two other angels who

predicted the birth of Isaac, and informed him that the land of Lot

would soon be destroyed. In this book the word God is used fourteen

times for others. The same book at 28:10-17, describing the event

of

Jacob own departure from Beer-sheba, has:

|

And Jacob went out from Beer-sheba, and went toward

Haran. And he lighted upon a certain place and tarried there

all night, because the sun was set; and he took of the stones of

that place, and put them for his pillows, and lay down in that

place to sleep. And he dreamed, and behold a ladder set up on

the earth, and the top of it reached to heaven: and behold, the

angels of God ascending and descending on it. And behold

the Lord stood above it and said, I am the Lord God of

Abraham, thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land wherein

thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed; and thy seed

shall be as the dust of the earth, and thou shalt spread abroad

to the west, and to the east, and the north and to the south:

and in thee, and in thy seed shall all the families of the earth

be blessed. And behold, I am with thee, and will keep thee in

all places whither thou goest, and will bring thee again into

this land; for I will not leave thee, until I have done that

which I have spoken to thee of. And Jacob awaked out of his

sleep, and he said, own urely the Lord is in this place; and I

knew it not. And he was afraid and said, How dreadful is this

place! this is none other but the house of God, and this is the

gate of heaven.

|

Further the same book at 3 1 1 3 Jacob addresses his wives Leah

and Rachel:

|

And the angel of God spake unto me in a dream, saying,

Jacob: And I said, Here am I. And he said, Lift up now thine

eyes, and see, all the rams which leap upon the cattle are

ringstraked, speckled and grisled: for I have seen all that

Laban doeth unto thee. I am the God of Beth-el, where thou

annointedst the pillar, and where thou vowedst a vow into me;

now arise, get thee out from this land, and retum unto the

land of thy kindred.

|

Further in 32:9 of the same book it says:

|

And Jacob said, O God of my father Abraham, and God

of my father Isaac, the Lord which saidst unto me, Retum

unto thy country, and to thy kindred.

|

Further in verse 12:

|

And thou saidst, I will surely do thee good, and make thy

seed as the sand of the sea, which cannot be numbered for

multitude.

|

And again in 35:1 of the same book:

|

And God said unto Jacob, Arise, go up to Beth-el, and

dwell there: and make there an alter unto God, that appeared

unto thee when thou fleddest from the face of Esau thy broth-

er. Then Jacob said unto his household, and to all that were

with him, Put away the strange gods that are among you, and

be clean, and change your garments: And let us arise, and go

up to Beth-el; and I will make there an altar unto God, who

answered me in the day of my distress, and was with me in

the way which I went.

|

Describing the same event in detail in verse 6 of the same chapter

it says:

|

So Jacob came to Luz, which is in the land of Canaan.

that is, Beth-el, he and all the people that were with him, And

he built there an altar, and called the place El-beth-el: because

there God appeared unto him, when he fled from the face of

|

his brother.

|

Also we find in Genesis 48:34:

|

And Jacob said unto Joseph, God Almighty appeared

unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me, And

said unto me, Behold, I will make thee fruitful, and multiply

thee, and I will of thee a multitude of people; and will give

this land to thy seed after thee for an everlasting possession.

|

It should be noted that the one who had appeared to Jacob was in

fact an angel as is explicitly understood from Genesis 31 13. The

vow and covenant made by him was with the angel, and not directly

with Almighty God, but we have seen in the above example that

Jacob used the word God for this angel more than eighteen times.

Even the angel himself used this word for himself.

|

Attribution of Divinib to Angels

|

We find another incredible and strange story about Jacob described

in Genesis 32:24-30:

|

And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with

him until the breaking of the day. And when he saw that he

prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh;

and the hollow of Jacob own thigh was out of joint, as he wres-

tled with him. And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh.

And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me. And

he said unto him. What is thy name? And he said, Jacob. And

he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel;l

for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men and

hast prevailed. And Jacob asked him, and said, Tell me, I pray

thee, thy name. And he said, Wherefore is it that thou dost

ask after my name? And he blessed him there. And Jacob

called the name of the place Peniel: for I have seen God face

to face, and my life is preserved.

|

1. Israel in Hebrew signifies wrestler with C;od.

|

It is obvious that the wrestler with Jacob was an angel referred to

as God in the above verse. Firstly, because if we take the word God

here in its real sense it would imply that the God of the

Israelites is,

God forbid, so weak and helpless that he could not overcome a man

in

a wrestling match which lasted for the whole night. Secondly,

because

the prophet Hosea made it clear that he was not God but an angel.

It

says in Hosea 12:34:

|

He took his bther by the heel in the womb, and by his

strength he had power with God: Yea, he had power over the

angel, and prevailed: he wept, and made supplication unto

him: he found him in Beth-el, and there he spake with us.

|

In this statement also the word God is used twice for the angel.

Besides, we find in Genesis 35:9-15:

|

And God appeared unto Jacob again, when he came out

of Padan-aram, and blessed him. And God said unto him, Thy

name is Jacob: thy name shall not be called any more Jacob,

but Israel shall be thy name; and he called his name Israel.

And God said unto him, I am God Almighty: be fruitful and

multiply: a nation, and a company of nation shall be of thee,

and kings shall come out of thy loins; And the land which I

gave Abraham and Isaac, to thee I will give it, and to thy seed

after thee will I give the land. And God went up from him in

the place where he talked with him. And Jacob set up a pillar

in the place where he talked with him, even a pillar of stone;

and he poured a drink offering thereon, and he poured oil

thereon. And Jacob called the name of the place where God

spoke with him Beth-el.

|

Here also the word God has been used five times for the angel who

spoke with Jacob.

|

Also we find in Deuteronomy 1:30-33:

|

The Lord your God which goeth before you, he shall fight

for you, according to all that he did for you in Egypt before

your eyes; And in the wilderness, where thou hast seen how

that the Lord thy God bare thee, as a man doth bear his son, in

all the way that ye went, until ye came into this place. Yet in

this thing ye did not believe the Lord your God, Who went in

the way before you, to search you out a place to pitch your

tents in, in fire by night, to shew you by what way ye should

go, and in a cloud by day.

|

The same use of the word "God" is found repeatedly in the above

passage. Again in Deuteronomy 31:3-8, we find this statement:

|

The Lord thy God, he will go over before thee, and he

will destroy these nations from before thee....Be strong and of

a good courage, fear not.... for the Lord thy God, he it is that

doth go with thee; he will be with thee.

|

Here too the word "God" has been used for an angel. In the book of

Judges 13:22 this angel is described as having appeared to Manoah

and his wife:

|

And Manoah said unto his wife, We shall surely die,

because we have seen God.

|

While verses 3, 9,13, 15, 16, 18 and 21 speak clearly of his being

an angel and not God. Besides, the word "God" is used for the angel

of God also in Isaiah 6, I Samuel 3, Ezekiel 4 and 9, and in Amos

7.

|

The Attribution of Divinity to Men and Satan

|

Psalm 82:6 gives us a particularly clear example of this, saying:

|

I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the

most High.

|

Here we find the word "god" used for all people. Also in II

Corinthians 4:3-4 we find:

|

But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: In

|

whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them

which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of

Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.

|

According to Protestant scholars, "God of this world" in this pas-

sage signifies Satan.

|

By presenting the above examples from the Bible we intend to

prove the fact that simply because the word "God" has been used for

someone or something else, that does not cause any sensible soul to

think that those things have become God or sons of God.

|

Fifth Point

|

We have already shown under the third and the fourth point that

metaphorical use of the word "God" is found in abundance in the

Bible. Now we intend to show that the use of metaphor in the Bible

is

not limited only to the occasions cited above. There are many other

situations where metaphor and exaggeration are used quite freely.

|

The following examples will show it more clearly. Genesis 13:16

contains the words:

|

I wiU make thy seed as the dust of the earth: so that if a

man can number the dust of the earth, then shaU thy seed also

be numbered.

|

Another example of exaggeration is found in 22:17 of the same

|

That in blessing I wiU bless thee, and in multiplying I wiU

multiply thy seed as the stars of the heaven, and as the sand

which is upon the sea shore.

|

A similar promise was made to Jacob that his generation would be

multiplied in number as the dust of the earth, while in fact the

genera-

tion of both Prophets together have never been increased in number

equal to the number of grains found in a few grams of sand far from

being equal to the dust of aU the sea-shores of the earth.

|

Describing the land promised to the Israelites, Exodus 3:8 says:

|

Unto a land flowing with milk and honey.

|

While we all know that no such place exists on earth.

Deuteronomy chapter 1 contains the following statement:

|

The cities are great and waUed up to heaven.

|

And in chapter 9 we read:

|

To possess nations greater and mightier than thyself,

cities great and fenced up to heaven.2

|

Psalm 78:65-66 says:

|

Then the Lord awaked as one out of sleep, and like a

mighty man that shouteth by reason of wine, And he smote

his enemies in the hinder parts; he put them to a perpetual

reproach.

|

Psalm 104:3 contains this eulogy to God:

|

Who layeth the beams of his chambers in the waters: who

maketh the clouds his chariot: who walketh upon the wings of

the wind.

|

The writings of the evangelist John are full of metaphors, similes,

hyperboles and exaggerations. You will hardly find a sentence that

does not require interpretation. Those who have read his Gospel,

his

Epistles and his Revelation are weU acquainted with this

characteris-

tic of John. For example he starts chapter 12 of Revelation with

this

description:

|

And there appeared a great wonder in heaven; a woman

clothed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon

her head a crown of twelve stars; And she being with child

cried, travailing in birth, and pained to be delivered. And

there appeared another wonder in heaven; and behold a great

red dragon, having seven heads and ten horns, and seven

crowns upon his heads. And his tail drew the third part of the

stars of heaven, and did cast them to the earth: and the dragon

stood before the woman which was ready to be delivered, for

to devour her child as soon as it was bom. And she brought

forth a man child, who was to rule all nations with a rod of

iron: and her child was caught up unto God and to his throne.

And the woman fled into the wilderness, where she hath a

place prepared of God, that they should feed her there a thou-

sand two hundred and threescore days.

|

And there was war in heaven: Michael and his angels

fought against the dragon; and the dragon fought, and his

angels, And prevailed not; neither was their place found any

more in heaven.

|

The ludicrous description above seems a meaningless outpouring

of a madman until some sensible explanation can be found for it

which is cerLainly not easy in this case. The Judaeo-Chrisdan

scholars

do try to forward some explanations for such statements and do

admit

the presence of exaggeration and hyperbole in the holy scriptures.

The

author of Murshid at-Talibeen said in section 3 of his book:

|

As far as the style of the sacred books is concemed, it is

full of innumerable and complicated metaphors, particularly

the Old Testament.

|

Further he has said:

|

And the style of the New Testament is also highly

metaphorical, particularly the events of our Saviour. For this

reason many wrong notions and ideas have spread, as some

Christian teachers have tried to provide such passages with

word for word explanations. Here are some examples to show

that word for word explanation for metaphorical passages is

not admissible. In Christ own statement about King Herod: "Go

ye, tell that fox,""l obviously, the word "fox" refers to the cruel

and deceitful king, since this animal is known for being cruel

and deceitful. Similarly our Lord said to the Jews:

|

I am the living bread which came down from heav-

en: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever:

and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will

give for the life of the world.l

|

but the Jews took this passage in its literal sense and asked

how it was possible for him to offer them his own flesh to eat,

not realizing that it referred to the sacrifice of Christ offering

himself as atonement for the sins of the whole world. Our

Saviour also said on the occasion of the Eucharist about the

bread that, "It is my body" and about the drink that, "It is the

blood of my covenant".

|

Then from the twelfth century Roman Catholics started to

interpret it in another sense, in contradiction to the statements

of the sacred books, and invented the teaching of the transub-

stantiation, by which the bread and drink would be trans-

formed into the body and blood of Christ. Whereas we say

that the bread and wine still retain their substance and do not

change at all. The correct explanation of the statement of our

Lord is that the bread is like the body of the Christ and wine

is like his blood.

|

This admission is quite clear and unambiguous, but he has inter-

preted Christ own statement to refute the belief of the Catholics

that the

bread and drink are really transformed in the body and blood of

Christ, while in fact, the apparent meanings of the passage are

exactly

what the Catholics have understood. Christ own statement is this:

|

And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it,

and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat;

this is my body. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and

gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; For this is my Wood

of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remis-

sion of sins."

|

The Catholics, who believe in the transformation of the bread into

the body of Christ, were in the majority before the appearance of

the

Protestant movement. The number of people of this sect is still

greater

all over the world.

|

Since this belief of transubstantiation is not correct, in the

opinion

of the Protestants, on the grounds that it is not acceptable to

human

reason and commonsense, the concept of trinity should similarly be

rejected on the same grounds, because universally acknowledged

rational ARGUMENTs bear witness against it, though some vague

indica-

tions to this concept may be found in some biblical statements. It

may

be contended that the fact that this belief is now the belief of

millions

of sensible Christians, is, in itself, an ARGUMENT for its being a

believ-

able concept. In answer to this contention we may remind them that

the millions of Roman Catholics who still hold the belief of

transub-

stantiation are equally sensible and are greater in number than the

Protestants. They still fimlly believe in the actual transformation

of

the bread into the body of Christ. This invalidates the Protestant

con-

tention. Now we will show that the sacrament of the Eucharist, as

believed by the Catholics, is totally irrational and something that

is

totally unacceptable to human reason.

|

First ARGUMENT

|

The Roman Catholic Church claims that the wine and bread physi-

cally change into the blood and body of Christ and become, in a

real

sense, Christ himself. This bread, when transformed into Christ,

must,

therefore, be physically transformed into human flesh. It is clear,

however, that the bread retains all its properties and anyone

seeing

and touching it finds nothing but bread, and if this bread is left

for

some time it decays and decomposes like any other bread. It will

not

show any of the changes that occur when the human body decom-

poses.

|

Second ARGUMENT

|

The presence of Christ, with his divine character, at thousands of

places in one and the same time may be possible in Christian

thought

but it is not compatible with his human character. Because being

fully

human he was like other human beings, feeling hunger, eating,

drink-

ing, and sleeping as all other men do. Being human he was even

afraid of the Jews and fled from them. It is, therefore, logically

impossible that Christ possessing a single human form could be pre-

sent physically at innumerable places at the same time.

|

Third ARGUMENT

|

If we assume that the thousands of priests are capable of instant

consecration, making the bread offered by them instantly tum into

the

body of the same Christ who was born of the Virgin Mary at their

recitation, it leaves us with two possibilities: either every one

of these

Christs is exactly and precisely the same real Christ born of the

Virgin

Mary, or that every one of them is other than the real Christ.

|

Fourth ARGUMENT

|

Now when the bread has tumed into the body of Christ in the

hands of the priest, he breaks it into many small pieces. This

again

presents two possibilities, either Christ is also divided into an

equal

number of small pieces or each piece again turns into a complete

and

perfect Christ. According to the fommer the eater of one piece

would

not be considered as having eaten the whole of Christ; and

according

|

1. The Christians believe that wherever in the world the ceremony

of Euchanst is

performed, Christ physically makes himself present at that place.

|

to the latter, you will have to believe in the presence of an army

of

Christs.

|

Fifth ARGUMENT

|

The event of the Lord own supper that took place a little before the

"crucifixion" served the purpose of the sacrifice that was later

sup-

posed to have been achieved by putting Jesus on the cross and

cruci-

fying him. It was quite unnecessary that he should be crucified by

the

Jews after having already sacrificed himself. Because, according to

Christian thought, the only purpose of Christ coming in the world

was

to sacrifice himself for the redemption of the world. He had not

come

to suffer again and again for this purpose, as is understood from

the

last passage of Hebrews chapter 9.

|

Sixth ARGUMENT

|

If the Christian claim is taken as correct, it would make the

Christians more cruel to Christ than the Jews as they persecuted

Christ only once and left him2 while the Christians day by day

perse-

cute Christ, slay him and eat and drink his flesh and blood. If the

Jews

can be condemned and cursed for crucifying Christ once what should

be the fate of those who kill and slay Christ a number of times

every

day and do not leave him alone after this but eat his flesh and

drink

his blood? What can be said of those who do not hesitate to eat

their

god? If their god cannot save himself from their clutches who on

earth

will be safe from them?

|

Seventh ARGUMENT

|

Luke 22:19 contains the following statement of Christ with regard

|

l. "So Chnst was once offered to bear the sins of many; and unto

them that look

for him, shall he appear the second time without sin unto

salvation."

|

2. The Christian Churc4 after the pact of friendship with the Jews

in 1964, clear-

ly declared that the Jews had nothing to do with the killing of

Christ. This declaration

stands in clear contradiction with what the Bible says and shows

the scant respect

they give to the Bible.

|

to the institution of Eucharist:

|

This do in remembrance of me.

|

If this supper was in itself a sacrifice, then it cannot have been

a

memorial or a remembrance, as nothing can be a remembrance of

itself.

|

People who accept such superstitions as a bread turning into Christ

are all the more liable to become a prey to greater superstitions

in

divine matters such as the concept of God and other matters related

to

reason. We contend that if all these sensible followers can agree

on a

belief which is absolutely rejected by logic and commonsense,

either

in blind pursuance of their ancestors or for some other reason, it

should not be come as a surprise to us that the Protestants and

Catho-

lics have together agreed on the trinity which is more absurd and

more in contradiction with human reason.

|

There are a large number of people, a greater number, in fact, than

the Catholics, who are called heretics because they have abandoned

the Christian faith simply because they found too many institutions

and beliefs of the Christian faith unacceptable to human reason.

They

refused to accept what is unacceptable. Their books are full of

argu-

ments to support their thought. Moreover, there is another sect

called

Unitarians who also have rejected the institution of the Eucharist.

The

Jews and the Muslims also refute and reject this mythological and

even absurd teaching.

|

Sixth Point: Ambiguity in the Statements of Christ

|

There are innumerable examples of ambiguity found in the state-

ments of Christ. So much so that his disciples and close friends

could

not understand his message until Jesus himself had elucidated it.

The

statements explained by Jesus have definitely been understood but

many other statements that were not explained by him still remain

obscure and ambiguous except some of them that were understood

with great effort after a long time. There are many examples of

this in

the New Testament of which we will mention only a few.

|

First Example

|

Chapter 2 of the Gospel of John, describing the event of some

Jews who asked Christ for some signs, reports the following reply

of

Jesus to the Jews:

|

Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.

Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in

building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake

of the temple of his body. When therefore he was risen from

the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto

them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which

Jesus had said."

|

In this example even the disciples of Jesus could not understand

the significance of the above statement until the resurrection of

Christ

let alone it being understood by the Jews.

|

Second Example

|

Jesus said to Nicodemus 2

|

Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom

of God.3

|

Nicodemus not understanding Jesus, answered:

|

How can a man be bom when he is old? Can he enter the

second time into his mother own womb, and be born?

|

Jesus tried to make him understand the second time, but he still

did

not understand. then Jesus said to him:

|

Art thou a master of Israel, and knowest not these

things?l

|

Third Example

|

Christ, addressing the Jews, said:

|

I am that bread of life.... This is the bread which cometh

down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die...2

and the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for

the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among them-

selves, saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

Then Jesus said unto them, ... Except ye eat the flesh of the

Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

|

For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink in-

deed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood,

dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent

me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, even he

shall live by me....

|

Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this,

said, This is a hard saying; who can hear it?

|

From that time many of his disciples went back, and

waLed no more with him.

|

This time the Jews did not understand Jesus and even his disciples

found it to be hard and complicated with the result that many of

his

disciples abandoned him.

|

Fourth Example

|

The Gospel of John 8:21-22 has:

|

Then said Jesus again unto them, I go my way, and ye

shall seek me, and shau die in your sins: Whither I go, ye

|

cannot come. Then said the Jews, Will he kill himself?

because he saith, Whither I go, ye cannot come.

|

Fifth Example

|

John 8:51-52 says:

|

Verily, verily, I say unto you, If a man keep my saying, he

shall never see death. Then said the Jews unto him, Now we

know that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the

prophets; and thou sayest, If a man keep my saying, he shall

never taste of death.

|

Here, too, the Jews could not understand the statement of Jesus,

rather they accused him of being possessed by the devil.

|

Sixth Example

|

We read in John 1 1 14:

|

And after that he saith unto them, Our friend Lazarus"

sleepeth; but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep. Then

said his disciples, Lord, if he sleep, he shall do well. Howbeit

Jesus spake of his death: but they thought that he had spoken

of taking of rest in sleep. Then said Jesus unto them plainly,

Lazarus is dead.

|

Here we see that the disciples did not understand him until he

explained what he had meant.

|

Seventh Example

|

Matthew 16:6-12 contains the following statement:

|

Then Jesus said unto them, Take heed and beware of the

leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees. And they rea-

soned among themselves, saying, It is because we have taken

no bread. Which when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O

ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye

have brought no bread?... How is it that ye do understand that

I spake it not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware

of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees? Then

understood they how that he bade them not beware of the

leaven of the bread, but of the doctrine of the Pharisees and of

the Sadducees.

|

Similarly here the disciples could not understand what Jesus said

to them until he explained it to them.

|

Eighth Example

|

Under the description of the maid that was raised from the dead

we find this statement in Luke 8:52-53:

|

And all wept and bewailed her: but he said, Weep not; she

is not dead, but sleepeth. And they laughed him to scorn,

knowing that she was dead.

|

Jesus, in this example, was laughed at, as no one could understand

what he meant.

|

Ninth Example

|

We find the following address of Jesus to his disciples in Luke

9:44-45:

|

Let these sayings sink down into your ears: for the Son of

man shall be delivered into the hands of men, But they under-

stood not this saying, and it was hid from them, that they per-

ceived it not: and they feared to ask of that saying.

|

The disciples again could not understand Jesus in the above exam-

ple.

|

Tenth Example

|

The following statement appears in Luke 18:31-34:

|

Then he took unto him the twelve, and said unto them,

Behold, we go up to Jerusalem, and all things that are written

by the prophets concerning the Son of man shall be accom-

plished. For he shall be delivered unto the Gentiles, and shall

be mocked, and spitefully entreated, and spitted on: And they

shall scourge him, and put him to death: and the third day he

shall rise again. And they understood none of these things:

and this saying was hid from them, neither knew they the

things which were spoken.

|

On this occasion the disciples did not understand this saying even

though it was the second time that they had been told about it.

Apparently the above statement had no ambiguity in it. Perhaps the

reason for their not understanding this saying was that they had

learnt

from the Jews that Christ would be a great king. Now at the appear-

ance of Christ when they embraced his faith, they were looking for-

ward to the time when they would sit on the royal throne with

Christ.

They had firm belief in this because Christ himself had promised

them that they would sit on twelve thrones, and each of them would

rule over the people of one tribe of the Israelites. They thought

the

kingdom promised by him was the kingdom of this world, as indicat-

ed by the literal sense of Christ own words. Now the a"oove saying

was

totally against their expectations and belief. We are going to

show, in

the next pages, that the disciples of Jesus truly had such

expectations.

|

Everlasting Doubt Concerning Some Precepts

|

Due to the ambiguity of some of Christ own statements his disciples

were left in everlasting uncertainty with regard to some matters

relat-

ed to faith and they were unable to remove this doubt as long as

they

lived. For instance, they believed that John the Baptist would not

die

until the Day of Resurrection and they firmly believed that the Day

of

Resurrection would come in their lifetime. We have discussed these

|

two matters in detail earlier in the book.

|

It is established that the actual words of Christ are not found in

any

of the Gospels. The Gospels only contain a translation of what the

narrators or reporters thought Christ had said. We have produced

undeniable evidence to prove that there is no trace of the

existence of

the original Evangel. All that we have is a translation and that,

too, is

without any sign or indication of the translator. There is no

convinc-

ing proof, either, that other books which are ascribed to various

authors really were written by these authors. We have already shown

that these books have undergone innumerable alterations, and have

been badly distorted. We have also proved that believing Christians

have distorted these texts for religious purposes, that is, either

for sup-

porting some commonly believed precept or for removing certain

objections from it.

|

We have also shown in earlier pages that any texts conceniing the

precept of trinity have also been distorted and changed. The

following

lines were added to the text of chapter 5 of the First Epistle of

John:

|

For there are three that bear record in heaven, the Father,

|

the Word, and the Holy Ghost.l

|

Similarly some words were added to the text of chapter 1 of

Matthew while a complete verse was omitted from chapter 22 of

Luke.

|

The Seventh Point: Impossibility of the Possibles

|

Sometimes human reason is not able to have access to the full sig-

nificance of certain things but at the same time it does not

discard

them as an impossibilities. Their existence is accepted as being

possi-

ble. All such things, therefore, are considered to lie in the

category of

the possible.

|

Similarly sometimes human reason, on the basis of some rational

ARGUMENT or merely on apparent evidence, decides that something is

|

impossible. The existence of all such things are categorised as

impos-

sibilities. Obviously each of them is explicitly different from the

other. Similarly two things contradictory to each other cannot

exist

together. Likewise it is not logically possible for one thing to be

devoid of both the qualities of possibility and impossibility. For

example, one cannot be human and non-human at the same time. For

instance if Zayd is not non-human he must be human, or if a stone

is

not human it must be non-human. Anything claimed against these

logical rules would be considered absurd and impossible by every

sensible person throughout the world. In the same way singularity

and

plurality cannot be found in one thing at the same time. Similarly

two

opposites cannot exist together at the same time. For instance,

light

and darkness, blackness and whiteness, wannth and coldness, wetness

and dryness, visibility and invisibility, motion and immobility,

cannot

exist together. This is so obvious that human reason would

instantly

decide against it.

|

The Eighth Point: What To Do With Counteracting ARGUMENTs

|

There are situations when we are faced with counteracting argu-

ments between the two ideas. In such cases if we are unable to

prefer

one over the other, both have to be discarded, otherwise some con-

vincing explanation must be found for both. However it is essential

that this explanation must not be a rational impossibility. For

example

the verse speaking of God own physical form and features contradict

or

counteract the verses that speak of God as being free from physical

shape and form. It is therefore essential to interpret these verses

so as

to remove the apparent contradiction from them. At the same time it

is essential that this interpretation should not define God as

being

physical and non-physical at the same time, because such an

interpre-

tation would be a rational impossibility and unacceptable to human

reason and would not remove the contradiction from the statements.

|

The Ninth Point: Three Cannot Be One

|

Number, in itself, is not self-existent. It always exists

causatively.

|

Philosophically speaking it is accidental. Every number therefore

is

an entity different from others. One is different from two, and

three

etc. Anything that is more than one, cannot be considered to be

one.

Any claim therefore, to the presence of singularity and plurality

in

one thing at the same time has to be rejected by human reason as

being absurd and irrational.

|

The Tenth Point: Real Unity and Trinity Together

|

From our view point there would nothing objectionable if the

Christians did not claim that the trinity and unity of God was real

and

factual, and that three were actually one and one actually three.

If they

claimed that unity existed in reality while the trinity existed

only figu-

ratively, in that case we would agree with them and have no con-

tention with them. But they claim their gods to be three and to be

one

at the same time as is more than evident from the books of

Protestant

scholars. The author of Meezan al Haqq said in his book Hall-al-

lshkal:

|

The Christians believe in trinity and unity in the real

|

sense of the words.

|

The Eleventh Point: Different Interpretations of Trinity

|

The great Muslim scholar Maqrizi,l describing contemporary

Christians said in his book Al-Khltat:

|

The Christians are divided into many sects: Melchites,2

|

Nestorians,3 Jacobites,4 the Bodhanians5 and the Maronites

who lived near Harran.

|

He further said:

|

The Melchites, Nestorians and Jacobites all believe that

God is three persons and that the three persons are one, that is

in their pre-existent essence. This means that the Father, the

Son and the Holy Ghost combined together are one God.

|

Again he said:

|

They claim that the Son was united with a bom son, the

uniter and the united together became Christ, and this Christ

is the Lord and God of the people. Now there is disagreement

among them regarding the nature of this Unity. Some Chris-

tians say that the essence of divinity and the essence of

humanity were united together, and this unity did not cancel

the essence of the other. Christ is both, the Lord God and the

son of Mary who remained in her womb and was given birth

by her and who was crucified.

|

Some other Christians claim that after being united they became

two separate essences, one human and the other divine, and his

death

and crucifixion are related to his human aspect and not to his

divine

person. Similarly his birth is related to his former person. They

say

that Christ as a whole is worthy of worship and Lord God.

|

Christians think that the human and divine essences were united but

that the divine essence is inseparable, while others claim that the

hypostasis of the son was incamated into the body and was united

with it. Others think that this unity is only an appearance like

writing

on wax or a reflection in a mirror. The Melchites say that God is

the

name of three meanings. They believe in one in three and three in

one. The Jacobites claim that God was One and self-existent, non

physical, then later he became physical and human. The Maronites,

on the other hand, hold that God is One. Christ is not his physical

son

but out of his kindness, love and grace he called him his Son, as

Abraham was called the friend of God. In short they have great

differ-

ences in this matter.

|

The above differences with regard to the interpretation of that

trin-

ity among Christians are so great and serious and so contradictory

to

each other that no definite conclusion can be arrived at. The

Protestants, realising this absurdity of the concept of union,

rebelled

against the opinion of their elders and took refuge in keeping

silent on

this matter.

|

1 welfth Point: The Trinity Did Not Exist Before

|

The previous peoples right from Adam to Moses had no concept of

tTrinity. Some of the verses from Genesis often quoted in its

support

are of no avail as trinitarian interpretations of these verses are

strange

and far removed from the text.

|

The most prominent among those verses is Genesis 1:26 which is

frequently quoted by the Christians. It says:

|

And God said, let us make man in our image.

|

ln this verse God has used first person plural for himself. The

Christians deduce from it that God was not one and alone at the

time

of the creation. Augustine said in his book:

|

Had the father been alone without the son, he would have

|

not used the first person plural.

|

Even Paul used this person for himself (See I Corinthians 3:4 and

8:1) Besides, if this plural has to be taken in its literal sense

what

would happen to those first person singula used for God that are

found profusely throughout the books of the Bible? Why and on what

ground are they not taken in their literal sense? If they contend

that

the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, united together are one,

the

use of plural for himself should not be allowed. It is rationally

impos-

sible that the singular and plural be used in a literal sense for

the same

person. In case they contend that "We" has been used in a literal

sense

while "I" is used metaphorically, it would mean that the actual

pelson

"We" for God is used in the whole Bible only two or three times,

while figurative use of the singular peon "I" is used at thousands

of

places. It is strange that the word "I" used in a thousand places

is not

to be taken literally and is interpreted as being figurative and

the plu-

ral "We" is taken to represent the reality and yet is rarely used,

in two

or three places only.

|

Apart from this it has now been confirmed through undeniable

ARGUMENTs that the verses of Genesis, containing the word "We" for

God have been distorted in their meanings. Jewish scholars and com-

mentators have unveiled this fact extensively. The Muslim scholar

Maulana Nasiruddin has proved through grammatical ARGUMENTs that

the Hebrew word "Mamnu" has been wrongly translated as "We" in

these verses.

|

Our present contention is that none of the verses proves that the

previous people ever believed in the concept of trinity. Any common

reader of the present Pentateuch fully knows that this precept did

not

exist in the time of Moses or in the subsequent times of his

followers.

|

Even John the Baptist was not certain that Jesus was really the

Christ, promised by God, as is plainly understood from chapter 11

of

Matthew, where we read that John sent two of his disciples to

Christ

to ask if he was the Christ that was to come or should they wait

for

some other.

|

Now if Christ is taken to be God Incamate, it makes John the

Baptist an infidel, as having any doubt about God is infidelity. It

is

obviously unimaginable that the Prophet John would not have recog-

|

nised his God, when, according to the witness of Christ, he was

supe-

rior to all other Prophets. This is understood from the same

chapter of

Matthew:

|

Among them that are bom of woman, there has not risen

greater than John the Baptist."

|

When John the Baptist, who is also the contemporary of Christ,

could not recognise him as God, how could prior Prophets have

recognised him?

|

Also all Jewish schola, right from the time of Moses up to these

days, do not accept this precept, it being obvious that God and His

attributes are self-existent and immutable, pre-existent and

etemal. If

the trinity was in truth the true nature of the Divine Reality it

would

have been necessary for all other Prophets and Moses to have

explained in clear temms the reality of tritheism. It would be

incredibly

strange that the law of Moses, which was followed by many of the

Prophets up to the time of Christ, should be absolutely silent on

a

matter of so great an importance and which was so basic to religion

to

the extent that, according to the tlinitarians, no salvation is

possible

without believing in it! Even more surprising and incredible is the

fact that Jesus himself did not speak of this belief before his

ascension

to heaven. For instance he would surely have said that God is of

three

persons, the Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost, and that the

second

person of the Son was united with his body and that it was beyond

their understanding to grasp the full significance of the character

of

this unity. In fact, there is not a single statement of Jesus to

that effect,

except some unacceptable and dubious remarks. The author of

Meezan al-Haqq said in his book Miftah al-Asrar:

|

If you raise the objection as to why Christ himself did not

express his deistic character saying clearly that he was God

without partners.....

|

Answering this objection he has given a lengthy, ambiguous and

|

obscure explanation that we will refrain from quoting here as it

does

not serve any purpose. However he said at the end:

|

The people were not able to understand the nature of this

unity and the actual relation of the three persons. Because of

this, had Christ described it in clear terms, people would have

misunderstood him to be God in his human capacity, and this

would have certainly been wrong. This is one of the matters

of which Christ said to his disciples, "I have yet many things

to say unto you but you cannot bear them now. Howbeit when

he, the spirit of Truth, is come, he will guide you into all

truth, for he shall not speak and show you things to come."

|

He also said:

|

Many times the leaders of the Jews sought to arrest him

and to stone him to death. In spite of the fact that he did not

clearly express his deification, he used to refer to his being

God only vaguely.

|

There are two excuses suggested by this author. Firstly people

would not be able to understand the significance of this matter

before

the ascension of Jesus. Secondly, Jesus did not express his godhood

out of fear of the Jews. Both excuses are, in fact, weak and

imbecilic.

First because people are equally unable to understand and to

explain

the riddle of trinity even after the ascension of Jesus. None of

the

Christian scholars up to this day has been able to understand the

nature of the unity of the three in one. Whatever has been said in

this

connection is all based on personal suppositions and assumptions.

The

Protestants, therefore, have resorted to silence. The above author

also

has admitted that this matter is a mystery and cannot be defined in

words.

|

The second excuse is also not acceptable because if the only objec-

tive of Christ own coming into this world was to atone for the sins

of the

people of this world by sacrificing his life, Christ would

certainly

have known that he was going to be crucified by the Jews. He would

also have known the time of crucifixion. This being the case, it

would

|

have been unnecessary and unimaginable for him not to have clearly

explained his "divine nature" out of fear of the Jews. It is

incredible

that the Creator of the heavens and the earth, having absolute

power

over his will, should fear his creatures, especially the Jews who

are

considered to be weak and helpless in this world. Is it believable

that

out of fear for such people he should have abstained from speaking

a

truth that was so basic for eternal salvation when Prophets like

Jeremiah, Isaiah and John the Baptist willingly faced the worst

kind

of persecution, some even giving up their lives for the sake of the

truth?

|

We find it even more incredible that Christ should have feared the

Jews in explaining this matter when he was so strict and so

unafraid

of the Jews that he severely abused them for not acting upon his

injunctions. The following statement is one of such examples. He

said

when addressing the scribes and Pharisees:

|

Woe unto you, ye blind guides....Woe unto you, ye fools

and blind..Thou blind Pharisee..Ye serpents, ye generation

|

of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell?

|

It is clear from chapter 23 of Matthew and chapter 11 of Luke that

Christ used to disclose their evil and weakness openly to the

people

without a trace of fear. Keeping this in view how one can imagine

that

he should not declare and explain a belief of so great an

importance

that human salvation depended on it. The Prophet Jesus (peace be on

him) was beyond such weakness.

|

The Trinity on Trial

|

First ARGUMENT

|

As trinity and unity are taken by the Christians in their literal

sense, the existence of trinity therefore would essentially prove

plural-

ity as we discussed under the ninth point in our introduction to

this

section. The presence of plurality essentially precludes

singularity.

Otherwise it would mean two opposites co-existing which is a

rational

|

impossibility. Someone who believes in the trinity cannot,

therefore,

be called a believer in unity.

|

The Christian contention that the unity of three and one are only

logically possible in the case of God is childish and unsupported

by

any ARGUMENT. Once it is confirmed that two things are inherently

opposite to each other, or intrinsically contMdictory to one

another,

both of them obviously cannot exist in one object at the same time.

This is because absolute "one" is not compound and made of other

parts. It is absolute and without parts, while contrary to it three

is a

collection of three separate "ones". Now if both of them are

assumed

to be found together in one object, it would imperatively require

that

the part is a whole and the whole is a part, this in tum would pre-

require that God is made of parts that are infinite. Only in this

case

could the parts and the whole be considered to have one reality.

This

assumption, therefore stands in contradiction to human reason. This

would also require that one is a third of its entity, and three is

a third

of one.

|

Second ARGUMENT

|

If we assume, as is claimed by the Christians, that God is com-

posed of three persons, each being distinctive in a real sense from

each other, it would not only prove a plurality of gods, but also

would

essentially demand that God cannot exist as an absolute reality,

but

only relatively as a compound. The parts of a compound are all in

need of one another. A stone simply laid beside man does not imply

that man and stone have been united together in a compound, and it

is

obvious that gods do not have need of one another for their

existence.

only created beings are in need of others for their being. Each

part is

evidently a separate entity from the whole. In this way the whole

would essentially be dependent on its part. Certainly God can not

be

supposed to be dependent on others for His existence.

|

Third ARGUMENT

|

The presence of three distinctive persons in God, in a real sense,

|

raises another question. Either this distinction is with a quality

of per-

fection, in this case all the persons would not possess all the

perfec-

tion equally, which is against the common belief of the Christians

who claim that each person of the trinity is attributed with all

perfec-

tion; or this distinction is with a quality of imperfection, in

this case

each person would be attributed with an imperfection, and God must

be free from any defects or imperfection.

|

Fourth ARGUMENT

|

A unity between the divine essence and a human essence would

essentially demand that the person of the son should be finite and

lim-

ited. Such a thing cannot be self-existent. It would always exist

through a creator. This necessitates that the second person, the

Son,

should be created; and a created thing cannot be supposed to be God

the Creator.

|

Fifth ARGUMENT

|

The three persons, distinct from each other in a real sense would

require that the thing making distinction between them should be

something that is not self-existent, as it would be commonly pos-

sessed by all the three persons. In other words it would be

something

other than the person. Therefore each person would be a compound of

two persons and obviously each compound needs its components for

its existence. It would therefore prove that each of the three

persons is

dependent on the other two for his existence.

|

Sixth ARGUMENT

|

The view of the Jacobites is evidently irrational hence unaccept-

able, because their view of trinity would require the created

existence

of God Who is Pre- and Self-existent. It would also necessitate

God own

presence in a physical and material form."

|

The other views of the Christians with regard to the trinity are

also

refuted for the following reasons.

|

If the unity of God and man was assumed to be through incama-

tion it would be rejected for three reasons. Firstly because this

incar-

nation would either be of the kind that is found in a rose and its

fra-

grance, seed and oil etc. This is impossible because it would only

be

possible only if the hypostatic person of the Son was assumed to be

physical, but the Christians believe him to be metaphysical and say

that he has no body. If the incamation were like a colour found in

a

body, this is also wrong as it would necessitate the presence of

the

body for the existence of the colour. Or if it is of the kind that

is found

between things and their properties, it would also make them

interde-

pendent on each other. Now when all the forms of incamation are not

possible the belief in the incamational concept is rationally

unaccept-

able.

|

Secondly, if we keep aside the nature of incamation and assume

that the Son incamated into the body of Christ, this would not be

pos-

sible if we assume that prior to the existence of this body the Son

also

did not exist, the Son would have a created existence, and

conversely

if we assume that the body also existed with the existence of the

Son,

it would prove that body too is self-existent which is again a

rational

impossibility. So if we assume that the son incamated into the body

of

Christ, this incamation would be an addition to his person that

again

calls for its being something that came into being causatively

which

again precludes his being self-existent.

|

Thirdly, the incamation of the Son in the body of Christ leaves us

with two possibilities: either the Son still remains with the

Godhead

or he leaves him. In the fommer case the presence of a person in

two

places at the same time is claimed and that is not possible, and in

the

latter case it would demand absence of the Son from the Godhead.

This would negate the existence of Godhead Himself as the absence

of the part essentially proves the absence of the whole.

|

Now if they claim that this unity of Christ and the second person

of the trinity, the Son, happens without incamation then that would

mean the presence of two and not one. Therefore they could not be

|

called united. And if both cease to be present, a third being would

come into existence which also would negate the unity. It would be

called the non-existence of the two and the new existence of the

third.

If one continues to exist and the other ceases to exist, the unity

between existent and non-existent would be impossible. This proves

that unity of the Son and the body of Christ is rationally

impossible.

|

Those who believe that this unity is like the writing on the wax or

like a reflection in the mirror are in no better position. This is

not a

sound basis for unity either, rather it proves contrary to it,

because the

writing and reflection are two separate entities. As the man and

his

reflection in the mirror are two separate beings. At the most it

proves

that man own reflection in the mirror resembles him more than any

other

man does.

|

The Seventh ARGUMENT

|

Wih regards to the Eucharist, the Protestants usually laugh at the

Catholics for their belief in the transformation of bread into the

body

of Christ on the ground that it is contrary to the human sense

perfec-

tion. They equally deserve this mockery because every one who has

seen Christ has seen him in human form only. Their view with regard

to the unity of Christ with the Son is equally laughable.

|

Three Converts to Christianity

|

It is said that three men converted to Christianity. The priest

taught

them the basics of the Christian faith especially the doctrine of

trinity.

Once a friend of the priest came to see him. He asked the priest if

he

had properly educated the converts in the basic principles of

faith.

The priest called the converts to his presence and asked his friend

to

test their knowledge. He asked one of the converts about the

trinity.

He answered that he had have been taught that there are three gods.

One that is in heaven, another that was bom of Mary, and a third

that

descended on the second god in the form of a dove when he was

thirty

years old."

|

The priest was angry with him and asked the second convert to

answer the same question. He said that there were three gods. One

of

them was killed by the Jews so now there were only two gods. The

priest admonished him on his ignorance and put the same question to

the third convert. He was the most intelligent of the three. He

answered that by the grace of the Lord he had leamt all that was

taught to him. He said that one is three, and three are one. One of

them was crucified and because of their unity the other two also

died.

Now there is no God. Otherwise the unity of the gods would have

been negated.

|

This trinitarian concept, in fact, is a riddle so complicated that

the

scholars and the laymen are equally unable to fathom its

signiflcance.

The scholars admit that they are unable to comprehend and to inter-

pret this doctrine. Imam Fakhruddin Raazi has said under his com-

ments of the Koranic chapter Al-Nisa":

|

The Christian faith is unintelligible.

|

Further he said:

|

There is nothing more misguided and evidently irrational

than the Christian faith.

|

Interpretation of Biblical Verses

|

It having been rationally proved through undeniable ARGUMENTs

that the trinity cannot exist, some interpretation must be found

for

those statements which apparently indicate it.

|

There are four possibilities. Either we should follow the rational

and textual ARGUMENTs; or we should reject the rational and textual

ARGUMENTs; or we should prefer the texts over reason and logic; or

we

should prefer reason and logic over the text.

|

The first is not practicable in Christianity as it would

necessitate

that one thing should be possible and impossible at the same time.2

The second is also not possible as it would negate all our acts and

beliefs. The third possibility is also out of question because all

the

textual evidence is dependent on rational evidence of the existence

of

God and on the fact that God really sent His prophets etc.

Therefore

rejecting rational evidence would call for the rejection of all the

textu-

al evidence. This means then that we should acknowledge the evi-

dence of reason and interpret the textual evidence to remove any

con-

tradictions it may present to rational ARGUMENT.

|

Interpretation of the text has been a usual practice among Judaeo-

Chrisdan scholars. They interpret the verses that speak of God own

phys-

ical form and features. Similarly they interpret many of those

verses

that seem to speak of God as being limited to space. We are really

sur-

prised at the Catholics who reject the clear bounds of human reason

and claim that bread and wine, that have come into being centuries

after the ascension of Christ, are suddenly transubstantiated into

the

flesh and blood of Christ and then worship them and prostrate

before

them. They also cast aside all the demands of human reason and

reject

very obvious rational ARGUMENTs with regard to the concept of

trinity

versus unity and insist that the two can exist together in one

person at

the same time.

|

We are faced with two kinds of excessive and contradictory

behaviour on the part of the Christians. On the one hand their

exuber-

ant and excessive respect for Christ does not stop them making a

man

into a God and on the other hand, they do not hesitate to attribute

shameful acts to him and to his ancestors. They believe that Christ

went down into hell after his death, remaining there for three

days.

Similarly they claim that the prophets David, Solomon and Christ own

ancestors are the descendants of Pharezl who was an illegitimate

son

of Tamar. Similarly they believe that the Prophet David, who. is

the

forefather of Christ, committed fornication with the wife of

Uriah.2

They also claim that the Prophet Solomon became an apostate and

worshipped idols in his later years.3

|

We have discussed all these examples earlier in detail.

Sale own Adrnission and His Will

|

The renowned orientalist and great scholar, Sale, whose translation

of the Koran is quite popular, left a written advice in the form

of a

will for the Christians which we reproduce below from his

translation

printed in 1836. He said:

|

Firstly, do not be hard with the Muslims; secondly, do not

preach doctrines that are openly irrational because the

Muslims cannot be overcome in these matters. For example

idol worship, the institution of Eucharist, etc., are matters that

are most resisted by the Muslims and the church has no

chance of convincing them by teaching these doctrinesd

|

Sale has admitted in clear terms that all the doctrines leading to

idol worship and the Eucharist are irrational and logically

unaccept-

able. In fact, all the believers in these doctrines do undoubtedly

asso-

ciate with God. May God guide them to the right Path.

|

The Trinity Refuted by Christ Himself

|

We intend to reproduce in this section those statements of Christ

which implicitly or explicitly refute the doctrine of trinity.

|

First Statement

|

The Gospel of John 17:3 contains the following statement. Jesus

said, making supplication to God:

|

And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the

|

only true God, and Jesus Christ whom thou hast sent.

|

The above statement has no other meaning except that the secret of

etemal life is that man should believe in Allah as being the only

true

God and in Jesus as his Messenger. This statement does not say that

eternal life lies in believing God to be a hypostatic union of

three per-

|

1. As we could not find the edition of this translation referred to

by the author. I

have faithfully translated the contents from Urdu. (Raazi).

sons who are distinct from one another, and that Jesus is fully

human

and fully divine at the same time or that he is God incarnate. This

statement was made by him during his supplication to God which pre-

cludes any assumption that he might have said it out of fear of the

Jews. If belief in the trinity was necessary for etemal salvation

he

must have expressed it here being alone and having none to fear.

|

When it is confimmed, as it is here, that etemal life resides in

belief

in the true unity of God and in belief in the prophethood of

Christ, it

follows that anything really opposite to this belief must be the

cause

of eternal death. Christ being sent by God essentially proves him

to be

other than God.

|

The Muslims, on the contrary, are the possessors of this etemal

life

for believing in the only true God while other nations who indulge

in

idol worship like Magians, Hindus and Chinese associaters are

deprived of it, as are the trinitarians for not having belief in

the true

unity of God. The Jews are deprived of it for not believing in

Jesus as

being sent by God.

|

Second Statement

|

The Gospel of Mark 12:28-34 says:

|

And one of the scribes came, and having heard them rea-

soning together, and perceiving that he had answered them

well, asked him, Which is the first commandment of all? And

Jesus answered him, The first of all the commandments is,

Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord: And thou shalt

love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul,

and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; this is the

first commandment. And the second is like, namely this,Thou

shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. There is none other com-

mandment greater than these. And the scribe said unto him,

Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God;

and there is none other but he: And to love him with all the

heart, and with all the understanding, and with all the soul,

and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as him-

self, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices.

|

And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto

him, Thou art not far frm the kingdom of God.

|

The above two injunctions are also described in Matthew chapter

22 in similar words and at the end it says:

|

On these two commandments hang all the law and the

prophets.l

|

We understand from the above the doctrine that was expressed and

elucidated by all the Prophets in their books and by Moses in the

Torah: that the only way to the kingdom of God is to believe that

Allah is one and there is no God but He. Had belief in the trinity

been

essential for etemal salvation it would have been expressed and

eluci-

dated by all the prophets, and Jesus must have said something to

the

effect that God consists of three persons, each person being

distinct

from one another in real sense. The absence of such indications in

the

sacred books is enough to prove the falsity of this irrational

doctrine.

|

Some vague and ambiguous deductions made by Christians from

the books of some Prophets are not valid as they are so cryptic and

equivocal that they cannot be accepted in the face of the simple

and

explicit statement quoted above. The following statements are quite

clear in their purport.

Deuteronomy 4:35 contains:

|

That thou mightest know that the Lord he is God; there is

none else beside him.

|

Further in verse 39 it says:

|

Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart,

that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth

beneath: there is none else.

|

Again in Deuteronomy 6:4-5:

|

Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord: and thou

shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thine heart, and with all

thy soul, and with all thy might.

|

The Book of Isaiah 45:5-6 contains:

|

I am the Lord, and there is none else, there is no God

beside me ..That they may know from the rising of the sun,

and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the

Lord, and there is none else.

|

The sarne book 46:9 has:

|

For I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there

is none like me.

|

All the above verses announce in simple and plain words that the

people of the east and the west are required to believe essentially

that:

|

There is no God but Allah.

|

The translator of the Arabic version of the Bible printed in 1811

distorted Christ own statement by changing the first person into the

sec-

ond person.l Christ own statement was "The Lord our God is one Lord",

this has been changed into, "The Lord thy God is one Lord". This

seems to have been deliberately changed as the first person used in

the first instance refutes any possibility of godhood for Jesus

while

the use of the second person does not necessarily refute it.

|

Third Statement

|

The Gospel of Mark 13:32 contains this statement:

|

But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the

angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.

|

This statement again speaks clearly of the falsehood of the

trinity,

because the knowledge of the Day of Judgement is only possessed by

God as is shown by Christ own statement above. Christ clearly

precludes

himself from this knowledge as well as others without any reserva-

tions. Had Christ been one of the hypostatic persons of God, this

absence of knowledge of the Day of Judgement would not have been

conceivable for him, especially keeping in view the belief that the

Word and the Son together are the "knowledge of God", and that the

Word, the Son and Christ are united together in one being. If we

accept, for a moment, that they are united through incamation, or

through transubstantiation as the Jacobites believe, it would mean

that

the knowledge of the Day of Judgement would have been possessed

by Christ alonel or, at least, that the Son must know it as Father

does.

|

Augustine said that Christ negated it to accord with the under-

standing of the people as if to say that since he could not tell

them of

the Day of Judgement, for them it was as if he did not know it.

|

Fourth Statement

|

In Matthew 20:20-23 we find:

|

Then came to him the mother of Zebedee own 2 children with

her sons, worshipping him, and desiring a certain thing of

him. And he said unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto

him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy

right hand, the other on the left, in thy kingdom. But Jesus

answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask ... but to sit on

my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall

be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father.

|

The same event has been described in Mark 10:35-45, but there he

speaks of James and John themselves coming to Christ instead of

their mother, which presents another example of contradiction of

the

Biblical text.

|

In this statement Jesus clearly states that it is not in his power

to

grant her reoluest and stressed that this power rests with the

Father

alone. This statement also precludes the Christ from being the

second

person of the trinity.

|

Fifth Statement

|

Matthew 19:16-17 says:

|

And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master,"

what good thing shall I do, that I may have etemal life? And

he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? there is none

good but one, that is, God.

|

This statement is evidently against the trinity. Jesus did not even

like being called "good" let alone being called God. This statement

would be meaningless if Jesus had really been God incarnate. In

that

case he would have said that there was none good but the Father,

Son

and Holy Ghost. How can Jesus be supposed to have been pleased

with their openly ascribing godhood to him and addressing him as

having created man with his own hands?

|

Sixth Statement

|

Matthew 27:46 contains:

|

And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice,

saying Eli, Eli, Lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, My

God, why hast thou forsaken me?

|

Further in verse 50 we find:

|

Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded

up the ghost.

|

1. Our author has the word "Righteous" here which is also present

in the Arabic

version 1865. In the King James version the word "Good" appears as

quoted by us

above.

|

And Luke 23:46 has:

|

And when Jesus had cried with a loud voice, he said,

Father into thy hands I commend my spirit.

|

The above statements plainly refute that he was God incarnate. For

if he had been God he would have not cried and said, "My God, my

God why hast thou forsaken me?" or, "Father I commend my spirt

into your hands," etc. because death cannot overcome God, as is

evi-

dent from the following verses of the sacred books.

|

God is Immune to Death

|

Isaiah 40:28 has:

|

Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the ever-

lasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth,

fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his

understanding.

|

Chapter 44:6 of the same book says:

|

Thus saith the Lord the king of Israel, and his redeemer

the Lord of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside

me there is no God.

|

Jeremiah 10:10has:

|

But the Lord is the true God, he is the living God, and an

everlasting king.

|

Paul own First Epistle to Timothy 1:17 says:

|

Now unto the King etemal, immortal, invisible, the only

wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever.

|

God who is etemal, immortal, free of weariness, and everlasting

cannot be helpless and subject to death. Can a weak mortal be God?

In fact the true God is the One whom, according to the texts quoted

above, Christ was addressing at the time of his death. Strangely

the

|

Christians believe that their God, Christ, not only suffered death

but

also entered into hell after his death.

|

This belief is reported from the Book of Prayer printed in 1506 in

these words:

|

As Christ died, and was buried for our sake, we must also

believe that he descended into Hell.

|

Philip Guadagnolo wrote a book in Arabic in refutation of the

work of Ahmad Al Sharif ibn Zain al-"Abidin and named it

Khiyalatol Filbos (The views of Philip). It was printed in Rome in

1669. Father Philip said in this book:

|

Who suffered for our sins, descended into hell, and then

was raised from the dead, the third day.

|

The prayer book contains the word "hell" in the Athanasian doc-

trine," fir nly believed by all the Christians.

|

Jawad ibn Sabbath said:

|

Explaining this belief, Father Martyrose told me that

when Christ accepted human form it became necessary for

him to bear all human sufferings and afflictions. Therefore he

was sent to hell and was punished. When he was delivered

from heM, all those who were present in hell before him were

released with him. I demanded some proof and support for

this belief. He answered that this belief did not need any

support. One of the Christians present, sarcastically remarked

that the Father must be very cruel, otherwise he would have

not allowed his son to go into the fires of hell. The priest

became very angry with him and drove him out of the meeting.

Later on the same Christian came to me and embraced

Islam but did not allow it to be made public in his lifetime. I

promised him to keep it secret.

|

In 1833 (1248 AH) a renowned priest, Joseph Wolf, came to

Lucknow in India. He claimed that he had received inspiration from

God. He declared in public that Christ would descend from heaven in

1847. A Shi"ah scholar had a debate with him. The Shi"ah scholar

asked him about the belief under discussion and he answered that

Christ did indeed enter hell and was punished but there was nothing

wrong with this as it was for the redemption of his people.

Some Christian sects hold an even worse belief about Christ. Bell

said in his history with regard to the Maronites:

|

This sect believes that the Christ entered hell after his

death and that he delivered the souls of Cain and the people

of Sodom from hell, because they were not the followers of

the creator of evil, while the souls of Abel, Noah and

Abraham remained in hell as they were opponents. They also

believe that the creator of the universe is not the God who

sent Jesus. They therefore reject the books of the Old

Testament as being inspired by God.

|

The author of Meezan al Haqq said in his book Hall al-lshkal

which he wrote answering the book Kashf al-Asrar:

|

It is true that the Christian faith includes the belief that

Christ entered into hell and came out of it on the third day

and ascended to heaven, but the word hell here signifies

"house" that is a place between hell and the highest heaven.

This implies that Christ entered the "House", so that he might

show his glory to the people of the "House" and that he should

disclose to them his being master of life, and that he had

atoned for all sins by being crucified. Thus hell and Satan

were overcome by him, and they were made as if non-existent

to the faithful.

|

It has been confirmed by the Book of Prayer and by the priests,

|

Philip Guadagnolo, Martyrose and Joseph Wolf that hell is meant

here

in the real sense, contrary to the interpretation presented by the

author

of Meezan al-Haqq. It remains to be supported by some convincing

ARGUMENTs that any place called "House" exists between hell and the

highest heaven, or that Jesus entered hell simply to show his glory

to

the people of the "House".

|

Besides, the existence of the "House" makes no difference since

either it is a place of pleasure and comfort or it is a place of

punish-

ment and torment. In the former case it would be unnecessary for

Christ to show them his glory as they would already be living in

eter-

nal pleasure and comfort and in the latter case the"House" is

nothing

other than hell for the souls that are suffering there.

|

Atonement: a Rational Impossibility

|

The sacrifice of Christ in the form of his death has no logical

con-

nection with the belief in atonement, that is the redemption of man

from his sins. As sin in this context is the original sin that was

com-

mitted by Adam in Paradise. It is logically inconceivable that all

of a

man own progeny should suffer for the sin of their father. It would

be a

great injustice to them. It is clearly said in the book of Ezekiel

18:20:

|

The Son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither

shall the father bear the iniquity of the son, the righteousness

of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the

wicked shall be upon him.

|

The other point that we are unable to understand is that Satan was

overcome by Christ through his death. According to the books of the

Christians Satan is eternally chained and imprisoned from the time

prior to the birth of Christ. The sixth verse of the Epistle of

Jude has:

|

And the angels, which kept not their first estate, but left

their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains

under darkness, unto the judgement of the great day.

|

Seventh Statement

|

The Gospel of John contains the following statement of Christ

addressing Mary:l

|

Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet

ascended to my Father: but go to my brethren, and say unto

them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father, and my God,

and your God.2

|

Christ, in this statement, describes himself as man like others so

that the people may not accuse him of the claim of

self-deification.

He stressed his humanity and said that he is a man like others, the

word son has been used for him only in metaphorical sense. As this

statement was made by him before his ascension to the heavens and

just after his "resurrection" it confirms that Christ had been

preaching

his humanity and his being the servant of God up to his ascension

to

the heavens, that is, the whole of his life. The above statement of

Christ is absolutely in accordance with the following statement of

the

Holy Koran where it quotes the statement of the Prophet Jesus

(peace

be on him).

|

I spoke to them of nothing except what you bade me. (I

said) worship Allah, my Lord and your Lord.3

|

Eighth Shtement

|

The Gospel of John 14:28, contains the following statement of

Christ:

|

For my Father is greater than I.

|

This also confirms that Christ denied being God, as no one can be

even equal to God far from being greater than Him.

|

Ninth Statement

|

The Gospel of John 14:24 contains the following statement of

Christ:

|

And the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father own

which sent me.

|

This makes it very clear that the word spoken by Christ is the word

of God and not the word of Jesus, and that Jesus was no more than

a

messenger sent by God.

|

Tenth Statement

|

Matthew chapter 23 contains this address of Christ to his

disciples:

|

And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is

your Father, which is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters:

for one is your Master, even Christ.l

|

This also clearly says that God is one and Jesus only his messen-

ger.

|

Eleventh Statement

|

The Gospel of Matthew 26:36-44 has:

|

Then cometh Jesus with them unto a place called

Gethsemane, and saith unto the disciples, Sit ye here, while I

go and pray yonder. And he took with him Peter and the two

sons of Zebedee,2 and began to be sorrowful and very heavy.

Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful,

even unto death: tarry ye here and watch with me. And he

went a little farther, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying,

O my Father, if it be possible, let this cup" pass from me: nev-

ertheless, not as I will, but as thou wilt. And he cometh unto

the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Peter.

What, could ye not watch with me one hour? Watch and pray,

that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing,

but the flesh is weak. He went away again the second time,

and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass

away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done; And he

came and found them asleep again.... And he went away

again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words.

|

All the sayings and the acts of Christ in the above description

clearly prove that Christ did not consider himself to be God, but

a ser-

vant of God. Would God be sorrowful to death, would God prostrate

and pray as Christ did? Besides, when the only purpose of Christ own

coming in the world in human form was to sacrifice his life for the

redemption of the whole world, why, on this very occasion, was he

so

sorrowful on the question of his death which was supposedly the

very

purpose of his existence? Why did he pray that God would remove

the cup of death from him?

|

l"welfth Statement

|

It was the usual habit of Christ to refer to himself with the words

"the son of man" as is evident from Matthew, 8:20, 9:6, 6:13, 27,

17:9,

12, 22. 18:11. 19:28. 20:18, 28. 24:27. 26:24, 45, 64. Similarly

there

are many other places in other books.

|

Christian ARGUMENTs in favour of the Trinity

|

It has been shown under the fifth point above that the writings of

John are full of metaphorical and symbolical descriptions and that

there are only rare occasions where some interpretation is not

required. Similarly we have shown in the sixth point that great

ambi-

guity is found in Christ own statements, to the extent, in fact, that

even

|

his disciples were unable to understand him until Christ himself

had

specified the meaning of his statements. Also we have cited

examples

proving that he never claimed godhood nor to be the second person

of

the trinity in clear words; and that the statements usually used by

the

Christians to support this claim are ambiguous and mostly taken

from

the Gospel of John.

|

These statements are of three kinds:

|

1. There are some statements that do not in any way support their

claim as far as their real meanings are concerned. Their deduc-

tions from these statements stand in clear contradiction to rea-

son as well as textual evidence and explicit statements of Christ

himself. We have sufficiently discussed them in the previous

two sections.

|

2. Some statements produced by them for this purpose are of the

kind that have already been explained by other verses of the

Gospels and by statements made by Christ himself. In the pres-

ence of these explanations, no other explanations of the

Christian scholars or commentators can be accepted.

|

3. There are statements that, according to ,Christian theologians

require interpretation. The necessity of interpretation in such

statements requires that this interpretation must not contradict

the holy text and be consistent with rational ARGUMENTs. It is

unnecessary to reproduce all those statements here and we will

reproduce and discuss only some of them in order to exhibit the

nature of their ARGUMENTation.

|

First ARGUMENT

|

The verses frequently quoted by Christian scholars are those that

refer to Christ as the son of God. These verses as an ARGUMENT for

Christ own divinity are not valid, firstly because they are

contradictory to

other verses that speak of Christ as the son of man,2 and because

these

|

verses also preclude Christ from being a descendant of David.

Therefore they need some interpretation to prevent them from being

a

logical impossibility. Secondly, because the word own on" cannot be

taken in its literal and real sense, as all the experts in

etymology unan-

imously describe its meaning as "the one born of the natural sperm

of

his father and mother." This literal meaning of the word is clearly

not

applicable here. Therefore, it requires that it should he used

metaphor-

ically in such a meaning as may be appropriate to the status of

Christ.

Especially when the Gospels elucidate that this word is used in the

meaning of "righteous" when referring to Christ. The Gospel of Mark

15:39 says:

|

And when the centurion, which stood over against him,

saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly

this man was the Son of God.

|

While the Gospel of Luke describes the same event in these

words:

|

Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified

God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man.2

|

It may be noted that Luke uses the words "righteous man" in place

of Mark own words "the son of God". This expression has been used to

signify "righteous man" by other people as well, exactly as "the

son of

Satan" has been used to mean an evil-doer. The Gospel of Matthew

says in chapter five:

|

Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the

children of God.3

|

It may be noted that Jesus himself used the words "children of

God" for the peacemakers. Moreover chapter 8 of the Gospel of John

contains a dialogue between Christ and the Jews in which Christ

says:

|

Ye do the deeds of your father. Then said they to him, We

be not bom of fomication; we have one Father, even God.

Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love

me."

|

Further in verse 44 he says:

|

Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father

ye will do. He was a murderer from the beginning, and abode

not in the truth, because there is no truth in him. When he

speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own, for he is a liar, and the

father of it.

|

The Jews in this example claimed that their father was one, that is

God, while Jesus said that their father was the devil. It is

obvious that

neither God nor devils can be father of any in the literal sense of

the

word. It is therefore, necessary for these words to be taken in a

metaphorical sense, that is to say, the Jews were claiming to be

obedi-

ent to God while Jesus said that they were followers of the devil.

The First Epistle of John 3:9,10 contains this statement:

|

Whosoever is bom of God doth not commit sin; for his

seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is bom

of God.

|

We read in chapter 5:1 of the same epistle:

|

Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is bom of

God: and every one that loveth him that begat loveth him also

that is begotten of him. By this we know that we love the

children of God, when we love God, and keep his command-

ments.2

|

Another statement we read in Romans 8:14:

|

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the

sons of God.
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ments.2

|

Another statement we read in Romans 8:14:

|

For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the

sons of God.

|

Also Paul says in Philippians 2:14,15:

|

Do all things without murmerings and disputings: That ye

be blameless and harmless, the sons of God.

|

All the above statements sufficiently prove our claim that the

words own on of God" used for Christ in some statements does not

prove

that Christ was the Son of God in the real sense of the word.

Especially when we find the words Father and Son used in metaphori-

cal sense frequently in both the Old and New Testaments. We present

some examples of such use from the Bible.

|

"Son of God" Used In The Bible

|

Luke, describing the genealogy of Christ says in chapter 3:

|

The son of Joseph...and Adam which was the son of God.

|

Obviously Adam was not the Son of God in the literal sense. Since

he

was created by God without biological parents, metaphorically he

has

been ascribed to God. Luke ascribes Jesus to Joseph although Jesus

had no biological father, as he relates Adam, who had no biological

parents with God.

Exodus 4:22 contains the following statement of God:

|

And thou shalt say unto Pharaoh,Thus saith the Lord,

|

Israel is my son, even my firstbom: And I say unto thee, Let

my son go, that he may serve me: and if thou refuse to let him

go, behold, I will slay thy son, even thy firstbom.

|

Here this idea is used twice in connection with Israel, who is even

referred to by God as his "firstborn".

Psalm 89:19-27 contains the following address of David to God:

|

Then thou spakest in vision to thy holy one, and saidst, I

have laid help upon one that is mighty; I have exalted one

chosen out of the people. I have found David my servant;

with my holy oil, have I anointed him ..He shall cry unto

|

me, Thou art my father, my God, and the rock of my salva-

tion. Also I will make him my firstborn, higher than the kings

of the earth.

|

In this example David is spoken of as being mighty, the chosen, the

anointed by God, and the firstbom of God, while the word father has

been used for God.

Jeremiah 31:9 contains this statement of God:

|

For I am a father to Israel, and Ephraiml is my firstborn.

|

Here Ephraim is referred to by God as his firstborn.

|

If such use of words are an ARGUMENT for being God then David,

Israel and Ephraim also must be gods even of higher status than

Christ, for, the firstborn deserves more respect than his younger

brother. If they contend that Christ is the "only begotten of the

father," we will be very glad to hear this since it would mean that

these words must have be able to be used metaphorically.

II Samuel in chapter 7 verse 14 has:

|

I will be his father, and he shall be my son.

|

This is God own statement in favour of the prophet Solomon.

|

The words own ons of God" have been used for all the Israelites in

Deuteronomy 32:19, 14;1, Isaiah 63:8, and Hosea 1:10. In Isaiah

63:16, we find the following address of Isaiah to God:

|

Doubtless thou art our father, though Abraham be igno-

rant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not: thou, O Lord, art

our father, our redeemer, thy name is from everlasdng.

|

Further in 64:8 of this book, we read:

|

But now, O Lord, thou art our father.

|

Isaiah here addresses God as being the father of all the

Israelites.

|

1. Ephraim was the younger son of the prophet Joseph (Peace be on

him)

|

Job 38:7 says:

|

When the morning stars sang together, and all the sons of

God shouted for joy?

|

Psalm 68:5 has:

|

A father of the fatherless, and a judge of the widows, is

God in his holy habitation.

|

Genesis 6:1-2 contains:

|

When men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and

daughters were born unto them, That the sons of God saw the

daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them

wives of all which they chose.

|

Further in verse 4 it says:

|

There were giants in the earth in those days; and also

after that, when the sons of God came in unto the daughters

of men, and they bare children to them.

|

In this example, the sons of God are the noble sons, and daughters

of

men are the daughters of the common people. The Arabic translator

of

1811 translated the first verse with the words, "the sons of the

nobles",

instead of "the sons of God". This allows us to understand that the

word "God" may be used metaphorically for noble.

|

There are many places in the Gospels where the expression "your

father" has been used for God addressing the disciples and others.

For

instance we find, "That ye may be the children of your father," in

Matthew 5:45. Also see Matthew 5:16 and 5:48, Luke 12:30 and 11:2,

and John 17:20 for other similar examples.

|

Sometimes the words "father" and own on" are used to stress and

emphasize their association with other things, like the expression

"father of the lie", own ons of hell" and own ons of Jerusalem" used by

Christ for the Jews in Matthew chapter 23. Similarly own ons of God"

and own ons of the Day of Judgement" are used for the residents of

|

Paradise.

|

Second ARGUMENT

|

The Gospel of John 8:23 contains this statement:

|

And he said unto them, Ye are from beneath; I am from

above: ye are of this world; I am not of this world.

|

From this statement of Christ, the Christians deduced that he was

God who, having descended from heaven, appeared in human form.

|

The above contention and deduction of the Christian scholars is

wrong for two reasons: firstly, because it is again clearly against

all

textual and rational evidence and, secondly, because similar state-

ments of Christ are found referring to his disciples. He said in

John

|

If ye were of the world, the world would love his own;

but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out

of the world, therefore the world hateth you.

|

Again in John 17:14 Christ has said about his disciples:

|

Because they are not of the world, even as I am not of the

world.

|

Christ declared that his disciples were not of this world exactly

as

he had said of himself, "I am from above." Now if his statement is

taken in its literal sense as proof of his godhood, it would

logically

mean that all his disciples too, were gods. The only logical

interpreta-

tion of his statement is, "You are desirous of this mundane world

while I am not, rather I seek the pleasure of Allah and etemal life

in

the Hereafter."

|

Third ARGUMENT

|

John 10:30 has:

|

I and my Father are one.

|

This verse is said to prove the unity of Christ and God. This con-

tention is also wrong for two reasons. Firstly, the Christians

agree that

Christ was a man like other human beings having a body and a soul.

The unity between the physical body of a man and God is impossible.

Therefore they would essentially have to say that, as Christ is the

per-

fect man, he is also the perfect God. According to the first

assumption

he would have accidental existence and according to the other he is

proved to be non-human, both contentions are therefore rationally

impossible.

|

Secondly, similar expressions have been used by Christ about his

disciples. He is reported to have said in John 17:21:

|

That they all may be one; as thou, Father, art in me, and I

in thee, that they also may be one in us: that the world may

believe that thou hast sent me.

|

Here Christ own expression that "they may be one" obviously cannot

be taken to prove that the disciples, Christ and God can be united

in a

literal sense. As their unity in a literal sense is not rationally

possible,

similarly Christ own unity with God, simply on the ground of such

expressions, is not possible. In fact, the expressions talking of

unity,

mean to be obedient to God own commandments, and to be righteous in

one own deeds. In this sense they are all united, with the difference

that

Christ own unity with God in this sense is more perfect than that of

his

disciples. This interpretation is in fact confirmed by John, the

apostle.

He says in I John 1:5-7:

|

This then is the message which we have heard of him,

and declare unto you, that God is light, and in him is no dark-

ness at all. If we say that we have fellowship with him, and

waLk in darkness, we lie, and do not the truth; But if we waLI

in the light, as he is in the light, we have fellowship with ane

another.

|

In Persian translations the last sentence appears as "we are united

with one another." This obviously supports our view that unity here

means exactly what we have described above.

|

Fourth ARGUMENT

|

The Gospel of John 14:9,10 says:

|

He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how

sayest thou then, Shew us the Father? Believest thou not that I

am in the Father, and the Father in me? the words that I speak

unto you I speak not of myself, but the Father that dwelleth in

me, he doeth the works.

|

Christ own expression, "I am in the father and the Father in me," is

supposed to prove that the Christ and God are one in a real sense.

This ARGUMENT is not acceptable again for two reasons. Firstly, the

Christians agree that the visibility of God in this world is

rationally

impossible, as we have discussed in our fourth point above. They

usu-

ally interpret it in the sense of recognition and awareness of God,

but

since this does not indicate unity between God and Christ, they

inter-

pret it as being united in spiritual sense. But it is essential for

an inter-

pretation that it must not be in contradiction with reason and

textual

evidence.

Secondly, in John 14:20 we read:

|

That I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.

|

This is similar to the statement we discussed in the third ARGUMENT

above. It is obvious that if A is in B, and B is united with C,

this

requires that A also should be united with C. Besides we read in I

Corinthians 6:19:

|

What? know ye not that your body is the temple of the

Holy Ghost which is in you, which ye have of God, and ye

are not your own?

|

We find a similar statement in II Corinthians 6:16:

|

And what argurnent hath the temple of God with idols?

for ye are the temple of the living God; as God hath said, I

will dwell in them, and walk in them, and I will be their God.

|

And it is said in Ephesians 4:6:

|

One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through

all, and in you all.

|

If this association necessarily proves unity between them in a real

sense, it would mean that all the Corinthians and Ephesians were

also

God.

|

What all the above statements show that this unity and association

is in fact, for his obedience and his love. We read the following

in the

First Epistle of John:

|

And he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in him,

and he in him. And hereby we know that he abideth in us, by

the Spirit which he hath given us."

|

Fifth ARGUMENT: The Miracles

|

The miracles performed by Jesus are also supposed to prove his

divinity. This ARGUMENT is as ridiculous as the others. The

greatest of

all the miracles performed by Jesus was raising some people from

the

dead. There are only three people said to have been raised from the

dead by Christ whereas we understand from chapter 37 of Ezekiel

that

Ezekiel revived thousands of men from the dead. Therefore he should

deserve godhood more than Christ does. Besides, we read in chapter

17 of I Kings2 that Elijah also revived a dead man. A similar event

is

described in II Kings chapter 4 where Elijah is also described as

hav-

ing revived a dead man. The same miracle was performed by Elisha,

even after his death, as is understood from II Kings chapter 13

where

a dead man was put into his grave and revived by the grace of God.

|

Even if we assume that some of Christ own statements can serve the

purpose of supporting Christian ARGUMENT for the trinity, this is

still

|

not acceptable in the presence of the fact that much of the text is

not

inspired, has undergone a great many distortions, and contains many

errors and fallacies as we have proved beyond doubt already in this

book. As for Paul own statements, they are not acceptable to us

because

he was not a disciple of Jesus. It may be noted here that all the

things

said above were only to show the obviously imbecilic nature of

their

ARGUMENTation, otherwise, as we have already proved with specific

examples, the books themselves are unacceptable to us, in any case,

because of the distortions, alterations and manipulations that are

found in them. Similarly we have quoted the statements of the

disci-

ples, assuming for their sake that they are really the statements

of the

disciples, otherwise they are equally unauthenticated and of

dubious

nature.

|

I must express the belief of the Muslims in this regard that Jesus

and his disciples were free and pure of any polluted thought and we

bear witness that there is no God but Allah, and Muhammad was His

Messenger and servant. Similarly the Prophet Jesus was a Messenger

and servant of Allah, and the disciples were his companions deputed

by him.

|

A Debate between Imam Raazi and a Priest

|

Imam Raazi had a debate on the question of the trinity with a

priest. He reported it in his commentary on the Holy Koran under

the

comments on 3:61:

|

When I was in Khwarazim, I was told that a Christian had

come there who claimed to have deep knowledge of Chris-

tianity. I went to him and a debate started between us. He

demanded proof of the prophethood of Muhammad. I said

that we have received authentic reports with regard to the

miracles performed by the Holy Prophet Muhammad, peace

and blessings be upon him, just like the reports we have

received with regard to the miracles performed by the

Prophets Musa (Moses) and Isa (Jesus) peace be on them.

Now if we deny the authentic reports, or we accept them but

deny the fact that miracles prove the truth of the prophets, this

|

would necessarily deny the prophethood of all the Prophets of

Allah. On the other hand if we accept the truth of the reports

and also believe that miracles are sure signs of the truth of the

Prophets, and both of these ARGUMENTs are proved to be true

for the Holy Prophet Muhammad, the truth of his prophet-

hood would be essentially proved.

|

The priest answered that he did not claim that Christ was

a Prophet but believed him to be God. I told him that first we

should have the definition of God. We all know that God

must be self-existent, the first and prime cause, and beyond

physical description. However, we find that Jesus had a

human form, was bom, and did not exist before, and then was

apparently killed by the Jews. In the beginning he was a child

and gradually grew into a youth. He needed food to live and

used to eat and drink, and had all the characteristics of a

human being. It is obvious that an accidental being cannot be

self-existent, and one who is subject to change cannot be eter-

nal and everlasting.

|

Secondly, your claim is wrong on the ground that you say

that Jesus was arrested by the Jews and then was crucified.

He also made every effort to run away in order to save him-

self. He tried to hide himself before his arrest and then, before

his death, he cried aloud. Now if he was God, or a part of

God that was united with the God-head or God was in him,

why could he not save himself from this persecution, and

punish them for such a sacrilegious act. His weeping and cry-

ing, and making efforts to hide himself, is just as inconceiv-

able. We are really surprised at how a man with ordinary

commonsense could ever believe something which is so evi-

dently irrational and contrary to human reason?

|

Thirdly, your hypothesis is impossible because we must

agree with one of three logical possibilities in this matter.

Either God was the same Christ who was visible to the people

in human form, or God was fully united with him or some

part of God was united to him. All three possibilities are

equally irrational and logically impossible.

|

The first because if the creator of the universe was Jesus,

it would require that the God of the universe was crucified by

the Jews, in this case the existence of this universe would

|

have ceased. The God of the universe being killed by the

Jews, who are the most inconsidered and disregarded nation

of the world, is all the more ironical and unimaginable. He

must be a most helpless God indeed!

|

The second possibility is also unacceptable, because if

God is neither a body nor an essence, his presence and unifi-

cation with form and body is rationally not possible. And if

God has a form and is material, its unity with other sub-

stances would mean that the particles of God own matter are sep-

arate from one another, if he is an essence, this would neces-

sitate some other matter for its existence, which would imply

that God was dependent on something outside Himself for his

existence.

|

The third possibility that some parts of God were united

with him is also absurd because if those parts were vital for

God, it would require that God would have been without

some of his vital parts after they were united with Jesus, and

God would no longer be perfect. If those parts were not vital

and God would lose nothing without them, such parts could

not be parts of God.

|

The fourth ARGUMENT, refuting this Christian claim, is that

it has been proved that the Christ had extraordinary liking for

worship and for obedience to God. Had he been God Himself

he would have not been involved in the worship of God. As

God is not required to worship himself.

|

I asked the priest what ARGUMENTs he had for his daim for

the divinity of Christ. He answered that he performed great

miracles like reviving the dead and healing lepers. These

miraculous achievements are not possible without divine

powers. I asked him if he agreed that the absence of a predi-

cate did not necessarily prove the absence of the existence of

the subject. If you do not agree with it, it would demand that

in the beginning when this universe did not exist, God also

did not exist.

|

On the other hand, if you agree that the absence of a pred-

icate does not necessarily prove the absence of the subject, I

will ask you a question. How do you know that God is not

united with me, with you or with any living creature as He

was united with Christ? He answered that it was obvious that

|

THE HOLY KORAN

The Only True Container of the Word of God

|

If you are in doubt of what we have revealed to our

servant, produce one chapter comparable to it. Call upon

your helpers, beside God, if you are Truthful.

|

Section One

The Miraculous Diction and Style of the Koran

|

There are innumerable aspects of the Koranic revelation that

explicitly or implicitly bring out the miraculous character of the

Koran. I will confine myself to the description of only twelve

such

aspects out of many.2 I will not speak of qualities like its full

con-

sciousness of every aspect of a subject when speaking on a

particular

theme and the moderation and considerateness of its speech. Whether

the passage concerned is one of hope or of threat, of reward or of

punishment, its speech is always balanced and never over-emotive.

This quality is not found in human speech as human expression is

always affected by the state of mind of the speaker. When he is

|

1. Holy Koran 2:23.

|

2. In the beginning of this section we should note that the author

has devoted it

mostly to demonstrating the astounding and miraculous eloquence of

the Koran, the

majesty and elegance of its style, the incomparable excellence of

its language. All

these marvels of Koranic diction and style can only really be

measured and appreci-

ated by those who read it in its original language. It is difficult

to translate any book

written in any language. Much more so with the Qur"ari whose

miraculous language

simply defies translation. The meaning of the words can be conveyed

in part, but

their charm, beauty and elegance cannot. The Holy Koran rightly

clairns to be a liv-

ing miracle of the Holy Prophet. Its miraculous quality resides

partly in its style

which is so perfect and lofty that, "....neither men nor Jinn could

produce a single

chapter to compare with its briefest verse," and partly in its

contents and guidance.

According to Eduard Montet, "The Coran.... its grandeur of form is

so sublime that

no translation into any language can allow it to be properly

appreciated." Therefore,

if readers fail to appreciate what our author is demonstrating in

this section, this is

due to the fact that even the best translation cannot transmit the

beauty of the lan-

guage. I am translating it because forms an integral part of the

book. (Raazi)

unhappy, he shows it in his speech, not showing concem for others

who might deserve praise or kindness. Talking of one thing, he does

not think and speak of its opposite. For instance when describing

the

creation, he does not speak of the Hereafter. When he is angry, he

often shows it without measuring the amount of anger that is appro-

priate.

|

First Divine Quality: The Eloquence of the Koran

|

The Holy Koran maintains throughout the highest possible stan-

dard of rhetoric in its speech, to the extent that it is literally

impossi-

ble to find its parallel in human works. The rules of rhetoric

demand

that the words chosen for expression should be so exact in

conveying

the message that they should not express too much or too little for

the

occasion. The more a description embodies this quality, and the

more

appropriate the words are to the situation, the more eloquent it is

said

to be. The Holy Koran fulfills all the requirements of rhetoric to

the

highest standard. We give some examples to prove our claim.

|

First ARGUMENT

|

Human eloquence,2 whether from Arabs or non-Arabs, usually

concerns the physical phenomena that are closely associated with

those people. For instance, the Arabs are considered to be great

ora-

tors and eloquent in the description of camels, horses, swords and

women. Poets, linguists and other writers acquire dexterity and

profi-

ciency in some particular fleld simply because poets and writers of

all

times have been writing and adding subtleties to the subject,

provid-

ing food for thought for subsequent writers to open new avenues in

it.

|

1. The author is referring to the unparalleled quality of the

Koranic language

which at such occasions chooses words that are appropriate and

exact for its subject

and also in its implications for other occasions. (Raazi)

|

2. Rhetoric, alaghah in Arabic, signifies use of language that is

eloquent u well

as appropriate for both the people and subject addressed. The use

of high-flown and

difficult words for the ignorant, and inelegant and sirnplistic

expression for a barned

audience is against rhetoric.

|

However, the Holy Koran does not fit this pattern, owing nothing

to precedent and being replete with astonishing and unparalleled

examples of eloquence that were unanimously acknowledged by all

the Arabs.

|

Second ARGUMENT

|

It is our usual experience that when poets and writers of

literature

try to adorn their language with eloquent expressions they do not

remain truthful. Any one trying to be absolutely true in conveying

his

message can do so only at the cost of eloquence. It is therefore

said

that untruth is a main element of a good poetry. The famous poets

Labid ibn Rabi"ah and Hassan ibn Thabit could not maintain the high

standard of their poetry after embracing Islam. Their pre-Islamic

poetry is more forceful and elegant than their post-Islamic

composi-

tions. The Holy Koran presents miraculous examples of eloquence in

spite of being absolutely true in all it says.

|

Third ARGUMENT

|

Good poetry is considered elegant and beautiful because some of

its verses are of a high standard of eloquence. Each and every

verse

of that poetry is rarely all of the same standard. The Holy Koran,

however, from beginning to end, is such an example of unabated

beauty, elegance and eloquence that human beings of all times have

been unable to produce even a small piece of equal standard. Take

for

example the Surah Yusuf," every word of which is a perfect specimen

of beauty and eloquence.

|

Fourth ARGUMENT

|

Any writer or poet, when he relates the same event more than

once, does not manage in the repeated account to be as elegant and

beautiful as he was the first time. The Holy Koran repeats

versions

|

1. Surah Yusuf, the twelfth chapter of the Koran which describes

the life of the

Prophet Joseph. (Raazi)

of the same event, and of descriptions of the creation and the end

of

the world, and of the injunctions and the attributes of God. Each

description is different in style and in size, but every one is of

so high

a standard that one cannot be preferred to another.

|

Fifth ARGUMENT

|

The Koran talks of many things like obligatory rituals, legal pro-

hibitions, instigation to virtue, repudiation of worldly desires,

and

prPparation for the Hereafter and other similar themes. The

descrip-

tion of these things does not lend itself to elegance and beauty

and

any poet trying to compose poetry on practical injunctions of this

kind would be hard put to produce a passage of literary merit. The

Holy Koran deals with all these subjects with a high standard of

elo-

quence.

|

Sixth ARGUMENT

|

The eloquence of every poet is confined to a particular subject and

when the same poet speaks on other subjects his beauty of

expression

and his proficiency is distinctly circumscribed. Imru"l-Qais, the

famous Arab poet, is known for his description of wine, women and

horses. No other poet is as eloquent on this subject. Nabigha is

known

for his description of fear and awful events, Zuhayr for hope and

so

on.l

|

The Holy Koran, on the other hand, talks on all kinds of subjects

with great force of eloquence, beauty and elegance, and is found to

be

miraculously eloquent in each description.

|

Seventh ARGUMENT

|

Diversion from one subject to another which in turn has many

branches usually makes it impossible for an author to maintain flow

and continuity with the sarne grandeur and majesty and his language

|

1. Similarly in English literature Wordsworth is known for the

description of

nature, Keats for human sentiments etc. (Raazi)

|

usually loses its height of eloquence. The Holy Koran is full of

such

diversions, frequently jumping from one event to another, but

miracu-

lously it maintains the same flow and continuity with all the other

subjects under discussion.

|

Eighth ARGUMENT

|

Another distinct feature of the Koranic diction is that it

encloses a

vast range of meaning in a surprisingly small number of words with-

out losing its charm and majesty in the least. Surah Sad own opening

verses are a good example of this. The Holy Koran here describes

a

large number of subjects in very few verses, including a

description of

the unbelievers of Makka, their rejection of the Holy Prophet,

admo-

nitions to them with reference to historical events of previous

people,

their distrust and astonishment at the revelation of the Koran, a

description of their envious nature, threats and instigations, the

teach-

ing of patience and a description of events related to the Prophets

David, Solomon, Job, Abraham and Jacob. Al these diverse subjects

been dealt with a force and eloquence that is unique to the Koran.

|

Ninth ARGUMENT

|

Majesty and sweetness, elegance and beauty are counteracting

qualities that are rarely found together in a single work. These

two

opposite qualities are seen divinely combined together throughout

the

Koran in a way unknown to human genius. This again is a strong

ARGUMENT for the miraculous eloquence of the Koranic diction which

is absolutely absent from human writings.

|

Tenth ARGUMENT

|

The language of the Koran contains all possible kinds of elo-

quence, metaphor, similes, comparisons, transitions, inversions

etc.,

but at the same time it is free of any hint of verbiage like false

exag-

|

1. The best example of this is the Surah Takir of the Koran, that

is Surah 81,

where all the above qualities can be seen side by side in each

verse.

geration, hyperbolical statements and all other defects of

falsehood

and of the use of strange words etc. Human writing does not usually

combine all the aspects of eloquence in one work. People have tried

in vain to accommodate all these qualities. The Holy Koran, howev-

er, does so superlatively.

|

These ten ARGUMENTs are enough to prove the claim that Koranic

language and its intonation are so sublime that they cannot be mea-

sured by human genius. The more one is acquainted with the Arabic

language, the more he will find the words of the Koran burning

into

his heart, and its thought breathing into his soul."

|

The Second Divine Quality of the Koran

|

The second quality of the Koran that makes it a living miracle is

its unique structure and internal arrangement, and, above all, the

sub-

limity of its thought and contents. The accumulation of all the

linguis-

tic perfections in the Holy Koran has been a permanent source of

astonishment to the great writers, philosophers and the linguists

of the

world. This acknowledged supremity of the Koran saves it from any

accusation of being no more than a collection of thoughts and ideas

borrowed from others and serves the purpose of making it so promi-

nent and so distinct from ordinary human writings that the Koran

by

itself is enough ARGUMENT to prove its divine provenance and its

being

a living miracle of the Holy Prophet.

|

The Arabs were arrogant regarding their command over the

Arabic language and harboured initially great enmity against the

Prophet and his teachings. The perfection of the Koranic eloquence

did not allow them to find any imperfection in it. On the contrary,

they were forced to admit that the language of Koran was compara-

ble neither with the poetry of the poets nor the oratory of the

orators.

They were astonished at its matchless eloquence. Sometimes they

declared it to be magic and sometimes they said that it was

something

|

that had been taken from a previous people. They often tried to

stop

people hearing it by making a noise when the Prophet recited it.

They

found themselves helpless against the inexpressible attraction of

the

Koranic language.

|

It is unimaginable that the Arabs who were known to be the mas-

ters of the Arabic language would not have met the simple challenge

of the Koran to produce the like of its smaIlest surah", rather

than

wage war against the Prophet of Islam and lose the best of their

heroes in the fighting as well as sacrificing much of their

property

and possessions, if they had been able to do so.

|

They heard this Koranic challenge many times through the

prophet. He cried aloud in their face:

|

Bring then a surah like unto it, and call (to your aid) any

one you can, beside God, if it be ye speak the truth.2

|

The Koran repeats this challenge in another surah in these words:

|

And if ye are in doubt, as to what we have revealed to our

servant, then produce a surah, like there unto; and call your

witnesses and helpers (to your aid) besides God, if you are

true. But if ye cannot, and of surety ye cannot, then fear the

fire, whose fuel is men and stones.3

|

Again this challenge was thrown at them with full force:

|

Say, if the whole of mankind and jinn were together to

produce the like of this Koran, they would not be able to

produce the like thereof, even if they backed up each other.4

|

The fact that they preferred to fight wars against him and

sacrifice

their lives is enough to prove that they acknowledged the

miraculous

eloquence of the Koran and it found impossible to produce any

passage comparable to the Koran.

|

There is a report that Walid ibn Mughirah, the nephew of Abu

Jahl, burst into tears when he heard the Koran recited. Abu Jahl

came to him and admonished him. He replied:

|

I swear by God, none of you is as conversant and

acquainted with poetry as I am and I declare that the words of

|

Muhammad have nothing to do with poetry.l

|

History has recorded that once at the time of flajj the same Walid

gathered together the dignitaries of the tribe of Quraysh of Makka

and suggested that they should agree on what to say to the pilgrims

if

they enquired about Muhammad. Some of them said, "We could say

that he is a soothsayer." Walid said, "By God, he is not, as is

evident

from his speech." Others suggested that he should be called insane.

Walid swore by God that he had no trace of insanity. They suggested

that he should be called a poet. Walid again rejected the

suggestion

saying that they were all fully conversant with poetic speech and

he

would never be accepted as a poet. The Quraysh then said, "We shall

tell them that he is a sorcerer." Walid said that they knew that he

could not be a sorcerer because his speech was far from sorcery and

that the only thing that could be said about him was that the magic

of

his speech had separated sons from their fathers, brothers from

broth-

ers and wives from their husbands. After this meeting they posted

themselves on the roads of Makka and prevented the pilgrims from

listening to the Holy Prophet.

|

It is also reported that "Utbah2 came to the Holy Prophet and dis-

cussed with him the opposition of the Quraysh with regard to the

Holy Koran. The Holy Prophet recited the opening verses of Surah

41. He had recited only thirteen verses when "Utbah, overcome,

requested the Prophet not to recite any more of it and hid his face

with his two hands.

|

Another report has said that as the Holy Prophet recited the

Koranic verses to "Utbah, he felt so restless that could not sit

straight

and leant back on his hands until the Holy Prophet recited a verse

of

prostration and prostrated before Allah. "Utbah retumed to his

house

in a state of emotional excitement, hid himself from the people

until

some Quraysh went to him. "Utbah said to them, "By God!

Muhammad recited verses the like of which I never heard in my life.

I was completely lost and could not answer him anything."

|

According to a report, the Companion of the Prophet, Abu Dharr,

said that he had not seen a poet greater than his brother Anis who

had

defeated twelve poets in a contest in pre-Islamic days. Once, when

he

returned from Makka, they asked him the opinion of he Makkans

concerning the Holy Prophet. He said that they accused him of being

a poet, a soothsayer, and a sorcerer. Then he said that he was

fully

conversant with the speech of soothsayers and sorcerers and found

the words of the Prophet in no way comparable to them. He was nei-

ther a poet nor a sorcerer and soothsayer for all of them were

liars

whereas his words were the truth.

|

We find in Sahih al-Bukhari and Sahih Muslim that Jabir ibn

Mut"iml reported that he heard the Holy Prophet reciting Surah al-

Tur in his prayer of MaBhrib (just after sunset). When he recited

this

verse:

|

Were they created of nothing, or were they themselves

the Creators? Or did they create the heavens and the earth,

Nay, they have no belief. Or are the treasures of thy Lord

with them, Or are they the managers (of affairs)?

|

Jabir said that he found his heart craving for Islam.

|

The Third Divine Quality of the Koran: the Predictions

|

The Holy Koran gives many predictions related to future events.

All the Koranic predictions turned out to be absolutely true. We

give

|

a few specific examples of such predictions.

|

First Prediction

|

The Holy Koran says:

|

Ye shall enter the Sacred Mosque (Masjid Al-Haram), if

Allah wills, secure, heads shaved, hair cut short, and without

fear.l

|

This passage from Sura Al-Fath (the Victory), from which this

passage is quoted, was revealed before the treaty of Hudaibiyah in

the

sixth year of Hijrah. In it the Muslims are promised by Allah that

they will soon enter the Sacred Mosque of Makka victoriously. Under

the prevailing circumstances this was unimaginable. The Muslims

captured Makka in the 8th year of Hijrah and entered the Sacred

Mosque toether with the Holy Prophet exactly as was predicted by

the Koran, some having shaved their heads and some having cut

short their hair.

|

Second Prediction

|

The Holy Koran says:

|

Allah has promised to those among you who believe, and

do good deeds, that He will surely grant them in the land

inheritance of power as He granted it to those before them-

that He will establish in authority their religion which He has

chosen for them. And that He will change (their state) after

fear to one of security and peace. They will worship Me

(alone) and not associate aught with Me.2

|

This Koranic verse promises that the Muslims will be made the

true viceregents of God and that Allah will grant them and their

faith

|

strength and power. The state of fear in which they were would be

changed to peace and security. This Koranic prediction foretelling

Muslim domination did not take long to prove its accuracy.

|

Let us see how, in surprisingly a short period, this Koranic pre-

diction and divine promise was fulfilled.

|

The whole of Arabian peninsula was brought under the Holy

Prophet own domination in his own life and some of the people of Hijr

and some rulers of Syria agreed to pay jizyah (a minority tax) to

the

Holy Prophet.

|

In the time of the first caliph of Islam, Abu Bakr, the boundaries

of

Islamic domination were greatly widened. The Muslims captured

some cities of Persia, and some of the cities of Syria such as

Bosra

and Damascus.

|

Then came the second Caliph, "Umar, who changed history by his

faith in the truth of Islam, defeating the world powers of that

time. He

conquered the whole of the ancient Persian empire and a large part

of

the Eastern Roman Empire.

|

In the time of the third Caliph, "Uthman, the Islamic domination

was further expanded. Islamic forces conquered Spain in the West,

and part of China in the East. It took only 20 years for the

Muslims to

have complete control of all these countries which constituted the

majority of the known world, thus abundantly fulfilling the

Koranic

prediction. Islam dominated over all other religions of the world

and

was the major world power of that time.

|

Third Prediction

|

The Holy Koran declares:

|

It is He who has sent His Messenger with guidance, and

the religion of truth, to make it triumphant over all religions.l

|

We have discussed under the second prediction that Islam, the

religion of truth, triumphed over the other religions of the world

and

the perfection of this domination of Islam over the world will be

witnessed by the world in the future.

|

Fourth Prediction

|

The Holy Koran says:

|

Allah was well pleased with the believers when they

swore fealty to you under the tree. He knew what was in their

hearts. So He sent down tranquillity upon them and rewarded

them with a victory (very) near. And many gains (spoils) that

they would take. And Mighty is Allah and Ise.

|

Allah has promised you rich booty which you will take.

And He has given you these beforehand, and He has

restrained the hands of men from you, so that it may be a sign

for the believers and that He may guide you to a straight path.

|

And other gains which are not in your power. And Allah

has encompassed: and Allah has power over all things.2

|

The victory promised in this verse is the conquest of Khaybar and

the "many gains" promised are the spoils and booty of Khaybar and

Hijr; similarly the promise of "other gains" are the booties and

spoils

to be taken from the conquest of Persia and Rome. All the promises

and predictions made in this verse came true exactly as they were

foretold.

|

Fifth Prediction

|

The Koran says:

|

And other blessings which you desire: help from Allah,

and a near victory.3

|

The promise of "near victory" contained in this verse is, according

to some, the conquest of Makka and, according to others, the con-

quest of Persia and Rome. The prediction, however, is true whatever

|

the case since Makka, Persia and Rome were all conquered.

|

Sixth Prediction

|

The Holy Koran says:

|

When comes the help of Allah and viictory, and you see

people enter Allah own religion in multitudes.l

|

In this verse the promised victory is the victory of Makka. Correct

reports place its revelation prior to the conquest of Makka.

Besides

"idha" (when) in Arabic is used for future tense and not for the

past

tense. Groups of people from Ta"if and Makka came in multitudes to

embrace Islam as was predicted by the Holy Koran.

|

Seventh Prediction:

|

We find in the Holy Koran:

|

Say to those who deny faith, soon you will be van-

quishcd.2

|

This came about exactly as wamed by the Holy Koran. The unbe-

lievers were all dominated.

|

Eighth Prediction

|

The Holy Koran says:

|

(Remember) When Allah promised you one of the two

(enemy) parties, that it should be yours, you wished that the

one unarmed should be yours, but Allah wanted to establish

the truth by his word, and to cut off the roots of the unbeliev-

ers.3

|

This is a reference to the battle of Badr and the two parties

referred to in this verse are the trade caravan that was returning

from

Syria and the other thal had come from Makka, and the unarmed

party was the trade caravan back from Syria. This also happened

exactly as was predicted.

|

Ninth Prediction

|

The Holy Koran says to the Prophet:

|

We are enough to sustain you against those who mock.

|

When the above verse was revealed to the Prophet, he told his

Companions that Allah would protect them against the ill intentions

of the idolaters of Makka who were always persecuting him and his

Companions. Allah fulfilled this promise.

|

Tenth Prediction

|

The Holy Koran declares:

|

The Roman Empire has been defeated in a land close by-

but they, (even) after this defeat, will gain victory in a few

years. Allah own is the command, in the past and in the future.

On that day shall the believers rejoice, with the help of

Allah,.He helps whom He wills. And He is Mighty and the

most merciful. (It is) the promise of Allah. Allah never

departs from His promise: but most men understand not.

They crave for the outer (things in the) life of this world, but

of the Hereafter they are heedless.2

|

This surah was revealed in Makka when Persia defeated the

|

Romans. The Persians were Magians by faith while the the Romans

were Christians. The idolaters of Makka were pleased with this news

and argued with the Muslims that they and the Christians claimed to

be the People of the Book while the Magians and Makkans were

without the Book. As the Christians of the Roman Empire were

defeated by the Persians, the Muslims would, likewise, be defeated

by

the Makkans. The Holy Koran, itself, refuted their assumption in

the

above verse and predicted the victory of the Romans.

|

Abu Bakr Siddiq, the devoted friend and companion of the Holy

Prophet, told the Makkan idolaters that the Romans would gain

victo-

ry over the Persians in a few years. Ubayy Ibn Khalaf accused him

of

making a false claim. It was decided that a specific period be

fixed for

the confirmation of this prediction. Both of them offered ten

camels to

be given to the winner and a period of three years was fixed. Abu

Bakr told the Holy Prophet of this and the Holy Prophet said that

the

prediction contained the word bid"a (a few) which signifies a

period

from three years to nine years, and suggested that he should

increase

the number of years by adding to the number of camels. Abu Bakr

went to Ubayy and it was decided that a hundred camels would be

given by each of them and the period of nine years was flxed.

|

Ubayy died when he was returning from theDattle of Uhud in

3 AH. Exactly seven years after this event the Byzantines gained a

great victory over Persia, as was predicted by the Holy Koran. Abu

Bakr, having won his wager, received hundred camels from Ubayy own

heirs. The Holy Prophet said that the camels received by him should

be given away in charity.

|

These are just a few of many such predictions in the Holy Koran

all of which have been fulfilled precisely as foretold.

|

The Fourth Divine Quality of the Koran: Knowledge of Past

Events

|

The fourth miraculous quality of the Koran lies in its description

of past events. The Holy Prophet was unlettered and did not know

how to read or write. He had no teachers nor did he ever keep

compa-

ny with scholars. On the contrary, he was brought up among

illiterate

idol-worshippers, devoid of any knowledge of the scriptures. The

Holy Prophet remained among these people throughout his life,

except for two trading journeys to Syria which were too short to

admit any possibility of his having acquired knowledge from anyone

there.

|

There are many past events that the Holy Koran describes differ-

ently from other sources. This difference is deliberate and

intentional,

as can be seen in the Koranic reference to the "crucifixion". The

Holy Koran avoids details that were to be proved untrue in the

accounts of previous books, such as the Pentateuch and the Gospels.

Our claim is supported by the following Koranic verse:

|

Verily this Koran does explain to the Children of Israel

|

most of the things about which they disagree.

|

The Fifth Divine Quality of the Koran

|

One of the miraculous qualities of the Koran is that it unveiled

and disclosed all the ill intentions of the hypocrites of Madina.

They

used to conspire against Islam and the Muslims in their secret

meet-

ings. All their decisions and secret plans were made known to the

Holy Prophet through divine revelation He used to inform the

Muslims of the intentions of the hypocrites. All such expositions

of

the Holy Prophet were found to be true.

|

Similarly the Holy Koran exposed the ill intentions of the con-

temporary Jews.

|

The Sixth Divine Quality of the Koran

|

The Holy Koran contains branches of knowledge that were not in

vogue in Arabia at its time of revelation and with which the

Prophet

himself was totally unacquainted. These include inductive and

deduc-

tive logic with regard to religious doctrines, exhortation, matters

relating to the Hereafter and other things. In fact there are two

kinds of sciences, the religious sciences and the other sciences. The

reli-

gious sciences are obviously higher in value than the other

sciences.

They include the knowledge of metaphysical realities like knowledge

about the Creator of the universe and His attributes, knowledge of

His

Prophets, angels and knowledge of the Hereafter. The branch of

knowledge covering all these aspects of religion is called "ilmu"l-

"aqa"id (the science of beliefs). Then comes the knowledge of the

practical injunctions, that is, the law. This science is known as

fiqh

(jurisprudence). The science of fiqh in Islam is a great science.

All the

jurisprudents of Islam have derived their law from the Koran. Then

comes the science related to the purification of the inner self

which is

called tasawwuf.

|

The Holy Koran gives simple and practical guidance on all the

above branches of knowledge, and this is unique to the Koran as

compared with other revelations of past peoples. This demonstrates

that the Koran is a collection of all the sciences. In addition it

is a

collection of rational ARGUMENTs, and refutes all heretical ideas

with

reason and logic.

|

The Holy Koran provides humanity with perfect guidance in the

fields of morality, ethics, religion, politics, culture, and

economics.

|

The Seventh Divine Quality of the Koran

|

The Holy Koran, in spite of being a copious and voluminous

book, is absolutely free of any contradiction, inconsistency or

incom-

patibility which would not possible for any human work of this

size.

No other book in the world can claim to be so free from all defects

as

the Koran. This distinct feature of the Koran is in itself an

ARGUMENT

of its being divine. The Koran itself invites people towards this

incomparable feature in these words:

|

Will they not ponder on the Koran? Had it been from

other than God they could have surely found in it many con-

tradictions."

|

There is no doubt that a text like the Koran having all these

divine features cannot but be from Allah, the All-Knowing, who has

knowledge of the unknown future as well as the past and present.

|

The Eighth Divine Quality: the Eternality of the Koran

|

The Holy Koran rightly claims to be the only divine revelation

that is everlasting, preserving its originality and genuineness

beyond

all reasonable doubts. This living miracle of the Holy Prophet is

unique in that it continued beyond his death unlike the miracles of

the

previous Prophets that lasted only as long as they lived. The texts

of

other Prophets and their signs all disappeared with them and no

trace

of them can now be found in the world. The Holy Koran made a

simple challenge to humanity to produce the like of it or any of

its

parts. Centuries have passed and it remains as incomparable today

as

it was on the day it was revealed and will remain so up to the Day

of

Judgement.

|

According to this Koranic challenge, every individual surah of

the Holy Koran, indeed any part equal to its smallest surah, is in

itself a separate miracle making the Koran a collection of nearly

two

thousand separate miracles.

|

The Ninth Divine Quality of the Holy Koran

|

Those who have recited the Holy Koran in Arabic are fully

acquainted with its strange quality of involving the reciter and

with

the entrancing influence of its melody. The more you recite it the

more you are charmed by it. This strange phenomenon is experienced

by all who recite the Koran regularly.

|

The Tenth Divine Quality of the Holy Koran

|

Another divine feature of the Holy Koran is that it combines in

itself the claim and its ARGUMENTs both at the same time. That is

to say,

its divine eloquence provides the proof of its divinity while its

mean-

|

ings convey the divine message of obligations and prohibitions.

This

applies to all its contents. It presents ARGUMENTs for what is

being said

at the same time as it says it.

|

The Eleventh Divine Quality of the Holy Koran

|

Another distinct divine feature of the Holy Koran is its

capability

of being memorised, even by those who do not know the Arabic lan-

guage. The Koran refers to this feature in this verse:

|

We have made the Koran easy to remember.l

|

This divine feature of the Holy Koran is frequently demonstrated

throughout the world by those young boys who have memorised the

whole of it. They can recite the whole of the Koran by heart.

Millions of such hafiz own (preservers of the Koran) are always

present

in the world and they can recite the whole of the Koranic text

with

absolute accuracy from memory alone. They memorize not only the

text but also its annotations and pronunciation exactly

corresponding

with the way the Prophet conveyed it.

|

The few people in the Christian world who memorize the Bible or

even just the Gospels are seldom able to do so with such miraculous

accuracy. This feature alone is so obviously an ARGUMENT for the

divine nature of the Koran that it cannot be overlooked easily.

|

The T velfth Divine Quality of the Holy Koran

|

Another inherent divine feature of the Holy Koran is the awe and

fearfulness that enters into the hearts of its listeners. It is

even more

strange that this sensual experience of awe is equally felt by

those

who do not understand its meanings. There are many examples

recorded by history that people were so moved by listening to the

Koran when they heard it for the first time that they converted to

Islam simply by listening to it.l

|

It has been reported that a Christian passed by a Muslim who was

reciting the Holy Koran. Listening to the Koran, the Christian

was

so struck and moved that he burst into tears. He was asked why he

was he weeping. He said, " I do not know, but as soon as I heard

the

word of God I felt greatly frightened and my heart filled with

tears."

|

Qadi Noorullah Shostri wrote in his commentary on the Holy

Koran that when the great scholar Ali Al-Qaushji set out for

Greece,

a Jewish scholar came to him to discuss about the truth of Islam.

He

had a long debate with him on different aspects of Islam. He did

not

accept any of the ARGUMENTs forwarded by Ali Al-Qaushji. This

debate lasted for one month with no definite result. One morning

when Ali Al-Qaushji was busy reciting the Holy Koran on the roof

of his house, the Jew came to him. Though Ali Al-Qaushji did not

have a good voice, as soon as the Jew listened to the Holy Koran,

he

felt his heart fill with fear and the Koranic influence found its

way

through to his heart. He came to Ali Al-Qaushji and asked him to

convert him to Islam. Ali asked him of this sudden change. He said

"In spite of your bad voice the Koran captured my heart and I felt

sure that it was the word of God."

|

The above examples clearly show the miraculous character of the

Holy Koran.

|

Conclusions

|

To conclude this section we must recapitulate that it is part of

divine custom that the Prophets are usually given miracles in those

fields that are popular among the people of that age. The

superhuman

demonstrations in that particular field make people believe in the

truth of the Prophet and his access to divine power. Sorcery and

magic were common in the time of Moses. As soon as Pharaoh own

magicians saw Moses" staff transforming into a living serpent and

devouring their illusory snakes they instantly believed in Moses as

being the Prophet of God and straightaway embraced his faith.

|

Similarly in the time of the Prophet Jesus the science of medicine

was a common practice. The people had acquired perfection in it.

When the experts of medicine watched Jesus healing the lepers and

reviving the dead, they instantly knew through their experience

that

such things were beyond the access of the science of medicine, and

believed that it could be nothing but a miracle of Jesus.

|

The same holds true with the Holy Prophet Muhammad. He was

sent to the Arabs who arrogantly claimed to be the best

elocutionists

of the world. They invested all their effort to achieve perfection

in

elocution and used to challenge others in public contests. They had

great pride in their linguistic achievements. The famous seven

poemsl

were hung in the House of Allah, the Ka"ba, as a constant

challenge.

They presented a practical challenge to the Arabs in general to

pro-

duce a piece similar to them by whoever claimed eloquence. As soon

as they heard the Koran they knew from their experience that it

was

far beyond the limits of humanly conceivable perfection. They

instantly realized that such superhuman eloquence could not exist

in a

human work.

|

The Gradual Nature of the Koranic Revelation

|

The Holy Koran was not revealed all at once. It came in pieces

gradually over a period of almost 23 years. There are many reasons

for this gradualness.

|

(1) Had it been revealed all at once, it might have been difficult

for

the Holy Prophet to retain the voluminous text of the Koran as

a whole, particularly given the fact that he was unlettered.

(2) Had the whole of the Koranic text come in written form, it

might have obviated the interest and necessity of memorising

it. The short passages, as they were revealed, were memorised

more easily. In addition, it established a valuable tradition

among the Muslims of memorising the Koranic text verbatim.

|

(3) It would have been very difficult, if not impossible, for the

Arabs to follow all the injunctions of the Koranic law at once

In this case, gradualness was more practical and wise and facil

itated the practical realisation of these injunctions.

|

One of the Companions of the Holy Prophet reported that it

was divine consideration for them that they were obligated by

the Koran gradually. Otherwise it would have been difficult

for them to embrace Islam. He said, "In the beginning, the Holy

Prophet invited us to tawhid (pure monotheism) only. After we

had accepted and imbibed its tender and sweet essence, then,

very gradually and practically we were asked to follow various

Koranic injunctions until the whole law was completed.

|

(4) This gradual revelation necessitated the frequent visitation of

the Archangel Gabriel to the Holy Prophet which was obvious-

ly a source of great strength to him, enabling him to carry on

his mission with certitude, and to bear the hardships of

prophethood with fortitude.

|

(5) The small pieces of the Koranic revelation, claiming to pos-

sess miraculous eloquence, provided opponents with more time

to meet the challenge to produce a text equal to the smallest

surah of the Koran. Their complete lack of success and the

inability of the Arabs to accomplish it is again an ARGUMENT for

the divine nature of its eloquence.

|

(6) The Koranic revelation provided guidance to the Muslims

according to the changing circumstances, and responded to the

objections raised by opponents. This helped increase their

understanding and nourished their certitude as they came to

realise the truth of the Koranic predictions and divinely

revealed knowledge of the unknown future.

|

(7) Being a messenger of Allah is the highest of all honours. The

|

Archangel Gabriel enjoyed this honour by carrying the divine

word to the Holy Prophet for a great period which would not

have been possible had it been revealed all-at-once.

|

Repetitions in the Koranic Text

|

The Koranic revelation contains repeated descriptions, especially

concerning tawhid (the unity of God), the Resurrection and the

lives

of the earlier Prophets. This repetition is unique to the Koranic

reve-

lation. These repetitions do certainly show divine wisdom to the

read-

ers. The Arabs were generally idolaters, totally ignorant of

monothe-

ism and the Day of Judgment, etc. Similarly some of the non-Arab

nations like the Indians and Chinese were also idol-worshippers.

The

people of the revealed religions like the Jews and the Christians

had

corrupted their original revelations, specially the truth with

regard to

the principles of faith like the unity of God, the Resurrection and

the

missions of the earlier Prophets. The Holy Koran repeatedly

describes these things using a variety of styles to attract

attention. The

events of the earlier Prophets were described in repeated passages

always using a different style, demonstrating divine eloquence in

each

instance. This has eliminated any possible claim that the presence

of

superhuman eloquence in its text was incidental. This linguistic

per-

fection is demonstrated repeatedly in variegated styles.

|

Besides this, the Holy Prophet sometimes felt depressed in the face

of the antagonistic activities of his opponents. A short passage of

the

Koran would then be revealed describing an event in the life of a

certain Prophet relevant to the situation in which the Holy Prophet

found himself. This had a highly consoling effect on him. The Holy

Koran attests to cause and resolution separately in the following

two

verses:

|

We know that you are vexed by what they say.l

|

For the consolation of the Holy Prophet,the Holy Koran has:

|

And aU that we relate to you of the accounts of the (earli-

er) Messengers is (meant) to put courage into your heart, and

through this the truth is revealed to you, along with exhorta-

tion and admonition for the believers.l

|

The same applies to the believers who were teased and vexed by

the unbelievers. The repeated consolation of newly revealed

passages

gave them heart to bear their sufferings.

|

Christian Objections to the Holy Koran

|

There are many objections raised by Christian scholars against

various aspects of the Holy Koran. A review of such objections and

their answers is our main object in this section.

|

First Objection

|

The first objection frequently raised by Christian scholars is

relat-

ed to the transcendence of the eloquent language of the Holy

Koran.

Their contention in this respect consists mainly of the following

points. Firstly that it is not acceptable to claim that its

eloquence real-

ly surpassed all human genius and that no such text can be produced

by human effort. Secondly that even if this claim of the Muslims is

accepted, it still only provides a defective ARGUMENT for its being

miraculous, bccause, in that cas, it could only be recognised as a

miracle by those few who have acquired the highest standard of

profi-

ciency and skill in the Arabic language. And this would further

mean

that books written in Latin and Greek, which have the highest stan-

dard of eloquence, should also be accepted as revealed, as well as

implying that all kinds of false and abject works could claim to be

miraculous simply on the strength of being composed in supremely

eloquent language.

|

We should here remind ourselves that in the previous section we

have produced undeniable ARGUMENTs to establish the transcendent

quality of the Koranic language. Given those specific criteria,

any

objection to the miraculous eloquence of the Holy Koran is not

valid

unless a parallel description of equal eloquence is produced by

other

claimants to meet the Koranic challenge quoted by us in the first

sec-

tion.

|

They are, however, justified in saying that only a few linguists

could apprehend the miraculous quality of its eloquence, but this

is of

no help to them as this miraculous feature of the Holy Koran aimed

exactly at that. That is to say, the Holy Koran challenged those

few

Arab linguists who had great pride in their eloquence.

|

quence but also admitted

their inability to contest it because, through their perfect

elocution,

they instantly recognized its super-human eloquence. The common

people have found out about this quality through these scholars.

Thus

the miraculous eloquence of the Holy Koran has become known by

all. The ARGUMENT, therefore, is not defective, as it achieved its

goal

by making the Arabs accept that it was the word of God.

|

Moreover, the Muslims do not claim that the eloquence of the

Holy Koran is the only thing that makes it a miracle. What they

rightly claim is, that its eloquence is one of the many miraculous

fea-

tures of the Holy Koran and that the Holy Koran is one among

many other miracles of the Holy Prophet. The miraculous nature of

the Holy Koran is so widely acknowledged that it has not been

refut-

ed by anyone in these 1280 years.l The following statement of Abu

Musa Muzdar,2 a leader of the Mu"tazilites, who said that it was

pos-

sible for a human being to produce something equal to the Koran,

is

unacceptable and rejected.

|

It is generally known that Abu Musa had become mentally disor-

dered due to his excessive involvement in spiritual exercises. He

made many delirious statements. For example, he said, "God has the

power of making false statements and acting with cruelty towards

the

people. He would be God, but a cruel and lying God." May Allah for-

bid. He also said:

|

Anyone who associates with kings is an infidel. He can-

|

not be an heir to anyone and no one can be his heir.

|

1. Now, in 1988, the nurnber of years passed from the beginning of

the Quranic

revelation has been 1410 years. (Kaazi)

|

2. Isa ibn Sabih Abu Musa Muzdar who died in 226 AH, was an insane

person-

ality. He was maniacally rigid in his belief in the accidentality

of the Holy Quran.

Any one believing in the self-existence of the Holy Quran was an

infidel in his eyes.

Once, the governor of Kufa asked his opinion aboul the people

living on the earth

and he said that all of them were infidels. The governor said to

him that the Holy

Quran describes Paradise as being greater than the heavens and the

eanh. Did he

think that he and his followers alone would live in paradise? He

had no answer.

(Shahristani vol.1 page 94). raqi)

|

As for their contention that books written in other languages pos-

sessing the highest degree of eloquence should also be considered

as

miracles this contention is not well-founded as no book in any lan-

guage has been proved to have achieved the super-human quality of

eloquence that is possessed by the Holy Koran. The authors of such

books never claimed them to be prophetic marvels. However, anyone

making any such claim would be required to prove its transcendent

quality of eloquence with effective ARGUMENTs and specific

examples.

|

Besides, the claim by some Christian scholars to the effect that

certain books of other languages demonstrate a standard of

eloquence

equal to that of the Koran, is not acceptable on the ground that

those

languages are not their first languages. They themselves are not

capa-

ble of defining the standard of eloquence of other languages, as no

one can claim to be as conversant with a foreign language as

someone

whose mother tongue that language is. This is not only the case

with

Arabic; it is equally true for all the languages of the world, be

they

Greek, Latin or Hebrew. Every language has its own particular

struc-

ture, grammar and idiom, which usually is radically different from

any other language. Acquiring any degree of knowledge in a foreign

language is not enough to make the claim that one has mastered it

in

all respects.

|

Under the orders of Pope Urban VIII, the Archbishop of Syria

called a meeting of priests, cardinals and scholars and masters of

the

Hebrew, Greek and the Arabic languages for the purpose of revising

and correcting the Arabic translation of the Bible that was full of

errors and missing many important passages. The members of this

council took great pains in rectifying the errors of this

translation.

After great labour and all possible efforts, they prepared a

version in

1625. In spite of all their effort, this translation still

contained many

errors and defects. The revising members of this council wrote an

apologetic introduction to it. We reproduce below their apology in

their exact words:"

|

You will find many things in this copy deviating from the

general rules of grammar. For example, masculine gender in

place of feminine, singular replaced by plural and plural in

place of a dual." Similarly there are unusual applications of

the signs of accentuation, emphasis and phonetics. Sometimes

additional words have been used in place of a phonetic mark.

The main reason of our being ungrammatical is the simplicity

of the language of the Christians. The Christians have formu-

lated a special language. The prophets, the apostles, and their

elders took liberties with languages such as Latin, Greek and

Hebrew, because it was never the will of the Holy Ghost to

confine the words of God within the narrow boundaries of

normal grammatical complexities. The Holy Ghost, therefore,

revealed the secrets of God without effusion and eloquence.

|

The English are particularly prone to arrogance when they acquire

even a little knowledge of a particular subject or a slight

proficiency

in another language. An example of this vanity and self-complacency

with regard to many sciences and subjects is pointed out below.

The famous traveller, Abu Talib Khan, wrote a book of his travels

recording his observations regarding the people of various

countries.

He described the people of England in detail discussing their

virtues

as well as their defects. The following passage is reproduced from

his

Persian book:2

|

The eighth defect of the English people is their deceitful

attitude towards the sciences and languages of other coun- ;

tries. They are easy prey to self-conceit. They start writing

books on subjects of which they have only elementary knowl-

edge, or in languages which they suppose they have mastered

without having any real proficiency in them. They publish

their works with a great complacency equal only to their

ignorance. It was through the Greek and the French people

that I first came to know this characteristic of the English. I

|

did not believe them fully until I read some of their Persian

|

writings and found it out for myself.

|

Their last contention, that abject and false statements described

in

the most eloquent words should also be considered as miracles, has

nothing to do with the Holy Koran since it is absolutely free from

any such thing. The Holy Koran deals with the following twenty-

seven subjects and every single one of its verses can be subsumed

under one or another of them.

|

1. Attributes of the infinity and perfection of Allah like His

self-

existence, eternality, His infinite power and wisdom, His infi-

nite mercy and love, His infinite justice and truth, His holiness,

majesty, sovereignty, infinity and unity, His being omnipotent,

omniscient, all knowing, all-hearing, all powerful and His

being the Creator of the universe.

|

2. His being free of all imperfections, like accidental existence,

mutability, ignorance and impotence etc.

|

3. Invitations to pure monotheism, prohibition from associating

partners to Him, the trinity being a kind of association.

|

4. Historical passages related to the people of the past and

accounts of certain Prophets.

|

5. Freedom of the Prophets from idolatry, infidelity and associa-

tion.

|

6. Appreciation and praise of those who believed in their

Prophets.

|

7. Admonitions and exhortations to those who disbelieved and

denied their Prophets.

|

8. Invitation to believe in all the Prophets in general, and in the

Prophet Jesus in particular.

|

9. The promise and prediction that the believers shall ultimately

triumph over the unbelievers.

|

10. Descriptions regarding the Day of Judgement and accounts of

reward and punishment on that day.

|

11. Descriptions of the blessings of Paradise and torture of the

fires

of Hell along with related details.

|

12. Descriptions of impermanence and mortality of this worldly

life.

|

13. Descriptions of the eternality of the Hereafter and the perma-

nence and immortality of its blessings.

|

14. Enjoining the good and prohibiting of the bad.

|

15. Injunctions with regard to family life.

|

16. Guidance for the political and social spheres of human life.

|

17. Exhortations for the love of Allah and of those who love Him.

|

18. The description of the ways and means through which man can

attain closeness to his Lord, Allah.

|

19. Premonitions and prohibitions against the company of evil-

doers.

|

20. Importance of sincerity of intention in the performance of all

rituals and acts of worship.

|

21. Warnings against insincerity, ostentation and pursuit of false

reputation.

|

22. Warnings against malefaction and malevolence.

|

23. Preaching of the moral and ethical behaviour appropriate to the

occasion.

|

24. Approbation and encouragement of benefaction and other

moral qualities like patience, modesty, generosity and bravery.

|

25. Disapprobation of unethical and immoral acts like vanity,

meanness, rage, indignation and cruelty.

|

26. Teaching of abstinence from evil and the necessity of taqwa

(active fear of Allah).

|

27. Exhortation to the remembrance and worship of Allah.l

|

It is clear that all the above subjects are undoubtedly valuable

and

noble. Not one of them could be considered to be abject or

unneeded.

|

Abominable Descriptions in the Bible

|

In contrast with the ideal and impeccable subjects dealt with by

the Holy Koran, we find a large number of indecent, shameful and

vile descriptions in the the Bible. Some examples would not be out

of

place here.

|

1. A Prophet is reported to have committed fornication with his

daughters.l

|

2. A Prophet is reckoned to have committed adultery with another

man own wife.2

|

3. A Prophet indulged in cow worship.3

|

4. One of the Prophets abandoned his faith and took to idolatery

and built temples for idols.4

|

5. One of the Prophets wrongly attributed his own false statement

to God, and described another Prophet and brought down the

wrath of God upon him.5

|

6. The Prophets David, Solomon and even Jesus were the descen-

dants of illegitimate ancestors. That is, the progeny of Pharez,

the son of Judah.6

|

7. The son of a great Prophet, who was.the "son of God" and

father of the Prophets, committed fornication with his father own

wife.7

|

8. Another son8 of the same Prophet similarly committed fornica-

tion with his son own wife. Besides this, the said Prophet, in spite

of being aware of their fornication, did not punish them. At the

|

1. Genesis 19:33. The Prophet Lot is imputed with this act.

|

2. II Samuel 11:2-5 describes the prophet David as having done this

act.

|

3. Aaron is accused of this in Exodus 32:2-6.

|

4. The Prophet Solomon in I Kings, 11:2-13.

|

S. See I Kings 13 29 for details.

|

6. It is described in Matthew 1:3 and Genesis 38 that Judah

committed fornica-

tion with his daughter-in-law who gave birth to Pharez.

|

7. This great prophet is Jacob. His elder son was Reuben. Genesis

29:32 and

35:23.

|

8. This other son is Judah as described by Genesis 38:18.

time of his death he only imprecatedl against the elder son

while prayed for and blessed2 the other.

|

9. Another great Prophet, the "younger son of God," committed

fornication with the wife of his friend and did not punish his

son for committing fornication with his sister.

|

10. The Prophet, John the Baptist, who is witnessed by Jesus to be

the greatest of all born of women (though the "least in the king-

dom of God is greater than he")3 did not recognise the second

person of his God for as long as thirty years,4 until this second

God became the follower of his servant, and so long as he did

not perform baptism, and until the third God had descended on

him in the form of a dove. When John saw this third one

descending on the second God like a dove, he came to remem-

ber the word of God that the same will be his Lord, the creator

of the heavens and the earth.5

|

11. Similarly one of the great Apostles, who is said to be a great

thief, who is also supposed to have performed prophetic mira-

cles, and who, according to the Christians, is superior to the

prophet Moses and others,6 sold out his faith for only thirty

pieces of silver. That is to say he betrayed his lord, the

Messiah, and conspired against him with the Jews and got him

|

1. Genesis 49:4 says, "Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel;

because thou wen-

test up to thy father own bed; then defiledst thou it: he went up to

my couch."

|

2. Genesis 49:10, "The sceptre shall not depart from Judah.... and

unto him shall

the gathering of the people be."

|

3. This is a reference to Matthew 11 "He that is least in the

kingdom of heav-

en is greater than he."

|

4. This refers to John 1:32-34: "And John bare record saying, I saw

the Spirit

descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him. And I

knew him not: but

he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon

whom thou shalt

see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he

which baptizeth with

the Holy Ghost."

|

5. In fact, it is understood from Matthew 11:2 that John did not

recognise him

even on that occasion. During his imprisonment, he sent his

disciples to ask him if he

was the same that was to come or if they should wait for another

one.

|

6. Matthew 26:14-47, Mark, 14:1043, Luke 22:3-47, John 13:26,18:2.

|

arrested and crucified.l

|

12. The high priest, Caiaphas, who is considered by the Evangelist,

John, to be a Prophet,2 issuedthe death sentence against his

God, Christ, believed in him and yet insulted him.3

|

The above virulent imputations against the Prophets of God speak

themselves of their falsity. We, however, express our absolute

nega-

tion of these mythical allegations and totally disassociate

ourselves

from such sacrilegious beliefs which are both irrational and

ridicu-

lous.

|

Intolerable Beliefs of the Roman Catholics

|

The major sect of the Christians, the Roman Catholics, still gives

credence to some dogmas that are obnoxious and at total variance

with human reason. The number of Roman Catholics, as reported by

some priests, is two hundred million.4 Many shameful and abom-

inable beliefs are still a part of their faith. For example:

|

1. According to a recently expressed opinion of the Christians,

|

Mary own mother also conceived her without any sexual union

with her husband.

|

2. Mary is the mother of God in the real sense of the word.

|

3. If all the priests in the world were to perform the sacrament of

Eucharist at the same time, according to the Catholics, the mil-

lions of pieces of bread would be transubstantiated into an

|

1. The famous Christian theologian De Quincy justified this act of

Judas Iscariot

by saying that he did not betray the Christ for any personal

interest, but for making

Christ manifest his powers of salvation. In this way he acquired

salvation himself and

redeemed the whole of Christendom through the death of Christ.

(Britannica-Judah

Iscariot). Apart from being illogical, this justification is

contraly to vivid descriptions

of the Bible. For example Luke 22:3 has said, "Then entered Satan

into Judas, sur-

named Iscariot." The same statement is contained in John 13:27, and

6:70. The Acts

1:18 says: " Now this man purchased a field with the reward of

iniquity."

|

2. John 11:51.

|

3. Matthew 26:65, Mark 14:63, Luke 22:71.

|

4. According to later records, the number of the Roman Catholics in

the world

exceeds 400 million, to be exact it is 550357000 as reported by

Britannica 1957 page

424.

equal number of Christs, all fully human and fully divine at the

same time and born of Mary.

|

4. This single piece of bread, when cut into any number of pieces,

is instantly transformed into an equal number of Christs.l The

physically observed process of the wheat own progress from its

growth to being baked into the form of bread does not preclude

its divinity, as physical senses have no say in these matters

according to the Catholic faith.

|

5. Making idols, and worshipping them is an essential part of

their faith.2

|

6. No salvation of a Christian is possible without having true

faith

in the Pope with no consideration as to his impiety, dishonesty

and immoral conduct.3

|

7. The Pope is considered to be infallible and pure of all errors.

|

8. There is always a great treasure of wealth in the Temple of

Rome owned and managed by the Pope. Among many other

sources of money is the money paid to him by the people for

absolution of their sins for which the Pope is supposed to have

special powers. That is to say, the Pope has all the powers of

forgiveness and absolution of sins, and he gives this forgive-

ness for a considerable amount of money.4

|

1. The Eucharist has been the most debated question among Christian

theolo-

gians. It was institutionalised by St Thomas Aquinas (1227 -1274).

He stated in his

book Surna Theologica that every single piece of the bread turns

into a perfect

Christ. (Britarulica-Eucharist vol.8, p.797.)

|

2. Izalatu-Shakuk page 26 vol.1. quoted by Sale own translation of

the Holy Koran.

Even today it is common in all churches that large paintings of

Jesus and Mary are

hung and worshipped by the Christians.

|

3. The Catholics believe that the Pope is Vicar of Peter the

Apstle. He enjoys all

the pwers once pssessed by Peter and all the holy attributes

ascribed to him in the

gospels are owned by him. For instance, in John 21:16. "Feed my

sheep", and in

Matthew 16:18, "I will give unto thee (Peter) keys of the kingdom

of heaven".

Misuse of these pwers by the ppes is the most sinister and

obnoxious part of the

history of Christian Church.

|

4. The priest Khurshid Alam has written in The istory of he Rorn

Church,

"The trade in certificates of forgiveness was a common practice in

the Church. The

people were delivered of their sins by paying money to the Bishop."

(page 142.1961.

Lahore)

|

9. The Pope has absolute power to change the laws of the faith. He

can permit any act that was previously prohibited. The

Protestant teacher, Michael Meshaka, said in his Arabic book,

Ajwabatu"l lnjileen "ala abatil Attaqlidin:

|

Now it should be noted that they permit matrimonial rela-

tions with blood relations prohibited by the Holy Scriptures.

They receive large amounts of money for permitting this, at

their own discretion, an act that was prohibited by the sacred

books and by the blessed compilers of the gospels. For exam-

ple, permission for an uncle own marriage (paternal or maternal)

with his niece, for marriage with one own brother own wife who is

the mother of one own brother own children. There are many addi-

tional prohibitions that they have imposed, and many dispen-

sations that they have disallowed people without any reli-

gious ARGUMENTs.

|

He further says:

|

There are many eatables that were prohibited by them,

and later on were permitted again. Eating of meat has been

allowed by them during fasting, that was strictly considered

prohibited for centuries.

|

He also said in his book entitled Thirteen Epistles on page 88 of

the second epistle:

|

The French Cardinal Zabadella said that the Pope enjoys

absolute power to permit any prohibition. He is greater than

God.

|

We seek refuge with Allah from such blasphemies and proclaim

that Allah is pure of all their imputations.

|

10. According to the Catholic creed, good souls remain in

Purgatory," suffering the torments of the fires of Hell, until the

|

1. Purgatory literally means a cleanser or purifier, used by the

Christians for the

Hell, as they believe that the fire of Hell purifies the human

souls.

|

Pope grants acquittal to them. Similarly priests are authorised

to grant such deliverance of the dead from Purgatory, against

payment of a certain amount of money, through their

suffrages. 1

|

11. Catholics can obtain certificates of salvation from the Pope

and his deputies for payment. It is strange that the people do

not demand acknowledgement of the dead, confirming their

salvation, from the Pope who is believed to be "greater than

God". He should be able, through his divine powers, to get

attestations from the dead that they have attained etemal salva-

tion.

|

Since the Papal powers are increased day by day through

the blessings of the Holy Ghost, indulgences were invented by

Leo X" and were sold to the people by him and his clergymen.

These documents contained the following words:

|

May our Lord Jesus Christ take pity upon and par-

don thee, by the virtue of his sanctified love. By the

power accorded to me by the Saints Peter and Paul,

chief of the apostles, I absolve thee of thy sins when-

ever they are committed, and thy faults and transgres-

sions and even the unremitted sins forgiven by the

Pope. As far as the power in the hands of the Church

of Rome can contend, I remit the miseries reserved for

thee in the purgatories. And I will lead you towards

the mysteries of the Holy Church, and its unity and

purity and innocence possessed by thee at thine bap-

tism.

|

The gates of Hell shall be closed to thee on thine

death and those of Paradise shall be opened. If thou

|

1. Suffrages is the word used for prayers that are meant to purify

the man from

his sins.

|

2. Pope Leo X was elected in 1513 and died in 1521. (Briannca),

C.P.S. Clarke

has written in his history of the Church, quoting Kidd, that the

instant the Bishop

heard the sound of the coins dropped in the box by the people for

indulgence, the

dead person was considered delivered from Hell.

|

will not die at present, the indulgence will remain

operative till your death. In the names of the Father,

the Son and the Holy Spirit, Amen. Written by

Firtilium, agent.

|

12. They claim that the Hell is a space in cubic form situated in

the

centre of the earth having sides of 200 miles in length.

|

13. The Pope makes the sign of the cross on his shoes while other

people do it on their faces. Perhaps his shoes are more sancti-

fied than the cross and the faces of the people.

|

Sanctification of the Cross

|

Christians in general hold the wood of the cross in great rever-

ence, and prostrate in worship before the paintings or image of the

Godhead, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, as well as making

prostrations

of reverence to the images of their saints. There can be any of the

fol-

lowing reasons for consecrating the wood of the cross: because it

had

a physical contact with, or was touched by, the body of Christ at

the

time of crucifixion; or because it became a means for their

atonement,

or the blood of Christ flowed over it. Now if it is for the first

reason,

all the donkeys of the world should be held holier than the cross,

as

Christ used to ride on the back of donkeys and mules. They had more

physical contact with the body of Christ and, contrary to the

cross,

they served the purpose of providing comfort to him. It was a

donkey

that carried Christ to the temple of Jerusalem. Besides, being

animate,

the donkey is closely associated with man as opposed to the wood of

the cross which is inanimate.

|

As for the second reason, Judas Iscariot deserves more reverence

and sanctification as it was through his betrayal that Jesus was

arrest-

ed and then crucified by the Jews. Without his betrayal, atonement

through the death of Christ would not have been possible. He,

there-

fore, is the first and main cause of eternal salvation. If the

sanctity of

the cross is related to the third reason, the thorns that were put

on the

|

head of the Christ on the form of a crown" deserve more reverence

and respect, as they too were coloured with the blood of Christ. We

are unable to see any reason why only the cross is held in such

great

respect and reverence. Maybe it is another riddle like the trinity.

The

most abhorrent and abominable thing is the act of worshipping the

image of the Father-God. We have already discussed with undeniable

ARGUMENTs that God Almighty is absolutely beyond the possibility of

any similitude being made of Him. Isualization of Him is a physical

impossibility. No human being can ever see Him. Is there any one to

claim the ability to make an image bearing any degree of similarity

to

Him? Besides, it would be more logical for them to worship every

human being as they are created in the image of God according to

the

Torah.2

|

It is strange that the Pope prostrates himself before images made

of stones, and humiliates and insults his human fellow beings by

extending his feet to be kissed by them. We fail to see any

difference

between the Catholics and the idolaters of India.

|

The Pope as Final Authority

|

The Pope is supposed to be the final authority on the

interpretation

of the texts of the Holy Books. This belief must have been added at

a

later period, otherwise Augustine and John Chrysostom could have

not written their exegetical works, since they were not popes and

did

not seek permission from the popes of their time for writing their

works. Their works enjoyed great popularity among the Christians

and in the Church of their time.

|

Bishops and deacons were not allowed to marry. They, therefore,

usually did the works that were not entrusted to married people.

Some

of the Christian theologians have strictly criticised this

contention of

|

the popes. I reproduce below some of their criticisms from the

Arabic

book Thalatha Ashara Risalah, (The Thirteen Epistles). Saint

Bernard

said in song no. 66:

|

They have completely abolished the noble institution of

marriage, and legitimate sexual relations have been aban-

doned. Instead they have turned their bedrooms into a place

of fornication. They commit adultery with young boys, moth-

ers, sisters. They have filled the Church with corruption.

|

The Bishop Pelage Bolagius of Portugal (1300) said:

|

It would have been much better if the Church authorities

in general, and the people of the Church of Spain in particu-

lar, had not taken the oath of purity and chastity, because the

number of children of the people of this area is only a little

more than the illegitimate sons of the priests and bishops of

the country.

|

John Sattzbourg, a bishop of the fifteenth century, observed, "I

have seen rarely any priests and bishops who do not habitually have

frequent intercourse with women. Nunneries have been turned into

cells of prostitution."

|

In the presence of their deep involvement in drinking liquor their

purity and chastity remains out of question, as long as they are

youth-

ful and young.

|

Perhaps one of the reasons that they do not believe in the Holy

Koran is that it does not contain any of these obscene and absurd

assertions.

|

As for their objections with regard to some Koranic passages

related to Paradise and Hell, we will discus this under the third

objec-

tion.

|

Second Objection

|

Contradictions between the Koran and the Bible

|

The second objection raised by the Christians against the truth of

the Koran is that in some places the Koran has opposed or contra-

dicted the books of the Old and the New Testament.

|

First Answer

|

Since the authenticity and divinity of the books of the Bible has

not been proved through an unbroken chain of authorities and, as we

have proved in the flrst part of this book, these books contain

contra-

dictions, errors, and inconsistencies and there are undeniable

witness-

es to the fact that they have been distorted, changed and

manipulated

by people through the ages, the Koranic opposition to them in some

places is deliberate and intentional to indicate that the books are

wrong in those places. This has already been discussed at consider-

able length earlier in this book. This intentional opposition of

the

Koranic revclation is indicating that the places opposed by the

Koran are either defective or have undergone distortion.

|

Second Answer

|

The Koranic opposition to the Bible, as expressed by the

Christian theologians, is categorized as follows:

|

1. The Koran abrogates a number of injunctions contained in the

Bible.

|

2. The Koran fails to mention some events that are described in

the Old and New Testaments.

|

3. Some events described by the Holy Koran are different from

the descriptions given in the Bible.

|

There are no grounds for denying the truth of the Holy Koran on

the basis of the above three types of Koranic opposition to the

Bible.

Firstly, abrogation is not unique to the Koran. We have cited

specific

|

examples of the presence of abrogation in the laws prior to the

Koran. The presence of abrogation in any revelation is not

contrary

to reason. We have already seen that the law of the Prophet Jesus

abrogated all but nine injunctions of the Torah including the Ten

Commandments.

|

Secondly, there are many events described by the New Testament

that do not exist in the Old Testament. It would be quite in order

to

reproduce some examples of such events. The following thirteen

events out of a large number of them should sufficiently prove our

claim. The Old Testament cannot be disbelieved only on these

grounds.

|

1. We read in the Epistle of Jude in verse 9:

|

Yet Michael the archangel, when contending with the

devil he disputed about the body of Moses, durst not bring

against him a railing accusation, but said, The Lord rebuke

thee.

|

No trace of the dispute of Michael with the devil mentioned above

is found in any book of the Old Testament

|

2. The same epistle contains in verses 14-15 the following state-

ment:

|

And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of

these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of

his saints, To execute judgement upon all, and to convince all

that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds

which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard

speeches which ungodly sinners have spoken against him.

|

The above statement made by Enoch is also not found in any of

the books of the Old Testament.

|

3. We find the following description in Hebrews 12:21:

|

And so terrible was the sight, that Moses said, I exceed-

ingly fear and quake. "

|

The event to which the above statement has referred is described

in chapter 19 of the Book of Exodus. The above sentence of the

Prophet Moses can be found neither in Exodus nor in any other book

of the Old Testament.

|

4. II Timothy 3:8 contains the following statement:

|

Now as Jannes and Jambers withstood Moses, so do these

also resist the truth.

|

The dispute referred to in the above passage is described in chap-

ter 7 of the Book of Exodus. The names Jannes and Jambers can be

found neither in any chapter of Exodus nor in any other book of the

Old Testament.

|

5. I Corinthians 15:6 says:

|

After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at

once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but

some are fallen asleep.

|

The number of five hundred people having seen Christ2 after his

resurrection cannot be found in any of the Gospels, nor even in the

book of Acts, in spite of Luke own fondness of describing such

events.

|

6. The book of Acts 20:35 says:

|

And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he

said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.

|

1. This refers to the oral communication of Moses with God on Mount

Sinai

described in Exodus.

|

2. This refers to the event of Christ own resurrection after the

"crucifixion". There is

no mention of five hundred people having seen him, only eleven

people are reported

by the gospels to have seen him. R.A. Knox has admitted that Paul

has erroneously

counted separately every time he was seen by James and Peter.

|

The above statement of the prophet Jesus cannot be traced in any

of the four gospels.

|

7. The genealogical description of Matthew in the first chapter

contains names after Zorobabel" that are not found in any book of

the

Old Testament.

|

8. We find the following event described in the book of Acts 7:23-

28:

|

And when he was full forty years old, it came into his

heart to visit his brethren the children of Israel. And seeing

one of them suffer wrong, he defended him, and avenged him

that was oppressed, and smote the Egyptian: For he supposed

his brethren would have understood how that God by his

hand would deliver them: but they understood not. And the

next day he shewed himself unto them as they strove, would

have set them at one again, saying, Sirs, ye are brethren: why

do ye wrong one to another? But he that did his neighbour

wrong thrust him away, saying, Who made thee a ruler and a

judge over us? Wilt thou kill me, as thou diddest the Egyptian

yesterday?

|

This event also appears in the Book of Exodus but we find that

there are many additional things mentioned in Acts which do not

appear in the following description of the book of Exodus, which

goes:

|

And it came to pass in those days, when Moses was

grown, that he went out unto his brethren, and looked on their

burdens: and he spied an Egyptian smiting a Hebrew, one of

his brethren. And he looked this way and that way, and when

he saw that there was no man, he slew the Egyptian, and hid

him in the sand. And when he went out the second day,

behold, two men of Hebrews strove together: and he said to

him that did the wrong, Wherefore smitest thou thy fellow?

And he said, Who made thee a prince and a judge over us?

|

1. See Matthew 1:13-16.

|

intendest thou to kill me, as thou killedst the Egyptian?

|

9. The Epistle of Jude vcrse 6 says:

|

2:4:

|

And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left

their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains

under darkness unto the judgement of the great day.

|

10. The same statement also appears in the Second Epistle of Peter

|

For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast

them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of dark-

ness, to be reserved unto judgement.

|

The above statements attributed to Jude and Peter do not exist in

any book of the Old Testament. In fact it seems to be a false

state-

ment, because the imprisoned angels referred to in this statement

are

it seems, devils while they too are not in everlasting chains of

impris-

onment. This is evident from chapter 1 of the Book of Job, Mark

1:12

I Peter 5:82 and many other similar verses.

|

11. Psalm 105:18 says, with regard to the imprisonment of the

prophet Joseph:

|

Whose feet they hurt with fetters: he was laid in iron.

|

Genesis also describes this event in chapter 39, but there he is

not

reported as being chained and laid in irons which was not always

nec-

essary for a prisoner.

|

12. The Book of Hosea 12:4 has:

|

Yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed: he wept

|

and made supplication unto him.

|

Genesis describes the above event of Jacob own wrestling with the

angel in chapter 32, but it does not speak of his weeping and

making

supplication to him.

|

13. The four gospels briefly describe Paradise, Hell, the Day of

Judgement and the rewards and punishments of the Hereafter, but in

contrast to this we do not find any of these things in the five

books of

the Pentateuch. The obedient are promised worldly rewards and the

disobedient threatened with only worldly punishments.l This proves

that the fact that such descriptions or events are described in

later

books and not mentioned in former books, does not necessarily prove

the falsehood of the later books. Otherwise it would demand that

the

gospels be declared false since they contain material from the past

that does not exist in any book of the Old Testament. It is not

there-

fore necessary for a later book to cover all past events. For

examples,

the names of all the descendants of Adam, Seth and Jonah and their

accounts are not mentioned in the Torah.

|

The commentary of D"Oyly and Richard Mant contains the fol-

lowing comments on II King 14:25:

|

The name of the Prophet Jonah is not found mentioned

anywhere except in this verse and in the famous message to

the people of Nineveh. There is no mention in any book of

any prophecy of Jonah with regard to Jeroboam own invasion of

Syria. This is not because we have lost many books of the

prophets, but simply because the prophets did not speak of

many events that took place.

|

Our claim is sufficiently affirmed by the above statement.

Similarly the Gospel of John 20:30 says:

|

And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of

his disciples, which are not written in this book.

|

John 21:25 also has:

|

And there are many other things which Jesus did, the

which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that

even the world itself could not contain the books that should

be written.

|

Apart from being a metaphorical exaggeration the above statement

testifies to the fact that all the events of Jesus" life could not

be

recorded in the books.

|

Thirdly, their objection that, regarding many events, the Koranic

description is different from the one in the Bible is not valid

because

a profusion of such differences is also present within the books of

the

Old Testament, and similarly some of the Gospels differ concerning

many events from the others; and also the New Testament differs

from the Old Testament. Though we have produced specific examples

of this at the beginning of this book, it is quite in order to cite

some

more examples of such differences here to eliminate any possible

misunderstanding Created by the above objections.

|

It goes without saying that the three basic versions of the

Pentateuch, that is, the Hebrew, the Greek and the Samaritan are

also

different from each other in the same way. A further prolongation

of

this exposition by producing more examples of such discrepancies is

necessary in view of their relevance to the present subject.

|

First Discrepancy

|

The period from Adam to the Flood of Noah is described differ-

ently in all the three versions.

|

Second Discrepancy

|

The period from the Flood to the birth of the prophet Abraham is

described as follows in the above three versions.

|

The Hebrew version: 292 years

|

2. TheGreekversion: 1072years

|

3. The Samaritan version: 942 years

|

Third Discrepancy

|

Arphaxad and Shelah are described by the Greek version as being

separated by only one generation from Canaan who is not mentioned

in the Hebrew and Samaritan versions. Similarly I Chronicles" and

the history of Josephus do not mention the name of Canaan. It may

be

noted that Luke has followed the Greek version and has added the

name of Canaan in the genealogy of Jesus. This requires that the

Christians should believe the truth of the Greek2 version and

reject

the other two as being false in order to save the Gospel of Luke

from

containing a falsehood.

|

Fourth Discrepancy

|

The appointed place of the temple, as described by the Hebrew

version, is mount Ebal, while according to the Samaritan version it

is

mount Gerezim. We have discussed this in great detail earlier and

so

no more comments are needed here.

|

Fifth Discrepancy

|

The period from Adam to Christ is differently described by the

different versions.

|

The foUowing statement concerning this is found in the first vol-

ume of Henry and Scott own commentary:

|

Hales having made corrections to the errors found in the

history of Josephus and in the Greek version has concluded as

follows: the period from the beginning of the creation to the

birth of Christ is 5411 years, while the period from the Flood

to the birth of the Christ comes to 3155 years.

|

Charles Rogers has presented in his book a comparison of various

English translations, providing us with no less than fifty-five

conflict-

ing statements from the historians with regard to the period from

the

Creation to the birth of Christ.

|

Names Years

1. Marianus Scotus:l 4192

2. Larntios Codemus: 4141

3. Thoms Lithet. 4103

4. MichaelusMastlinus 4079

5. G.Baptist Rickulus 4062

6. Jacob Salianus 4053

7. HenryKuspemdens2 4051

8. Wllliam Link 4041

9. Erasmus Reinholt 4021

10. JacobusKipalus 4005

11. Archbishop Ussher 4003

12. Dionicius Petavius 3983

13. Bishop Burke (Book) 3974

14. Kirogian 3971

15. Ellius Rusnileus 3970

16. Johnias Cleverius 3968

17. Christanis Logomentenas 3966

18. Philip Malla Nagtuj 3964

19. Jacobin Lins 3963

20. Alphonso Salmeron 3958

21. Johi Liker" 3949

22. MatthewsBurundius 3927

23. AndriansHull 3836

24. The Jewish view 3760

25. The Christian view 4004

|

None of the above statements seems to be the same as any other.

This great variety of views on the matter is highly confusing. The

main reason for the great inconsistency found in historical

descrip-

tions is the indifferent and neglectful attitude of the historians

towards

the systematic preservation of their history. It makes it

absolutely

impossible for anyone now to arrive at the correct number of years

from Adam to Christ. Charles Roger has admitted that the number of

years estimated by the ancient historians are based on nothing but

their conjectures and inferences from defective documentation.

Moreover we find that the period commonly acknowledged by the

Jews is different from the common belief of the Christians.

|

Now resuming our course of discussion, we should state that the

deliberate opposition of the Koran to any or some descriptions of

the

Bible, especially in the presence of such a profusion of

contradictions

and inconsistencies, is certainly no reason to cast doubt on the

Koranic revelation. We must repeat our claim that the elders of

the

Christians included in their books erroneous, and sometimes unbe-

lievable, material that seemed to suit their whims at the time.

This is

why the periods described by the Bible are not considered to have

any historical value.

|

The great scholar Taqiuddin al-Maqrizi quoted Ibn Hazm in the

first volume of his book:

|

We Muslims do not believe in any definite number of

years. Those who have claimed it to be around seven thou-

sand years, have claimed something about which we find no

indication made by the Holy Prophet in his traditions. We

believe that the definite period of the creadon of the universe

is known to none but Allah. Allah, our Lord, says in the Holy

Qur "an: "

|

I did not make them witness to the creation of the

heavens and the earth, nor to their own creation.

|

The Holy Prophet said that in comparison with the past

people we are not more than a single white fibre on the body

of a white ox, or a black fibre on the body of a white ox. The

above and all other circumstantial evidence point to the fact

that the definite period since the Creation is known to none

but Allah.

|

Sixth Discrepancy

|

In addition to the ten commandments of Moses an eleventh com-

mandment is present in the Samaritan version which does not exist

in

the Hebrew version.

|

Seventh Discrepancy

|

Genesis 4:8 of the Hebrew version has:

|

And Cain talked with Abel his brother: and it came to

pass, when they were in the field.....

|

The same statement appears differently in the Greek and

Samaritan version in these words:

|

1. Koran 18:51. Even up to 1988 modem scientific resources have

been com-

pletely unable to provide a definite estimate in this regard.

(Raazi)

|

so

|

Cain spoke to his brother Abel, let us go to the field; and

it carne to pass when they were in the field.

|

The theologians have preferred the Greek and the Samaritan ver-

sions.

|

Eighth Discrepancy

|

Genesis 7:17 of the Hebrew version says, "And the flood was

forty days upon the earth." The Greek version has, "he flood was

forty days and nights upon the earth."

The Greek version is obviously correct.

|

Ninth Discrepancy

|

Genesis 29:8 of the Hebrew version contains:

|

Until all the flocks be gathered together.

|

The Greek and the Samaritan versions and the Arabic translation

of Houbigant and Kennicott contain a different statement:

|

Until all the herdsmen gather together.

|

Tenth Discrepancy

|

Genesis 35:22 of the Hebrew version says:

|

That Reuben went and lay with Bilhah his father own concu-

bine: and Israel heard it.

|

The Greek version has:

|

He went and lay with Bilhah, his father own concubine and

Israel heard it and he fell low in his estimation.

|

The Greek version seems to be correct.

Eleventh Discrepancy

|

The Greek version of Genesis 44:5 has this sentence:

|

Why did you steal my measures?

|

This sentence does not exist in the Hebrew.version.The Greek text

is correct.

|

Twelfth Discrepancy

|

The Hebrew version of Genesis 50:25 says:

|

And ye shall carry up my bones from hence."

|

The Greek and Samaritan versions have:

|

Ye shall carry up my bones from hence with you.Z

|

Thirteenth Discrepancy

|

The Greek version of the Book of Exodus contains the following

statement at 2:22:

|

Second time she bore a son and called his name Eleazer

and said, For this reason that the Lord of my father assisted

|

me and protected me from the sword of Pharaoh.

|

The verse is not found in the Hebrew text.3 The Greek version

seems to be correct as the Arabic translators have included it in

their

translation.

|

Fourteenth Discrepancy

|

The Hebrew version of Exodus 6:20 says:

|

And shel bare him Aaron and Moses.

|

The Greek and Samaritan versions have:

|

And she bare him Aaron and Moses and their sister

Miriam.

|

The Greek and Samaritan versions are correct.2

|

Fifteenth Discrepancy

|

The Book of Numbers in the Greek version contains the following

verse at 10:6:

|

And on the third sound the western camp, and on the

fourth the northern camps shall be raised for a march.3

|

The above verse is also not found in the Hebrew version, and the

Greek version is correct.

|

Sixteenth Discrepancy

|

The Book of Numbers in the Samaritan version contains the fol-

lowing passage between verses 10 and 11 of chapter 10:

|

The Lord our God spake unto Moses, ye have dwelt long

enough in this mount, tum you and take your journey, and go

to the mount of the Amorites and unto all places nigh there-

unto in the plain, in the hills and in the vales, and unto the

south; and by the sea side, to the land of the Canaanites.

Behold, I have given the land to you, go and possess the land

which the Lord sware unto your fathers, Abraham, Isaac and

Jacob, to give unto them and to their seed after them.

|

The above passage does not exist in the Hebrew version. Horsley

said in his commentary, vol. 1, page 161:

|

The description that is found in Numbers between verses

10 and 11 of the Samaritan version can be found in

Deuteronomy 1:6,7 and 8." It was discovered in the time of

Procobius.

|

Seventeenth Discrepancy

|

We find the following verses in Deuteronomy 10:6-8 of the

Hebrew version:

|

And the children of Israel took their journey from

Beeroth of the children of Jaakan to Mosera: there Aaron

died, and there he was buried; and Eleazar, his son ministered

in the priest own office in his stead. From thence they journeyed

unto Gudgodah; and from Gudgodah to Jotbath, a land of

rivers and waters. At that time the Lord separated the tribe of

Levi, to bear the ark of the covenant of the Lord, to stand

before the Lord to minister unto him, and to bless in his

name, unto this day.

|

The above passage is different from the description of Numbers

33:30-42, where the route of their journey is described very

different-

ly. It is there described as follows:

|

And they departed from Hashmonah, and encamped at

Moseroth. And they departed from Moseroth and pitched in

Bene-jaakan. And they removed from Bene-jaakan and

encamped at Hor-hagidgad. And they went from Hor-

hagidgad and pitched in Jotbathah. And they removed from

Jotbathah and encamped at Ebronah. And they departed from

Ebronah and encamped at Ezion-gaber. And they removed

from Ezion-gaber, and pitched in the wilderness of Zin,

which is Kadesh. And they removed from Kadesh and

pitched in mount Hor, in the edge of the land of Edom.

|

And Aaron the priest went up into mount Hor at the com-

mandment of the Lord, and died there, in the fortieth year

after the children of Israel were come out of the land of

Egypt, in the first day of the fifth month. And Aaron was a

hundred and twenty and three years old when he died in

mount Hor.

|

And king Arad the Canaanite, which dwelt in the south in

the land of Canaan, heard of the coming of the children of

Israel.

|

And they departed from Mount Hor, and pitched in

Zalmonah. And they departed from Zalmonah and pitched in

Punon.

|

Adam Clarke quoted a long passage by Kennicott under his com-

ments on the tenth chapter of Deuteronomy in the first volume of

his

book on pages 779 and 780. The sum and substance of what he says

is that the Samaritan text in this respect is correct while the

text of the

Hebrew version is erroneous. He also concluded that four verses,

that

is from 6 to 9, are strange and irrelevant at this place. Their

exclusion

from the text does not in any way lessen the text. The copier seems

to

have inserted these verses here by mistake. Further he suggested

that

this proposition should not be rejected in a hurry." He said that

these

verses originally belonged to the second chapter of Deuteronomy. We

may add here that the sentence which is found at the end of verse

8 is

enough evidence of the fact that these verses are a later addition.

|

Eighteenth Discrepancy

|

Deuteronomy 32:5 in the Hebrew version contains:

|

They have corrupted themselves, their spot is not the spot

|

of his children; they are a perverse and crooked generadon.

|

This verse appears differently in the Greek and Samaritan ver-

sions. It reads:

|

They have corrupted themselves, it was not proper for

|

them: they are children illegitimate and with spot.

|

Henry and Scott own commentary remarks that this version seems to

be closer to the original.

|

Horsley says on page 215 of vol. 1 of his commentary:

|

This verse should be read according to the Greek and

|

Samaritan versions.2

|

Contrary to the above, the translations of Houbigant and Kennicott

and the Arabic translations have distorted this verse. The Arabic

translations of 1844 and 1848 contain this verse in these words:

|

Take measures against them. They are distinct from the

|

children of evil. O perverse and crooked generation!3

|

Nineteenth Discrepancy

|

The Hebrew version of the Book of Genesis 20:2 has:

|

And Abraham said of Sarah, his wife, She is my sister:

|

And Abimelech king of Gerar sent, and took Sarah.

|

1. This verse contains the words "unto this day" which also

indicate that it verse

iS a later addition.

|

2. The present translations of the Hebrew version, however, have

been made in

accordance with the Greek and the Samaritan texts.

|

3.1 have reproduced the above English passage from the English

translation of

the GuJrati version of Izharul Haqq. (Raazi)

|

According to the commentary of Henry and Scott, the above verse

appears in the Greek version in the following words:

|

And he said of his wife Sarah, she is my sister; for he was

afraid to call her his wife, fearing lest the citizens might kill

him for her, for, Abimelech, king of Palestine sent his men

and took Sarah.

|

The sentence, "...he was afraid to call her his wife fearing lest

the

citizens might kill him for her," is not present in the Hebrew

version.

|

Twentieth Discrepancy

|

Genesis 30:36 in the Samaritan version contains:

|

The messenger of the Lord cried, Jacob, he replied, Yes, I

am here; the messenger said, Raise up thy eyes and behold

the goats and sheep going to she-goats and ewes. Again they

are white spotted, and moteley. For what Laban has done to

you, is witnessed by you. I am the God of Beth-el, in where

you erected the stone and poured oil and took a vow.

|

The above passage is not found in the Hebrew version.

|

lwenty-f"ust Discrepancy

|

The following description, found after the first sentence of Exodus

11:3 of the Samaritan version, is not found in the Hebrew version:

|

And Moses told Pharaoh, The Lord said, Israel is my

first-born. I said to you release my children that they may

worship me, you refused to set them free. Know that I will

kill your first-born son.

|

lwenty-second Discrepancy

|

The Book of Numbers, 24:7 in the Hebrew version has:"

|

He shall pour the water out of his buckets, and his seed

|

shau be in many waters, and his king shall be higher than

Agag, and his kingdom shall be exalted.

|

The Greek version contains this description in these words:

|

And a man wiu be born of him who will govern many

tribes, his kingdom shall be greater than Agag, and his king-

dom shau be exalted."

|

Twenty-third Discrepancy

|

Leviticus 9:21 in the Hebrew version contains:

|

As Moses commanded.

|

The Greek and Samaritan versions have the following words

instead:

|

As the Lord commanded Moses.

|

Twenty-fourth Discrepancy

|

The Book of Numbers 26:10 in the Hebrew version has:

|

And the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up

together with Korah, when that company died, what time the

fire devoured two hundred and fifty men: and they became a

sign.

The Samaritan version contains:

|

And the earth opened her mouth, and swallowed them up

together with Korah, when that company died, what time the

fire devoured two hundred and fifty men, and they became a

|

the Satnaritan version is not available to me. I arn not certain of

the faithful reproduc-

tion of this passage. (Raazi)

1. The Catholic Bible (Knox version) gives yet a different version

of this verse. It

says, "Like a bucket brimrning over the well, see how their

posterity spreads from

one river frontier to the next! The King that rules over them shall

rival Agag himself

and take away his kingdom from him." Numbers 24:7 (Raazi).

|

sign."

|

The commentary of Henry and Scott have said that the above

verse is closely related to the context and is in accordance with

Psalm

No. 106:17.

|

Twenty-fifth Discrepancy

|

The celebrated Christian theologian Leclerc divided au the differ-

ences found between the Hebrew and the Samaritan versions into six

categories:

|

(I) The passages of the Samaritan version that are more correct

than the Hebrew version. There are eleven such passages.

|

(2) The passages in the Hebrew version that seem to be more cor-

rect by their context. Such differences are seven.

|

(3)The passages of the Samaritan version that contain later addi-

tions which are thirteen.

|

(4)The passages of the Samaritan version that have been distorted

which are seventeen.

|

(5)The passages of the Samaritan version which look more rea-

sonable than the Hebrew version are ten.

|

(6)The passages that are defective in the Samaritan version are

two.

|

The references to au the above passages are as follows according

to the numbers given above

|

(I) GENESIS: 4:2, 7:3,19:19, 20:2, 23:16, 34:14, 49:10,11,

50:26. (9)

EXODUS : 1:2, 4:2 (2)

|

(2) GENESIS: 31:49, 35:17,35, 41:34,37,41, 47:3 (6)

DEUTERONOMY: 32:5 (1)

|

1. The King James version has this passage in accordance with the

Samaritan ver-

Sion. Our author might have quoted it from the Hebrew version

having a different

text. Now both the passages are identical. (Raazi).

|

(3) GENESIS: 29:15, 30:36, 14:16 (3)

EXODUS: 7:18, 8:23, 9:5, 21:20, 22:5, 23:10, 32:9 (7)

LEVITICUS : 1:10, 17:4 (2)

DEUTERONOMY: 5:21 (1)

|

(4) GENESIS: 2:2, 4:10, 9:5,10:19,11:21,18:3,19:12, 20:16

24:55, 35:7, 36:6, 41:50 (13)

EXODUS: 1:5, 13:6,15:5 (3)

NUMBERS: 22:36 (1)

|

(5) GENESIS: 8:5, 31:11, 9:19, 34:37, 4:39, 25:43 (6)

EXODUS: 40:12, 17:14 (2)

NUMBERS: 14:4 (1)

DEUTERONOMY: 16:20 (1)

|

(6) GENESIS: 14:25,16:20 (2)

|

The renowned scholar Horne says in vol. 2 of his commentary

printed in 1822:

|

The renowned theologian Leclerc, with the greatest pain

and labour, has sorted out the differences of the Hebrew and

Samaritan versions, and has concluded that the Samaritan

version is comparatively more correct.

|

Such differences between the Hebrew and the Samaritan versions

are not limited to the sixty pointed out by Leclerc. There are many

more such dissimilarities found in the two versions. Leclerc has

con-

fined himself to the differences that were of serious nature. If we

add

twenty-four of the twenty-five discrepancies cited above to the

sixty

discovered by Leclerc, the total number of discrepancies comes to

eighty-four. This is not counting all the differences and

discrepancies

that exist between the Hebrew and the Latin versions of the

Pentateuch; and also those found between many other books of the

Old Testament.

|

The above sufficiently proves our point that the objection raised

by the Christians against the truth of the Koranic revelation

based on

|

Koranic disagreement with some of the descriptions of the Old and

the New Testaments is not valid and does not serve the intended

pur-

pose.

|

Third Objection

|

The third objection often raised by Christians against the truth of

the Holy Koran is centred around three concepts contained in the

Holy Koran. The first is the Koranic claim that Allah is not only

the

Creator of guidance but that misguidance is also created by Him.

The

second is the fact that the Holy Koran contains descriptions of

Paradise which include the presence of houris, rivers and

buildings.

The third is that the Holy Koran contains the commandment to wage

war (iihad) against the disbelievers.

|

Their main contention with regard to these things is that the word

of God should be free from such unseemly concepts. This objection

is

considered by them to be the most convincing ARGUMENT against the

divine nature of the Koran. There is hardly any book written by

the

Christians on the subject that does not contain their strange

elabora-

tions on this aspect of the Holy Koran.

|

We should, therefore, examine the validity of the above objection

with regard to each of the above three aspects separately.

|

Guidance and Misguidance from Allah

|

One of the many answers to this aspect of the objection is that the

holy books of the Christians also say the same thing in many

places.

According to this view the presence of such passages in them should

be an ARGUMENT against their being the word of God. We reproduce

below some specific examples of such passages from their books.

|

(1) Exodus 4:21 says:

|

And the Lord said unto Moses, When thou goest to return

into Egypt, see that thou do all those wonders before Pharaoh,

which I have put in thy hand: but I will harden his heart, that

|

he shall not let the people go.

|

(2) Exodus 7:3 also contains:

|

And I will harden Pharaoh own heart, and multiply my signs

and my wonders in the land of Egypt.

|

3) The same book contains the following in 10:1:

|

And the Lord said unto Moses, Go in unto Pharaoh: for I

have hardened his heart, and the hearts of his servants, that I

might shew these my signs before him.

|

(4) Exodus 10:20 says:

|

But the Lord hardened Pharaoh own heart, so that he would

not let the Children of Israel go.

|

(S) Also verse 27 of the same chapter has:

|

But the Lord hardened Pharaoh own heart, and he would not

let them go.

|

(6) Exodus 11:10 has:

|

And Moses and Aaron did all these wonders before

Pharaoh: and the Lord hardened Pharaoh own heart, so that he

would not let the children of Israel go out of his land.

|

(7) Deuteronomy 29:4 says:

|

Yet the Lord hath not given you an heart to perceive, and

eyes to see, and ears to hear, unto this day.

|

(8) Isaiah 6:10 contains:

|

Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears

heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their hearts...

and convert, and be healed.

|

(9) Epistle to the Romans 11:8 says:

|

God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they

should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this

day.

|

(10) The Gospel of John, chapter 12," says:.

|

Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said

again, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart;

that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with

their heart, and be converted.

|

The above quotes from the Pentateuch, the book of Isaiah and the

New Testament are explicit in implying that God blinded the eyes,

stamped the ears and hardened the hearts of the Israelites so that

they

might not be converted to the truth and should not be healed from

their disease of perversion. They are therefore unable to see the

truth,

to hear it or to understand it. The following Koranic description

is in

no way different from what we have read above:

|

God hath set a seal (stamped) on their hearts and on their

hearing, and on their eyes is a veil; And for them is great pun-

ishment.2

|

(11) The Arabic translations of Isaiah printed 1671, 1831 and

1844 contain the following at 63:17:

|

O Lord, why hast thou made us to err from thy ways, and

hardened our heart from thy fear? Return for thy servants"

sake, the tribes of thine inheritance.3

|

The Book of Ezekiel contains the following statement at 14:9:

|

And if the prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a

thing, I the Lord have deceived that prophet, and I will stretch

out my hand upon him, and will destroy him from the midst

of my people Israel.

|

The book of Ezekiel ascribes the act of deceiving and the Book of

Isaiah attributes the act of misguiding to God.

|

(13) I Kings 22:19-23 contains the following passage:

|

"And hel said, Hear thou therefore the word of the Lord:

I saw the Lord sitting on his throne, and all the host of heaven

standing by him on his right hand and on his left. And the

Lord said, Who shall persuade Ahab, that he may go up and

fall at Ramoth-gilead? And one said on this manner, and

another said on that manner. And there came forth a spirit,

and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And

the Lord said unto him, Wherewith? And he said, I will go

forth, and I will be a Iying spirit in the mouth of all his

prophets. And he said, Thou shalt persuade him, and prevail

also: go forth, and do so. Now therefore, behold, the Lord

hath put a Iying spirit in the mouth of all these thy prophets,

and the Lord hath spoken evil concerning thee.

|

It is not difficult to see that the above description gives us to

believe that God sits on His throne meeting with the host of heaven

to

seek their counsel for deceiving and misguiding people, then a

lying

spirit is deputed to misguide them.

|

(14) The Second Epistle to Thessalonians 2 12 says:

|

And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion,

that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned

who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteous-

ness.

|

The above statement of Paul is unambiguous in implying that God

deludes people to prevent them from believing in truth.

|

(15) The Gospel of Matthewl reports Jesus as saying the following

after his crying woe to the unrepentant cities:

|

I thank thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, because

thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast

revealed them unto babes. Even so, Father: for so it seemed

good in thy sight.

|

(16) The book of Isaiah 45:7 says:

|

I form the light, and create darkness: I make peace, and

create evil: I the Lord do all these things.

|

(17) The Lamentations of Jeremiah 3:38 contains:

|

Out of the mouth of the most High proceedeth not evil

and good?

|

The above question implies nothing if not that God is the creator

of both good and evil.

|

(18) The book of Micah 1:12 contains:

|

But evil came down from the Lord unto the gate of

Jerusalem.

|

The above is plain affirmation to the fact that just as God is the

creator of good, so He is the creator of evil.

|

(19) The Epistle to the Romans 8:29 has:

|

For whom he did foreknow, he also did predestinate to be

conformed to the image of his Son, that he might be the first-

born among many brethren.

|

(20) Also we read in 9 21 of the same Epistle:

(For the children being not yet born, neither having done

any good or evil, that the purpose of God, according to elec-

tion might stand, not of works but of him that calleth;) It was

said unto her, the elder shall serve the younger. As it is writ-

ten, Jacob have I loved, but Esau have I hated.

|

What shall we say then? Is there unrighteousness with

God? God forbid. For he saith to Moses, I will have mercy on

whom I will have mercy, and I will have compassion on

whom I will have compassion. So then it is not of him that

willeth, not of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth

mercy. For the scripture saith unto Pharaoh, Even for ths

same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my

power in thee, and that my name might be declared through-

out all the earth. Therefore hath he mercy on whom he will

have mercy, and whom he will he hardeneth.

|

Thou wilt say then unto me, Why doth he yet flnd fault?

For who hath resisted his will? Nay but, O man, who art thou

that repliest against God? Shall the thing formed say to him

that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus? Hath not the

potter power over clay, of the same lump to make one vessel

unto honour and another unto dishonour?

|

The above statement of Paul is a clear affirmation of the belief in

destiny and also an explicit indication that guidance and

misguidance

are both from God.

|

The following statement of the Prophet Isaiah, 45:9:

|

Woe unto him that striveth with his Maker! Let the pot-

sherd strive with the potsherds of the earth. Shall the clay say

to him that fashioneth it, What makest thou or thy work, He

hath no hands?"

|

It was on the basis of such verses that Luther, the founder of the

Protestant faith, was conspicuously inclined towards belief in the

pre-

destination of human fate. There are many statements of Luther that

bring out his views on this concept. We produce two such statements

from the Catholic Herald vol. 9 page 277:

|

Man and horse have been created alike. They obey their

rider. If God rides man he obeys His commands and if Satan

rides him he goes the way he is commanded by Satan. He

does not possess free will to choose between the two riders,

both the riders are always striving to get hold of him.

|

The following statement has also appeared in the Catholic Herald:

|

Whenever you find a commandment in the holy books to

do a certain act, be sure that this book is not asking you to do

it, because you are not capable of doing it of your own will.

|

The famous Catholic priest Thomas Inglis said in his book

Mira"atus Sidk printed 1851 on page 33:

|

Their early ecclesiastics taught them the following absurd

dogmas:

|

(1) God is the Creator of sin.

(2) Man has no power or free will to abstain from sins.

(3) It is not possible to observe the Ten Commandments.

|

(4) Sins, no matter how great and grave, do not demean a

man in the eyes of God.

|

(5) Only belief in God is enough for eternal salvation,

because it is only on the basis of belief that man wiu be

awarded or punished. This doctrine is very comforting

and useful.

|

Luther, the father of the Reformation said:

|

Only believe and you will be redeemed. There is no

necessity to bear the hardships of good acts like fasting, absti-

nence from sins, and humility of confession, be sure that

without them and only for your true faith in Christ, you shall

certainly get salvation equal to the salvation of Christ. No

matter if you get involved in fornication and murder a

thousand times a day, you are destined to reach salvation

only for your true belief. I repeat only your belief will get you

redeemed.

|

The above is enough to show that the first contention of the

Protestants that the divinity of the Holy Koran was dubious

because

it attributed the creation of evil to God is totally irrational and

against

reason. The creation of evil does not in any way require the

evilness

of the Creator, just as the creation of white and black does not

mean

that the Creator has to be black or white. The creation of Satan by

God is a part of His divine wisdom; the same wisdom is present in

the

creation of evil.

|

Similarly God has created evil desires, jealousy and other negative

forces in human nature, although it was in His eternal knowledge

that

negative forces would produce negative results. Everything created,

good or bad, therefore, owes its existence to God.

|

The Blessings of Paradise

|

As for their second point of contention regarding the presence of

palaces, damsels and other material delights in Paradise, this too

is

not a valid objection. In any case the Muslims do not claim that

the

blessings and delights of Paradise are only physical, as is very

often

misstated by the Protestant theologians, but the Muslims believe -

and

this belief is strongly supported by Koranic verses and other

authen-

tic ARGUMENTs - that the blessings and pleasures of Paradise are

both,

physical and spiritual, the latter being stronger and more

prominent

than the former. The Holy Koran says:l

|

Allah has promised to the believers, men and women,

gardens under which rivers flow, in which they shall dwell for

ever; and beautiful mansions in the Gardens of Eden, but the

|

greatest bliss is the pleasure of Allah. That is the supreme

|

felicity.

|

The "pleasure of Allah" in the above verse has been described as

being the greatest of all the blessings of Paradise, qualitatively

as well

as quantitively. That is to say, this spiritual blessing of having

the

pleasure of Allah exceeds all the physical delights such as

mansions,

gardens and damsels etc. The same is alsQ indicated by the last

phrase, "That is the supreme felicity."

|

Man has been created of two elements: spirit and matter. The

supreme felicity of man or his ultimate success lies in the

achieve-

ment of both physical and spiritual delights. He cannot be said to

have achieved his ultimate salvation if he is denied either of the

two

felicities.

|

The Christian Concept of Paradise

|

It has already been elucidated earlierl that to the Muslims the

Evangel strictly means the book that was originally revealed to the

Prophet Jesus. Now if any of the statements of Jesus is found to be

in

contradiction with any Koranic injunction, effort should be made

to

explain away the discrepancy. According to the Christian

scriptures,

the comparison of the dwellers of Paradise with the angels does not

negate their eating and drinking there. Have they not read in

Genesis

chapter 18 that the angels who visited Abraham were presented with

"dressed calf, butter and milk, which they did eat"?2 Similarly the

angels who appeared to Lot ate the bread and other food that Lot

pre-

pared for them, which is clearly written in ch?pter 19 of the book

of Genesis.

|

It is surprising that the Christians believe in the physical

resurrec-

tion of human beings on the Day of Judgment and yet insist on deny-

ing physical delights for them in Paradise! It would have been less

objectionable if they totally denied the resurrection of man as did

the

associators of Arabia, or believed only in spiritual resurrection

as

was believed by the followers of Aristotle.

|

Physical attributes, like eating and drinking, are ascribed to God

by the Christians because they believe that Jesus was God incamate.

On the other hand we are made to understand that Jesus was not as

abstinent and ascetic as was John the Baptist. Christ own opponents

even

accuse him of being, "gluttonous and winebibber"," though we

Muslims totally deny this accusation and firmly believe that he was

totally free from such defects.

|

We unhesitatingly claim that the Prophet Jesus was purely human.

Now, when physical pleasures like eating and drinking could not

pre-

vent him experiencing spiritual delights and as he enjoyed the

spiri-

tual blessings more than the physical ones in this life, so the

physical

pleasures in Paradise will not deprive people of their spiritual

delights.

|

In fact, the Protestant claim that there will be no physical

pleasure

in Paradise is clearly denied by innumerable statements appearing

in

the Bible. We produce a few examples of such statements below:

|

And the Lord God commanded the man (Adam) saying,

Of every tree of the Garden thou mayest freely eat."2

|

This clearly indicates that there are many trees in Paradise

bearing

fruit to eat. In this context they contend that Adam own Paradise was

on

the earth while the Paradise of the Hereafter is in the heavens and

that

the former was different from the latter. Firstly, their claim of

Adam own

Paradise being on earth is not supported by any statement of their

sacred books; secondly, if we assume it to be true, they have no

argu-

|

ment to support that this Paradise was different from the one in

heav-

ens. On the contrary the Gospels make us believe that there will be

physical pleasures in the Paradise of the Hereafter. The Prophet

Jesus

is reported to have said itto his apostles:

|

But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this

fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you

in my Father own kingdom.l

|

Also see Mark 14:25, Luke 22:18. Similarly we read the following

under the description of the Hereafter in Luke 13:25:

|

And they shall come from the east, and from the west,

and from the north, and from the south, and shall sit down in

the kingdom of God.

|

It is on the basis of such statements that the ancient Christians

believed in both physical and spiritual pleasures in Paradise.

Saint

Augustine also said that he liked the opinion that Paradise

consisted

of physical as well as spiritual pleasures. Saint Thomas Aquinas

has

also refuted those who deny physical pleasures in Paradise.

|

The third contention with regard to Jihad (Religious War) will be

discussed later in this book. This is regarded by the Christians as

their

strongest point against the Holy Prophet and we intend to discuss

it in

depth.

|

Fourth Objection

|

Another objection which is often forwarded by Christians against

the divine origin of the Holy Koran is that the Holy Koran,

accord-

ing to them, does not speak of the motives and requirements of the

human spirit.

|

There are only two things that can be said to be the motives and

requirements of the human spirit. Firm belief and good deeds. The

|

Holy Koran is full of descriptions with regard to the above

spiritual

desires and requirements. Elaborate descriptions are found in

almost

all the chapters of the Holy Koran. The absence of other things

that

are assumed by the Protestants to be the motives and requirements

of

the spirit does not prove any defect in the Holy Koran. The Bible

and Koran are not considered to be defective for not preventing

peo-

ple from eating meat, something which is considered by the Hindu

Pandits to be against the motives and requirements of the human

spir-

it, because, in their opinion, slaughtering animals only for eating

and

physical pleasure is not liked by the spirit. According to Hindu

the-

ologians such an act cannot have divine sanction. They contend that

any book containing such ideas cannot be the word of God.

|

Fifth Objection

|

The fifth objection raised by the Christians against the Holy

Koran is that certain passages of the Holy Koran disagree with

cer-

tain others. For example the following verses of the Holy Koran

are

said to contradict those verses that proclaim the doctrine o f

jihad.

|

(l)"There is no compulsion in religion.""

|

2) "Your duty is only to warn them; you are not their keeper."2

|

(3)"Say, Obey Allah and obey His messenger. If you turn away, he

is still bound to bear his burden, and you are bound to bear

your own burden. If you obey him you shall be on the right

Path. The duty of the messenger is nothing but to convey the

message clearly."3

|

They claim that the above verses are contradictory to the verses

that enjoin the duty of jihad (war) against the disbelievers.

|

Similarly, it is claimed by the Christians that the Holy Koran

speaks in some places of Jesus as being purely human and the

|

Messenger of God while other verses speak of his being superior to

human beings. For example at one place the Holy Koran says:

|

Al Masih Isa (Jesus), the son of Mariam, was no more

|

than Allah own messenger and His word which He cast of

|

Mariam: a spirit from Him.

|

The following verse is cited, as contradicting the above verse:

|

And Mary the daughter of Imran, who guarded her

|

chastity and we breathed into ( her body) of our spirit.2

|

The above two objections are forwarded by the Christians with

great force. As far as the first objection is concerned, the verses

quot-

ed above denying compulsion etc. are verses that were revealed

prior

to the verses of jihad. They were abrogated by the later verses

that

enjoined jihad. Abrogation, as we have discussed earlier in detail,

is

not in any way a discrepancy or contradiction. Otherwise it would

require that all the abrogated injunctions of the Pentateuch and

the

Gospels be considered as real contradictions. It may be added here

that the verse 2:256 is not included in the abrogated verses.3

|

The answer to the second objection has already been discussed in

this book where we proved that the above verses do not and cannot

imply that Jesus, the son of Mary, does not belong to mankind or

that

he was superior to human beings. This kind of deduction from these

verses is nothing but sheer ignorance. We are surprised to note how

they ignore the plain contradictions presen in their own books of

which we have cited so many specific examples earlier in this

book

|

The Status of Oral Tradition in the Bible

|

Oral tradition was held in high esteem by the People of the Book,

both Jews and Christians, of all times. It was held by them to be

as

authentic and reliable as the written law. The Jews give even more

reverence to oral tradition than they do to their written law. The

Catholics hold both of them as equal in status while the

Protestants

disbelieve and deny oral tradition like the Sadducees, a Jewish

sect.

The Protestants deny it because they have to deny it, otherwise it

would be quite difficult for them to prove their innovations in

Christianity. In spite of this, the Protestants too find themselves

in

grave need of oral tradition on certain occasions, which is evident

from the examples found in their sacred books, and which will

short-

ly be made clear.

|

The Talmud and the Mishnah

|

Adam Clarke said in the introduction to the Book of Ezra in his

commentary printed in 1751 that the Hebrew canon was of two kinds:

the written canon which was called Torah and the other which was

unwritten and called the oral tradition. This oral tradition was

trans-

mitted orally by the ancients to later generations. They claim that

both of these canons were revealed by God to Moses on Mount Sinai.

The Pentateuch reached them by means of writing while the other

was handed down to them orally through the generations. The Jews

believe that both of them are equal in status, preferring, in fact,

oral

tradition to the written law of Moses, the Torah. They think that

writ-

ten law is often more complicated than the oral tradition, and it

can-

not be made the basis of faith without the oral traditions. These

tradi-

tions, in their opinion, are simpler and clearer and elucidate the

writ-

|

ten canon. This is why Jews disregard any commentary that is found

to be in disagreement with the oral tradition. It is commonly

believed

by the Jews that the covenant, that the Children of Israel were

made

to enter into, was for the oral law and not for the Torah.

|

Through this claim they have disregarded the written law and the

oral tradition was given the status of being the source of their

faith.

Similarly the Roman Catholics also chose the same path and defined

and explained the word of God through oral traditions, with no con-

sideration of its being against many verses of the word of God. In

the

time of Jesus, they had gone so far that he rebuked them for

distorting

the word of God, saying:

|

Thus have ye made the commandment of God of none

effect by your tradition.2

|

They also transgressed God own covenant and made the oral tradition

superior to the written law. It is stated in their books that the

sayings

of their elders are dearer to them than the words of the

Pentateuch.

Some words of the Torah are good but some others are absurd and

useless while all the sayings of their elders are desirable and

praise-

worthy, far better even than the sayings of the Prophets.

|

The Jewish writings also say that the written law is like water,

while the traditions contained by the Talmud and Mishnah are like

aromatic herbs. Also their writings state that the written law is

like

salt while the Talmud and Mishnah are like pepper. There are many

other similar expressions preferring the oral tradition to the

written

canon. The word of God is defined and understood by them through

oral traditions. The written law is regarded by them as a dead body

and the oral tradition to them is like the soul in the body.

|

This oral tradition is supported by them with the ARGUMENT, that at

the time the Torah was revealed by God to Moses, God also elucidat-

ed the text of the Torah to Moses, and commanded him to write down

the Torah and to remember the explanation without putting it into

writing. He was also commanded to convey this elucidation orally to

the people, so that it could be transmitted orally from generation

to

generation. They use the term "written canon" for the Torah and

"oral

canon" for the tradition. The judgments and religious decrees which

are in accordance with the oral tradition are termed as "the canon

of

Moses".

|

They also claim that just as the Torah was revealed to Moses in

forty days, being a direct dialogue between God and Moses, the oral

tradition was also revealed to him in the same way. He brought both

of them from Mount Sinai and conveyed them to the Israelites. It is

stated that on his return from Mount Sinai, Moses first called

Aaron

to his tent and taught him the written canon then he taught him the

oral tradition that was the elucidation of the Torah given to him

by

God. Afler acquiring the knowledge, Aaron came and sat at the

right-

hand side of Moses. Then came the two sons of Aaron, Eleazar and

Ithamar. They were also taught the canons in the same way and after

learning them they got up and one of them sat at the left hand of

Moses and the other at the right hand of Aaron.

|

Then came seventy elders. They also learnt the canons and then

they took their seats in the tent. They were followed by some other

people who were intent upon learning the canons. The Moses stood

up and Aaron recited what had been imparted to him and then got up,

then Eleazer and Ithamar also recited the canoPs and so did the

others

who had learnt them. In this way every one who was present heard it

four times and remembered it well.

|

On their return people communicated the written law through

writing and its elucidation was conveyed orally to the Israelites.

In

this way the canons were handed down to other generations. The

number of the written commandments in the Torah was six hundred

and thirteen which were later divided into parts.

|

They also claim that Moses gathered them into a great assembly in

the eleventh month of the fortieth year after their exodus from

Egypt,

in which he also informed them of his death, and commanded them to

learn any part of the Law they had forgotten. He also invited

people

|

to satisfy their doubts, if any, with regard to any commandment or

statements of the Law. Thereafter he remained busy teaching the

Torah until his death (that is, from the first day of the eleventh

month

up to the sixth day of the twelfth month). He taught both of them,

the

written and the unwritten canon. He also prepared thirteen copies

of

the written law in his own hand and gave one copy to each tribe so

that it might remain safe through the generations. One copy of this

law was also given to the children of Levi for preservation in the

tem-

ple. The verbal traditions were conveyed to Joshua. Then on the

seventh day of this month he climbed up Mount Nebo where he died.

|

After his death Joshua communicated the verbal traditions to the

elders of the Israelites, they, in turn passed them to the

Prophets.

Every Prophet conveyed it to his people, until Jeremiah handed it

down to Baruch who passed it to Ezra, and Ezra communicated it to

the scholars of whom Simon the just was last. Simon handed it down

to Antigonus who gave it to Jose, the son of Johanan. He passed it

to

Jose, the son of Joezer. He conveyed it to Nathan the Aurelite and

Joshua, the son of Berechiah. These two passed it to Joshua own son

Judah and Simon son of Shetah. They passed it to Shemaiah and

Abtalion, these two to Hillel, and he to his son Simon. This Simon

is

supposed to be the one who took Jesus in his arms when Mary had

brought him to the temple after her confinement. This Simon then

passed it to his son Gamaliel. He is the one from whom Paul learnt

it.

Then he passed it to Simon, who in turn passed it to Rabbi Judah

ha-

Nasi. This Judah then collected them into a book which he called

the

Mishnah.

|

Adam Clarke has observed that the Jews hold this book in great

reverence and believe that its contents are divine and a revelation

from God, revealed to Moses along with the Torah. It is also estab-

lished that the teaching of this book has been a common practice

among the Jews right from the time it came into existence. Scholars

and great theologians have written commentaries on this book, two

of

which occupy pride of place with them. The first exegetical work

was

written in Jerusalem in the third century AD, while the second com-

mentary was written in Babylon around the beginning of the sixth

century AD. Both of them are named "Gemara" i.e. the Perfection.

|

They believe that the two commentaries have fully elucidated the

text of the Mishnah. These two commentaries and the text of the

Mishnah together are called the Talmud. To istinguish between the

two commentaries, one is called the Palestinian or Jerusalem Talmud

and the other the Babylonian Talmud. The complete teachings and

instructions of modern Judaism are contained by these two books

which are separate and distinct from the books of the Prophets.

Since

the Jerusalem Talmud is comparatively more complicated, the

Babylonian Talmud is more commonly read and followed.

|

Home said in chapter 7 of the second volume of his commentary

printed in 1822 that the Mishnah is a book comprising the Jewish

tra-

ditions and commentary on the texts of the sacred books. They

believe that these traditions were also given by God to Moses along

with the Torah. Moses passed them down to Aaron. From Aaron they

were communicated to Joshua and Eleazer and other elders and then

they were handed down from generation to generation until they

found their way to Simon. This Simon was the same who took Jesus

in his arms. He gave it to Gamaliel who passed them to Juda

ha-Nasi.

Ith great pain and labour he took about forty years to collect them

in the form of a book in the second century. Since that time it has

been in vogue among the Jews. This book is very often more venerat-

ed than the written Law itself.

|

He further added that there are two commentaries on the Mishnah

both of which are known as Cemara, one of them being the Jerusalem

Gemara, supposed by some scholars to have been written in

Jerusalem in the third century, and according to Father Insoue in

the

fifth century, while the other is known as the Babylonian Gemara

written in Babylon in the sixth century. This Gemara is full of

fabu-

lous legends and stories, but it is more respected by the Jews than

the

other. It is more emphatically taught and followed by them. They

turn

to it with great certitude to seek guidance when they find

themselves

in trouble. The name "Gemara" signifles Perfection. They think that

this book is the perfection of the Torah, and that it is not

possible for

any other commentary to be better than this, and it satisfies all

possi-

|

ble demands of the faith. When the Jerusalem Gemara is added to the

text together they are called the Jerusalem Talmud.l

|

The above sufficiently proves the following four points:

|

(l)Verbal tradition is venerated among the Jews as much as the

Pentateuch; rather they sometimes prefer the oral tradition to

the Torah. They believe that the oral tradition is like the spirit

while the written law is like the body. This being the status of

the Pentateuch, one can guess the status of other books among

them

|

(2) Secondly, we understand from the above that the oral tradition

was first collected and written by Judah ha-Nasi in the second

century, implying that for 1700 years it was conveyed through

human memory. During this period the Jews had to undergo the

great calamities of their history. That is to say, the invasions of

Nebuchadnezzar, Antiochus and Titus all belong to this period.

It is already known historically that the sacred books were

destroyed and the continuity of the traditions was badly affect-

ed as we discussed earlier in this book. Despite all that, they are

still held in more veneration than the Pentateuch.

|

(3)Thirdly these oral traditions have been reported from genera-

tion to generation by single reprters. For example Gamaliel I

and II and Simon I, II and III. They were not even Prophets

according to the Jews, and were the worst kind of infidels and

deniers of Christ as claimed by the Christians. These traditions,

though transmitted through single reporters, are supposed to be

the basis of their faith, while according to the Islamic science

of traditions, any tradition transmitted through a single reporter

termed as Khabar al-Wahid is not allowed to be used as a

source of any article of faith.

|

(4) Fourthly, we understand that the Babylonian Gemara was writ-

ten in the sixth century, and according to Horne "this collection

of absurd legends and stories" remained purely in the form of

oral tradition for two thousand years, being transmitted through

the generations purely by memory.

|

Eusebius, whose historical work is considered authentic equally by

the Catholics and the Protestants, said in chapter 9 of the second

vol-

ume of his book printed in 1848 under the description of Jacob:

|

In writing about Jacob, Clement cited an anecdote in

book seven that is worth remembering. Clement reported this

from the oral tradition that was transmitted to him from his

forefathers.

|

He also cited a statement of Irenaeus on page 123 of the third

chapter of his third book:

|

The council of Ephesus, erected by Paul and in which the

apostle John stayed until the rule of Trajan, is a strong wit-

ness to the traditions of the apostles.

|

He cited the following statement of Clement on the same page:

|

Attend to the tradition of the disciple John which is

beyond doubt and true and has been preserved orally

throughout.

|

He again said on page 124 of chapter 24 of the third book:

|

The number of Christ own disciples, like his apostles, is

twelve, then there are seventy Prophets, and many others who

were not ignorant of the events referred to (that is, the events

recorded by the evangelists), but out of them only John and

Matthew have included them. It is known through oral tradi-

tions that their inclusion of these events was out of necessity.

|

On page 132 of chapter 28 of his third book he again says:

|

Irenaeus has included a story in his third book which is

worth recording. He received this story from Polycarp

through oral tradition.

|

Again he says on page 147, chapter 5 of the fourth book:

|

I have not read about the bishops of Jerusalem in any

book but it is established through oral tradition that they

stayed there for some time.

|

He also says on page 138 of chapter 36 of the third book:

|

We came to know through oral tradition that Ignatius,

being a Christian, was carried to Greece to be offered to car-

nivorous animals. He was conveyed under army protection.

The people of all the churches that were on his way sought

strength through his sermons and admonishments. He

preached to them against the heresy that was common in that

time and told them to hold firmly to the oral tradition. He

wrote down the oral tradition for preservation and stamped it

with his name.

|

Again he says on page 142, chapter 39 of his third book:

|

Papias said in the introduction to his work, "I write for

your benefit all the things that I received from the elders

which I preserved after thorough inquiry into their authentici-

ty, so that my testimony may be an additional proof of their

truth. Usually I do not like to accept the tradition from those

who frequently relate absurd stories. I have received the tra-

dition only from those who know nothing except what has

been reported truthfully from our Lord. Whenever I met any

of the disciples of the elders, I necessarily asked them what

had been said by Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, Jacob,

Matthew or any other disciple of our Lord because I was ben-

efited more by oral tradition than by the sacred books.

|

Further he said in chapter 8 of his fourth book on page 151:

|

Hegesippus is a renowned name among Church histori-

ans. I have cited many passages from his books that he

reported from the disciples through oral tradition. This author

collected, in five books, laws of the disciples transmitted to

him through oral tradition.

|

In chapter 14, page 158 of the same book he reported a statement

of Irenaeus about Polycarp:

|

Polycarp has always preached the doctrines that he

received orally from the disciples or from the Church.

|

Again on page 201, chapter 6 of book 5 he said, listing the

bishops

of Rome:

|

This chain of bishops extends up to Bishop Antherus,

who is nineteenth in this sequence. We received it through

reliable and true sources from the disciples, transmitted to us

through oral tradition.

|

He again cites the statement of Clement on page 206, chapter 8 of

the fifth book:

|

I have not written these books to project myself or to

show off my knowledge, rather, it is in consideration of my

old age and to correct my shortcomings. I have collected

them as elaboration of the texts. They may be considered as

commentary on the inspired books. Among those who raised

me to this high position and greatness and placed me among

the truthful and the blessed was Janicus of Greece and anoth-

er was in Magna Graecia. Some others were from the East,

while one was from Syria, one was a Hebrew from Palestine,

and the master that I reached last was in Egypt living an

ascetic life. He was superior to all the other teachers. I did not

feel like seeing other masters after him, as no teacher better

than him existed on earth. These elders had preserved the tra-

ditions orally communicated from Paul, James, and John Ch

through the generations.

|

He also reports the following statement of Irenaeus on page,

chapter 20, of the fifth book:

|

By the grace of God I have listened to those traditions

attentively and imprinted them on my memory instead of

writing them on paper. For a long period it has been my prac-

tice to recite them faithfully for the sake of preserving them.

|

Again on page 222, chapter 24 of the fifth book he said:

|

Bishop Polycrates wrote an oral tradition in his epistle to

the church of Rome and to Ictor. This tradition was trans-

mitted to him orally.

|

He also said on page 226, chapter 25 of the fifth book:

|

The Bishops of Palestine like Narcotius, Theophilius and

Cassius, and bishops Ptolemy and Clarus and other bishops

that accompanied them presented many things with regard to

the tradition related to the Passover, transmitted to them oral-

ly from the disciples through generations. All of them wrote

at the end of the book that the copies of this book be sent to

all churches, so that the book might help the churches save

the renegades.

|

He again said on page 246, chapter 13 of the sixth book under the

|

SCi-

account of Clement of Alexandrla, wno was tne Iollower o tne a

ples of Christ:

|

Africanus wrote a booklet which still exists in which he

tried to explain away the inconsistencies found in the

genealogical descriptions given by Matthew and Luke

through the oral traditions received by him from his forefa-

thers.

|

The above seventeen statements sufficiently prove that the ancient

Iristians had great trust in oral tradition. John Milner, who was

a

Catholic, said in the tenth letter of his book printed in Derby:

|

I have already said that the basis of the Catholic faith is

not only the written word of God. The word of God is gener-

al, written or not written. That is to say, the sacred books and

the oral tradition as interpreted by Catholic Church.

|

Further in the same letter he says:

|

Irenaeus observed in part three and chapter five of his

book that simplest way for the seekers of the truth is to search

for the oral traditions of the apostles and preach them in the

world.

|

Again in the same letter he says:

|

Irenaeus said in part one chapter three of his book that in

spite of the difference of people own languages, the essence and

reality of the traditions is always the same at all places. The

teachings and doctrines of the Church of Germany are not

different from the teachings of the Churches of France, Spain,

the East, Egypt and Libya.

|

Further he said in the same letter:

|

Irenaeus observed in chapter two of part three of his

book, "Prolixity does not allow me to give a detailed account

of all the Churches. Catholicism, however, will be considered

as the standard faith which is the oldest of all and the most

popular, and was founded by Peter and Paul. All the other

Churches also follow it, because all the oral tradidons report-

ed by the disciples through generations are preserved in

Catholic Church.

|

The same letter also contains the following:

|

Even if we take it as granted for a moment that the disci-

ples left no writing after them, we are bound to follow the

doctrines transmitted to us through oral tradidons of the dis-

ciples who handed them down to the people to be conveyed

to the Church. There are the traditions that are followed by

the illiterate people who believed in Christ without the help

of ink and letters.

|

Again he said in the same letter:

|

Tertullian said on pages 36 and 37 of his book written by

him against the heretics: it is usual for heredcs to derive their

ARGUMENTs only from the sacred books, and claim that nothing

else other than the sacred books can provide the basis for

faith. They deceive people through this approach. We, there-

fore, insist that they should not be allowed to seek their argu-

ments from the sacred books. Because through this kind of

approach we cannot expect any good other than racking our

brains. It is therefore wrong to rely on the sacred books, as no

definite conclusion can be achieved through them, anything

derived from them will be defective. Besides, the correct

approach demands that first it should be decided to whom

these books should be attributed? We must know about the

books that decide our being Chrisdans as to who transmitted

them to whom and when? Because the truth of the evangels

and the doctrines of Christianity are found only in the form of

oral traditions.

|

Again in the same letter he said:

|

Origen said that it was not proper to rely on the people

who cite from the sacred books and say that the word of God

is before you to read and probe into, or that we should believe

in something else other than communicated to us by the

Church through consistent oral tradidon.

|

Further in the same letter he said:

|

Basilides said that there are many Christian doctrines pre-

served by the Church and often presented in sermons. Some

of them have been borrowed from the sacred books, while

others are based on oral tradition. Both of them are equal in

value. There can be no objection against this from any one

having a little knowledge of Christian faith.

|

Further he said in the same letter:

|

Epiphanius said in his book written against the heretics

that it was necessary to rely on the oral tradition as the sacred

books do not contain everything.

|

He also said in the same letter:

|

Under his comments on II Thessalonians 2:14, John

Chrysostom said, "This proves that the disciples did not con-

vey to us everything through writing, but they had transmit-

ted to us many things orally. Both are of equal value. It is

therefore our opinion that the tradition of the Church is only

the basis of faith. When we find anything proved by oral tra-

dition, we need not seek anything else to prove it.

|

Further he says in the same letter:

|

Augustine, favouring a man baptised by heretics, said that

although no written authority could be presented in its favour,

it should be noted that this custom was started through oral

tradition. Because there are many things that are acknowl-

edged by the Church as being suggested by the disciples,

though they are not in writing.

|

He also said in the same letter:

|

The bishop Vincentius observed that heretics should

explain the sacred books according to the general tradition of

the Church.

|

The above statements sufficiently prove that the oral traditions

are

considered to be the basis of faith by the Catholics as well as by

the

ancients. We find the following statement on page 63 of volume 3 of

the Catholic Herald:

|

Rabbi Dosi cited many observations to prove that the text

of the sacred books caMot be comprehended without the help

of oral tradition. The elders of the Catholics have followed it

in all times. Tertullian said that it was necessary to follow the

Churches founded by the disciples for understanding the

teachings of Christ. They transmitted them to the Churches

through oral tradition.

|

The above statements are enough to establish that the traditions

are more respectcd by the Jews than the Torah. Similarly it is con-

firmed that all the ancient Christians like Clement, Irenaeus,

Hegesippus. Polycarp, Polycrates, Arksius, Theophilus, Cassius,

Clarus. Alexandrius, Africanus, Tertullian, Origen, Basilides,

Epiphanius, Chrysostom, Augustine and bishop Vincentius attached

great respect to the oral traditions. Ignatius insisted before his

death

on holding fast to the oral traditions. Similarly Clement wrote in

his

history of the elders:

|

They memorised the true traditions that were transmitted

through generations from Peter, James, John and Paul.

|

Epiphanius observed that he benefitted more from the oral tradi-

tions than the sacred books.

|

We have already cited the opinions of Irenaeus, Origen and

Tertullian etc. to establish that the oral traditions and the

sacred books

are held by them to be equal in value. Basilides declared that the

doc-

trines derived by oral tradition have a value equal to that derived

by

the sacred books. He said that the oral tradition was the basis of

Christian faith.

|

Augustine also confirms that there are many doctrines that are

acknowledged by the Church as being ordained by the disciples while

they are not found in any texts. It is therefore not justified to

reject all

the traditions. The Gospels themselves uphold oral tradition.

|

The Gospels and Oral Tradition

|

The Gospel of Mark 4:34 contains the following:

|

But without a parable spake he not unto them: and when

|

they were alone, he expounded all things to his disciples.

|

It is unthinkable that none of these were transmitted by them to

the

people. It is all the more impossible to suggest that the disciples

should depend on those traditions while the people of our time

should

not.

The Gospel of John 21:25 says:

|

And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the

which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that

even the world itself could not contain the books that should

be written.

|

Though the above statement is an exaggeration, there is no doubt

that there must be many things that Jesus did in his life, be they

mira-

cles or other acts that might have not been written down by the

disci-

ples.

We read in II Thessalonians 2:15:

|

Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions

which ye have been taught, whether by word or by our epis-

|

The last sentence is clear in implying that part of Christ own teach-

ings were communicated orally and another in writing, both of them

equally valuable according to Chrysostom.

I Corinthians 11:34 (Arabic version 1844) has:

|

And the rest will I set in order when I come.

|

It is obvious that, since the commands promised by Paul in the

above statement are not found in writing, they must have been com-

municated orally.

II Timothy 1:13 says:

|

Hold fast the form of sound words, which thou hadst

heard of me, in faith and love which is in Christ Jesus.

|

The phrase, "Which thou hadst heard of me," clearly

indicates that some teachings were communicated orally by

him. The same letter contains the following in 2:2:

|

And the things that thou hadst heard of me among many

witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall

be able to teach others also.

|

II John also says at the end:

|

Having many things to write unto you, I would not write

with paper and ink: I trust to come unto you, and speak face

to face, that our joy be full.l

|

And at the end of the Third Epistle of John we find:

|

I had many things to write, but I will not with ink and pen

write unto thee: But I trust I shall shortly see thee, and we

shall speak face to face.2

|

The above two verses give us to understand that John taught many

things orally as he promised. Now those things can only have been

passed on orally.

|

In view of the above, it is clearly sheer ignorance for any

Protestant to deny the status and value of the oral tradition. Any

such

claim would be a claim against the sacred books and the decisions

of

the ancient Christians, and according to some of them such a

claimant

should be considered a heretic. Besides, Protestants owe many doc-

trines invented by their elders to oral tradition, for example

their

belief that the Son is equal to the Father in his essence; that the

Holy

Ghost own existence is through the Son and the Father; that Christ is

one

person possessing two natures at the same time; that he has two

wills,

human and divine; and that he entered hell after his death. In fact

none of these absurdities can be found in the New Testament. The

inClusion of all such concepts in their faith comes only through

oral

|

tradition.

|

This denial of oral tradition also entails the denial of some parts

of

the sacred books. For example, the Gospels of Mark and Luke and

nineteen chapters of the book of Acts were written through oral

tradi-

tion. They were not written through revelation or through vision,

as

we have discussed in an earlier volume. Similarly five chapters (5

to

9) of the Book of Proverbs would also be denied because they were

collected through those oral traditions that were current in the

time of

Hezekiah. The compilation of these chapters are separated by two

hundred and seventy years from the death of the Prophet Solomon.

We read in the Book of Proverbs 25:1:

|

These are also proverbs of Solomon, which the men of

Hezekiah, King of Judah copied out.

|

The following are the comments of Adam Clarke on the above

verse as found in his commentary printed in 1801:

|

It seems that the Proverbs referred to above were collect-

ed under the orders of Hezekiah from the oral traditions that

were current among them from the time of Solomon.

Afterwards they were added as a supplement to this book.

Probably Hezekiah own friends were Isaiah and Sophanias who

were among the Prophets of those times. In that case this sup-

plement would also acquire the status of the other books, oth-

erwise it would have not been included in the sacred books.

|

The above provides sufficient proof that oral traditions were col-

lected under the orders of the King Hezekiah. His presumption that

those copiers were also Prophets cannot be accepted unless it is

sup-

ported by some reliable authority or convincing ARGUMENTs which the

author has not provided. Again his premise that their inclusion in

the

sacred books should be a proof that the copiers were Prophets is

obvi-

ously a wrong conclusion because the oral traditions are held in

respect by the Jews than the Torah itself. The present Torah was

col-

lected nearly 1700 years after the collection of the oral

tradition,

which is acknowledged by the Jews as the word of God. Similarly

|

they accept the Babylonian Gemara as an authentic book, though the

traditions it contains were collected 200 years later. There was

noth-

ing to stop them from including these five chapters in the sacred

books.

|

What Protestant Scholars Say

|

Some Protestant scholars have honestly admitted that the oral tra-

ditions are as authentic as the sacred books. The Catholic Herald

vol. 2 page 63 has:

|

Dr. Bright, a distinguished Protestant scholar, said on

page 63 of his book that it is evident from the sacred book

that the Christian faith was transmitted to the followers of the

disciples and the early bishops through oral tradition, and

they were asked to preserve it and convey it to the succeeding

generations. We do not find any evidence in the books, be it

from Paul or any other disciple, that they had individually or

collectively written all the things related to our salvation.

There is no indication that every essential doctrine necessary

for salvadon is confined only to the written law. On pages 32

and 33, he tells you that you already know that Paul and other

disciples have transmitted the tradition to us not only in

writing but also as verbal statements. So those are lost who

do not preserve both of them. The oral tradition concerning

the Christian faith is equally trustworthy and acceptable. The

Bishop Munichl said that the oral traditions of the disciples

are as acceptable as are their epistles and other writings. No

Protestant can deny the fact that the oral traditions of the dis-

ciples are superior to their writings. Chilingworth has said

that the dispute about which Gospel is canon and which is

not, can be decided through oral tradition which is a reason-

able source to resolve any dispute.

|

The bishop Thomas Inglis in his book Miraatu-Sidq printed in

1851 said on pages 180 and 181:

|

Bishop Maniseek, a Protestant scholar, observed that

|

there are six hundred precepts, ordained by God and followed

|

by the Church that are not stated in the sacred books.

|

This proves that six hundred precepts are based on oral tradition

and they are followed by the Protestants.

|

It is human nature that an extraordinary or unusual event leaves a

lasting impression on human mind while usual and routine events are

not permanently stored in memory. For example a rare event like the

appearance of a comet will be remembered by those who saw it. On

the other hand they would not be able to say exactly what food they

had eaten three or four days ago.

|

Since the memorization of the Holy Koran has been a matter of

the greatest significance in every age for the Muslims, there has

always been a large number of people who have learnt the whole of

the Koranic text by heart. They are called haf z. More than one

hun-

dred thousand such haflz are present in our time in the Muslim

coun-

tries, in spite of the fact that Islam does not rule over those

countries.

There are always more than one thousand hafiz in the University of

Al-Azhar, Egypt alone, not to speak of Egyptian villages, where

even

cart drivers and loaders are frequently fully qualified hafiz who

have

memorised the whole of the Koranic text." These ordinary men are

certainly superior in this respect to the bishops of the Christian

world.

We are sure that even ten such hafiz of the Bible cannot be found

throughout the Christian world.

|

It is a fact that anything important and of significance is

imprinted

and preserved easily in a way which is not affected by the passage

of

time. The Holy Koran alone fulfils the requirement of being com-

pletely unaltered and miraculously genuine. Throughout these twelve

hundred and eighty years,2 the Holy Koran was not only preserved

in writing but also in human hearts. Besides, the recitation of the

|

Koranic text is in itself a part of Islamic worship and a usual

practice

of the Muslims, while the recitation of the Bible is not a ritual

prac-

tice among Christians.

|

One of the Protestant scholars, Michael Mechaka, observed on

page 316 of his book, Kitab-ad-Dalil of 1849:

|

One day I asked a Catholic priest to tell me honestly how

many times he had read the sacred book in full in his life. He

said that in his early age he had read it many times in full but

for the last twelve years he could not spare any time for read-

ing it as he was busy serving the Christian brethren.

|

A Historical View of the Hadith Collections

|

The traditions (Hadiths) are held to be authentic and acceptable by

Muslims if they are found to be in accordance with the laws and

regu-

lations that we shall soon discuss.

The following is a standing commandment of the Holy Prophet:

|

Be careful in reporting a hadith from me unless you have

learnt (from me) abstain from reporting other things. Anyone

reporting a falsehood in my name knowingly shall have his

abode in fire.

|

The above tradition is mutawatir (having a large number of

reporters in every period right from the time of the Holy Prophet)

having been reported by not less than sixty-two Companions of the

Holy Prophet. The above warning coming from the Holy Prophet was

enough for the companions to be extremely careful in reporting

tradi-

tions from the Holy Prophet. History has recorded unique examples

of the extreme scrupulousness of the Muslims and their being highly

prudent in maintaining the highest standard of accuracy in

reporting

the traditions, something that is certainly not present in case of

Christian tradition. For certain positive reasons the Companions of

the Holy Prophet did not collect the traditions in the form of

books.

One of the reasons was that the revelation of the Holy Qu"ran was

in

|

progress and being written down by the Companions. To avoid any

possible mixing of the Koranic text with the tradition they did

not

collect the traditions in book form."

|

However, they were collected later by the disciples of the

Companions like Imam Zuhri, Rabi" ibn Sabih and Sa"id etc. Still

they did not arrange their collections according to the standard

arrangement of the jurisprudents. Later, all the subsequent

scholars

adopted a standard arrangement in their great works. In Madina, the

great Imam Malik compiled his coUection known as Muwatta". Imam

Malik was bom in 95 AH. In Makka a collection was compiled by

Abu Muhammad "Abdul-Malik ibn "Abdul-"Aziz Ibn Jurayj. In Kufa,

Sufyan ath-Thawri compiled his work while in Basra, Hammad ibn

Salma also compiled his collection.

|

Then Bukhari and Muslim made their collections for their books

including only sahih hadiths of the Prophet and did not allow any

tra-

dition that was not qualified as sahih. Muslim hadith scholars

invest-

ed great labour and took great pains in maintaining the accuracy of

the prophetic traditions. A new branch of knowledge was initiated

known as Asma" ur-Rijal, that is the biographies of each and every

reporter of hadith right from the Companion to the present time. It

helped them know everything about a particular reporter in the

chain

of reporters of any single tradition. All the collections known as

Sihah (the books containing only sahih hadiths) were so compiled by

their authors that each and every statement is prefixed with

complete

chain of reporters starting from the author to the Holy Prophet

him-

self. There are some hadiths reported by Bukhari that have only

three

names between him and the Holy Prophet.

|

1. In spite of the above reservations there were many collections

of traditions

written down by the Companions of the Holy Prophet. According to

Abu Dawud, the

companion "Abdullah ibn "Amr ibn "As wrote down traditions with the

permission of

the Holy Prophet himself (Jam" al-Fawa"id vol 1, page 26). It is

stated that this col-

lection was named As-Sakiha Al-Sadiqa. A collection of traditions

compiled by

Humam Ibn Munabbih has been recently discovered which was dictated

to him by

the Companion Abu Hurayra which proves that the traditions were

written down in

the time of the Companions. For more details see Tadveen-e-adih by

Sheikh

Munazir Ahsan Geelani.

|

Three Kinds of Hadith

|

The sahih hadiths are further divided into three kinds:

|

(I) Mutawatir:

|

A mutawatir hadith is a hadith that is reported by such a large

number of people at every stage of transmission so that their

agree-

ment on a false statement is denied by human reason. Examples of

these are the hadlth describing the number of rak"ats (genuflexion)

in

salat or specifying the amount to be paid in zakat.

|

(2) Mash-hur:

|

This kind of tradition is the one that was reported by a single

Companion of the Holy Prophet but at later stages, that is, in the

time

of the followers of the Companions or in the time of their

disciples, it

became famous and was generally accepted by the Ummah. Now

from this stage onward it was reported by a large number of people,

so attaining the status of mutawatir. For example, the injunction

describing the punishment of fomication through stoning to death.

|

(3) Khabar al-wahid:

|

This kind of hadith is the one that is reported by a single

reporter

to an individual or to a group of people, or a group of people

reported

it to an individual.

|

Now the knowledge imparted through a mutawatir hadith is

always undeniable and certain. Denial of this kind of hadith

consti-

tutes unbelief. The mashhur hadith satisfies all the doubts and

creates

satisfaction. Anyone denying this kind of hadith is not an

unbeliever

but a heretic and a sinner.

|

Khabar al-wahid does not impart knowledge as certain as in the

above two examples. Though it cannot be a source of beliefs and

basic doctrines it is acceptable in practical injunctions. If it

happens to

run counter to a stronger source, effort must be made to reconcile

the

two. If this effort fails then this kind of hadith should be

abandoned.

|

Distinction between Koran and Hadith

|

There are three kinds of distinctions between the Holy Koran and

hadith:

|

Firstly, the whole of the Koranic text is a mutawatir report. It

has

been reported verbatim and exactly as it was revealed to the Holy

Prophet, without the alteration of a single word or replacing any

word

by a synonym. Whereas the sahih hadith was allowed to be reported

by an expert and qualified reporter in his own words.l

|

Secondly, since the whole of the Koranic text is mutawatir, the

denial of a single sentence of the Koran is an act of infidelity

while

the denial of hadith, mutawatir excepted, is not an act of

infidelity.2

|

Thirdly, there are many injunctions that are directly related to

the

words of the Koranic text, like salat or the miraculous nature of

the

Koranic words, whereas the words of the hadith are not directly

related to any injunctions they might contain.

|

In view of the above, it should be sufficiently clear that it is in

no

way against logic or human reason to rely upon the traditions, spe-

cially when they are reported through a constant chain of reliable

reporters.

|

1. This implies that the actual words spoken by the Holy Prophet

are not report-

ed, but the message is transmitted faithfully in the reporter own own

words.

|

2. It may be noted that the denial of mashhur and khabar al-wahid

is not an act of

infidelity, but any one denying the hadith altogether as a source

of knowledge is

declared an infidel by all the schools of thought. In the same way

a Christian is not

excommunicated for claiming that a particular verse of the Bible is

a later addition,

but he wlll be declared infidel if he disbelieves the Bible as a

whole. (Taqi).

|

Objections Raised against the Holy Traditions

|

There are five main objections raised by the Christians against the

authenticity of the Holy Traditions.

|

First Objection

|

Since the reporters of the holy traditions were either the

relatives

of the Prophet Muharnmad like his wives and other kinsmen, or his

Companions and friends, their witness in favour of the Prophet is

not

acceptable.

|

We are afraid that this very objection stares into the eyes of the

Christians very threateningly because all the early accounts of

Jesus

recorded by the evangelists in their gospels are reported either by

his

mother or his stepfather, Joseph the Carpenter, or his disciples,

there-

fore all these accounts must not be acceptable. As for their

contention

that the faith of the relatives and the Companions of the Holy

Prophet

was not genuine because they showed their faith in the Prophet only

for the sake of acquiring political power and other worldly

interests,

the baselessness of this objection is more than obvious for the

reason

that the first thirteen years of the Prophetic mission in Makka

were"

full of distress and afflictions for the Muslims. The faithful

Muslims

were constantly persecuted by the idol-worshippers of Makka. Their

life was so much endangered in Makka that they had to leave their

homeland first for Ethiopia and then Madina. Under these circum-

stances, it is unimaginable that they could think of acquiring

wealth

or any kind of worldly power through the Holy Prophet.

|

This might, however, be true in the case of the disciples of Jesus,

all of whom were poor labourers. They were told by the Jews that

the

Messiah would be a great king. When Jesus declared that he was the

promised Messiah, they might well have expressed belief in him in

order to attain worldly positions in his kingdom and to get rid of

their

present labours of fishing and other things.l Specially given the

fol-

lowing promise of Jesus made to them as reported by Matthew in

chapter 19:

|

And Jesus said unto them, Verily I say unto you, That ye

which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of

man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon

twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel."

|

Similarly he promised them in these words according to Mark

10:29-30:

|

Verily I say unto you, There is no man that hath left

house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or

children, or lands, for my sake, and the gospel own , But he shall

receive a hundredfold now in this time.

|

There are many other promises that Jesus made to his disciples.

The disciples, therefore, were sure they were going to get a share

in

his kingdom and possessions, and rule over the tribes of the

Israelites,

or at the very least a hundredfold of everything they had left for

their

faith. They were so certain of this promise that James and John,

the

sons of Zebedee, or their mother demanded ministry in his kingdom,

so that one of them should sit on the right hand of Jesus and the

other

on his left in his kingdom. This can be verified from chapter 20 of

Matthew and chapter 10 of Mark.

|

Later, when the disciples realised that no possibility of such a

existed and that Jesus himself was as poor and without money as he

was before and they saw Jesus hiding himself out of fear of the

Jews;

and that the Jews were after his life, all their expectations were

frus-

trated and they were utterly disappointed.2 One of the disciples

even

went as far as to betray Jesus for only thirty pieces of silver and

had

him arrested by the Jews. The rest of the disciples not only left

him

alone but also denied him three times. Peter, the founder of the

Church and most high among the disciples, even cursed Jesus and

swore falsely that he did not know him. In short, they were all

disap-

pointed until the resurrection of Jesus when they revived their

hopes

once again and gathered around him and asked him if the Israelites

would then be able to regain the lost kingdom. See the first

chapter of

the book of Acts for details.

|

After the Ascension of Jesus to Heaven they clung to the more

alluring idea that Jesus would soon descend from heaven, and that

the

Last Day was at hand and that Jesus would kill the Antichrist and

imprison the Devil for a thousand years. After this they would sit

on

thrones and live luxurious lives all those years. This is stated in

the

Book of Revelations (Chapters 19,20) and I Corinthians 6:2. Then

after the Second Coming, they would enter Paradise for eternal

happi-

ness. The Evangelists made exaggerations in his praise. The fourth

Gospel says:

|

And there are also many other things that Jesus did, the

which if they should be written every one I suppose that even

the world itself could not contain the books that should be

written."

|

Every sensible man can see the exaggeration in this statement.

Therefore their witness in favour of Jesus cannot be considered

acceptable. We need not repeat the fact that the above is not our

belief, we have said it only to show the poverty of imagination

behind

the above objection against hadiths. As the above assumptions will

not be acceptable to the Christians, similarly they are

unacceptable if

applied to the Companions of the Holy Prophet.

|

ARGUMENTation through Shi"ite Statements

|

There are occasions when Christian scholars try to create doubts

among the people through the false and fabricated statements of

Shi"ite writers. Such objections can be refuted both dialectically

and

|

academically.

|

First Answer"

|

The renowned historian Mosheim said in the first volume of his

book:

|

The Ebionites, a Christian sect of the first century, had

the belief that Jesus was only a human being, born of his par-

ents Joseph and Mary, like other human beings. They held

that the observance of the Law of Moses was obligatory not

only for the Jews but also was necessary equally for others

and that no salvation was possible without practicing the Law

of Moses. Since Paul did not agree with this belief, he was

highly criticized and disapprobated. His writings are not

respected by them.

|

Lardner said on page 376 of vol. 2 of his book:

|

We have been informed by the ancients that this sect

strictly rejected Paul and his epistles.

|

Similarly Bell described them in his history in these words:

|

This sect acknowledges only the Pentateuch of the Old

Testament and the Prophets Solomon, David, Jeremiah and

Hezekiel were held in abomination by them. Out of the New

Testament only the Gospel of Matthew is acknowledged by

them, but they have distorted its text in many places. They

have excluded the first two chapters of this Gospel.

|

The same historian, Bell, described the Marcionites in his history

in these words:

|

This sect believes in two gods; the creator of good and

the creator of evil. They also claim that the Pentateuch and all

other books of the Old Testament are from the God of evil.

All of them are against the books of the New Testament.

|

He further said:

|

They also believe that Jesus entered hell after his death

and released the souls of Cain and the People of Sodom as

they submitted to him and did not follow the God of evil. He

left the souls of Abel, Noah, Abraham and others in hell as

they were his opponents. They also believe that the creator

God is not alone the God who sent Jesus, therefore they do

not accept that the books of the Old Testament are inspired

books. Out of the New Testament they accept only the Gospel

of Matthew with the exception of the first two chapters of this

gospel. They also acknowledge the epistles of Paul but reject

anything they find contrary to their opinion.

|

Lardner quoted the following statement of Augustine under his

description of Manichaeans in the third volume of his commentary:

|

The God who revealed the Torah to Moses and spoke

with the Israelites was not God but Satan. Though this sect

accepts the books of the Old Testament, it at the same time

admits that additions have been made in these books. They

only accept what they like of these books and reject what

they do not like. They accept the apocryphal books as being

certainly true and genuine.

|

Furer in the same volume Lardner said:

|

The people of the this sect never did acknowledge the

books of Old Testament.

|

The beliefs of the people of this sect were described in the Acts

of

Archillas as follows:

|

Satan deceived the Prophets of the Jews and he was the

|

one who spoke with Moses and other prophets. They derive

their ARGUMENT for this claim from John 10:81 in which Jesus

said that they were thieves and plunderers. They rejected the

New Testament.

|

Similar views are held by many other sects. Now we may well ask

the Protestant scholars if they agree with the views expressed in

the

above statements? If so, they should declare that the following ten

beliefs are the part of their faith:

|

(l)Jesus was only a human born of Joseph the Carpenter.

|

(2) Practising the Law of Moses is essential for their salvation

|

(3)Paul was dishonest and his statements are essentially to be

rejected.

|

(4) There are only two gods, the creator of good and the creator of

evil.

|

(5)The souls of Cain and of the people of Sodom were released

from hell through the death of Jesus while the souls of Abel,

Noah, Abraham and others remained there to suffer the punish-

ment of hell.

|

(6) Those Prophets were the followers of Satan.

|

(7)The Torah and all other books of the Old Testament are from

Satan.

|

(8)It was Satan, not God, who conversed with Moses and other

Prophets.

|

(9)The books of the New Testament have been distorted through

later additions.

|

(10) Some apocryphal books are true and genuine.

|

If the statements of the above three sects are not acceptable to

the

Protestants how can they justify their objection against the

Muslims

on the basis of statements from people who are, according to

authen-

tic ARGUMENTs of the whole Muslim umrnah, a sect?

|

econd Answer

|

Academically speaking, their ARGUMENTation on the basis of the

statements of Shi"ite scholars is false because, according to the

Ithna-

"Ashari (the Twelvers) sect of the Shi"ites, the Holy Koran is

free

from all kinds of distortions and changes. Any isolated statement

claiming contrary to it is strictly rejected and denied by the

Ithna-

"Ashari scholars. The following statements of the Shi"ite scholars

should be more than enough to establish our claim.

|

Shaykh Saduq Muhammad ibn Babuyah was one of the great

scholars of the Twelvers, the Ithna-"Ashari sect of the Shi"ites.

He

said in his book Al-A"taqadiya:

|

Our belief with regard to the Holy Koran is that the

Koran in the hands of the people today is the same Koran

that was revealed to the Holy Prophet and there is nothing

different in it except that the number of surahs of the Holy

Koran is generally held to be 114 while we believe that

surahs Al-Duha and Al-lnshirahl are not two separate surahs

but together they are one. Similarly Surah Al-Quraysh and

Al-Fil are one surah together. Anyone ascribing to us any-

thing more than this is a liar.

|

Majma" al-Bayan is considered by the Shi"ites to be the most reli-

able exegesis of the Holy Koran. In this book Sayyed Murtaza

Abu"l-Qasim "Ali ibn Husain Musawi said:

|

The collection of the Holy Koran in the time of the Holy

Prophet was exactly in the same form as it is today.

|

He based his ARGUMENT on the fact that it was taught and was mem-

orized by people in that period as a whole. He enumerated a large

number of the Companions who were hafiz. He also added that the

Holy Koran was repeatedly recited before the Holy Prophet. He

pointed out that there were many Companions like "Abdullah ibn

Mas"ud and Ubayy ibn Ka"b etc. who completed the recitation of the

whole Koran a number of times before the Holy Prophet. All the

above events were, in his opinion, a strong indication that the

Holy

Koran was present in the form of a collection in the time of the

Holy

Prophet.

|

He also refuted the Imamiyal sect of the Shi"ites and said that

their

views contrary to the Koran are not acceptable since they have

trust-

ed some unreliable and weak traditions that were reported by some

Muhaddiths because they thought them to be correct.

Sayyed Murtaza said in another place:

|

The certainty and knowledge of the authenticity of the

Koran is equal to the certainty that we have about the great

cities of the world, great historic events, or the great literary

compositions of the Arabs etc.

|

This is because of the high involvement of the Muslims in preserv-

ing and authentically transmitting the Holy Koran. Since the Holy

Koran has the status of a Prophetic miracle and is the source of

divine law, Muslim scholars have always invested great labour and

taken unusual pains in its word-by-word memorization, along with

ensuring its genuine pronunciation and precise notations and

phonet-

ics. In the presence of the above factors even the slightest change

in

its text was unimaginable.

|

A renowned scholar of the Shi"ites, Qazi Nurullah Shostri, said in

his book, Masaib-u-Nawasib:

|

The view of the Koranic distortion ascribed to the

Imamites (Imamiya Sect) cannot be ascribed to the majority

of the Shi"ite people. This view is held only by a disrespected

and isolated few.

Mulla said in his commentary on Kalini:l

|

At the appearance of the twelfth Imam, the Holy Koran

will appear and be known with the same order and arrange-

ment.

|

Muhammad Ibn Hasan Amili, a great "muhaddith" (hadith scholar)

of the Imamites, has said in one of his books, while making some

crit-

icism on some of his contemporaries:

|

A thorough historical research and elaborate quest of

events leads us to the sure conclusion that the Holy Koran

enjoys the highest degree of uninterrupted historical authen-

ticity. Thousands of the Companions used to memorize it and

convey it to others. It had been collected and compiled in the

time of the Holy Prophet.

|

The above statements sufficiently prove that the Shi"ite scholars

in

general have no doubt that the version of the Holy Koran, which is

in

our hands today, is exactly the same as was revealed to the Holy

Prophet, and that at the appearance of the twelfth Imam the same

Koran will be publicised among people. The few writers who have

the view that there is distortion in the Holy Koran are not

considered

reliable and are strictly rejected by the Shi"ites themselves

because

the traditions that support their view are inauthentic and not

reliable

in the face of the undeniable reports which prove to the highest

degree its genuineness. This is also true because knowledge that is

derived by al-khabar al-wahid (the single report) has to be

rejected if

it is not supported by more certain ARGUMENTs. This is explained by

Ibn Al-Mutahhar Al-Hilli in his book Mabadi" al-Wasul ila "llm al-

Usul.

|

Now, once the authenticity of the Holy Koran has been estab-

lished, we must be allowed to cite the Koranic evidence to support

our belief that the Companions of the Holy Prophet, in general,

never

committed a single act against Iman, fidelity to Islam and the Holy

Prophet.

|

The following Koranic verses are sufficient to prove our claim

particularly with regard to the Shi"ite assertion of the

superiority of

"Ali over the other caliphs.

|

First Proof

|

The first Muhajireen and those who gave them help

(Ansar) and those who follow them in good deeds well

pleased is Allah with them as are they with Him. Fo; them

has He prepared gardens under which rivers flow, to dwell

therein for ever: that is the supreme felicity.l

|

The above verse speaks of four qualities of those Muhajirun of

Makka and Ansar of Madina who were the first believers in Islam.

|

1. Allah has declared His pleasure with them.

2. They are also pleased with Allah.

3. The Gardens of Paradise have been promised to them.

4. They shall live in Paradise forever.

|

Now it is obvious that the caliphs Abu Bakr, "Umar, "Uthman and

"Ali are at the top of the list of those who first embraced Islam.

The

above Koranic honour has been conferred upon all of them equally

without any distinction of the Companion "Ali over others. Any

objection or disregard for any of the first three caliphs is as

absurd

and false as it is for the caliph "Ali.

|

Second Proof

|

The Holy Koran says in Surah Al-Tawba:

|

Those that have embraced the faith and migrated from

their homes and fought for Allah own cause with their wealth

and their persons are held in higher regard by Allah. It is they

who shall triumph. Their Lord has promised them joy and

mercy, and gardens of eternal bliss where they shall dwell for

|

ever. Allah own reward is great indeed."

|

The above verse speaks of the following four rewards for those

who embraced Islam, migrated for the sake of their faith and sacri-

ficed their wealth and selves.

|

1. They are held in higher regard by God.

|

2. They shall be sewarded with success and triumph.

|

3. They are promised blessings and the pleasure of Allah and

Paradise.

|

4. They shall have eternal dwelling in Paradise.

|

The fourth promise has been strengthened with three Koranic

terms Muqim, Khalidin and Abadan, all three signifying the

eternali-

ty of their dwelling in Paradise. It is undeniable that the first

three

caliphs fulfill the requirements of being staunch believers and

sacri-

ficing their wealth and taking pains for their faith, just as the

compan-

ion "Ali did.

|

Third Proof

|

It is again stated in Surah Al-Tauba:

|

But the Messenger and those with him fought with their

goods and their persons. Those shall be rewarded with good

things. Those shall surely prosper. Allah has prepared for

them Gardens under which streams of water flow, in which

they shall abide for ever. That is the supreme felicity.2

|

This verse too speaks of four rewards for the believers who fought

with their wealth and with their persons. The first three caliphs

are

decidedly the best believers and Mujahidin. Therefore they

necessari-

|

ly deserve the above rewards.

|

Fourth Proof

|

Again we read in the same surah (Tawba) the following verse:

|

Allah has purchased of the faithful their lives and worldly

goods in retum for Paradise. They will fight for His cause

slay and be slain. Such is the True Pledge which He has made

them in the Torah, the Gospel and the Koran. And who is

more true to his Promise than Allah. Rejoice then in the bar-

gain you have made. That is the supreme felicity. Those that

repent and those that serve Allah and praise Him, those that

kneel and prostrate themselves, those that enjoin good, forbid

evil and observe the Hudud of Allah are the faithful who

deserve good news.l

|

The above verse similarly speaks of the promise of Paradise for

the believers, and also the verse has spoken of nine other

attributes of

the companions which are proved more perfectly in the four Caliphs

of Islam.

|

Fifth Proof

|

The Holy Koran says in Surah Al-Hajj:

|

Those who are once given power in the land shall estab-

lish the institution of own alat" and pay the Zakat, shall enjoin

good and forbid evil, and Allah alone decides the destiny of

all things.2

|

The phrase "given power in the land" refers to the Muhajirun (the

migrants from Makka) which is obvious from the preceding part of

this verse. The Ansar of Madina are not included as they did not

have

to migrate from their homeland. Now this verse implies that the

|

uhajirun. once being in possession of political power, will

establish

the institutions of Salat and Zakat and will propagate good and

forbid

evil. It is historically evident that the Muhajirun were made the

rulers

of the land and that they established the above institutions and

found-

ed a society free of all evils. Therefore the above Koranic verse

is an

affirmation of the truth of all the four caliphs of Islam. The last

sen-

tence of the verse, "Allah alone decides the destiny of all

things,"

assures that they shall certainly get the power in land, and that

Allah own

Kingdom alone is etemal and everlasting.

|

Sixth Proof

|

Another verse of the same Surah says:

|

Fight for the cause of Allah with the devotion due to

Him. He has chosen you and laid on you no constriction in

the matter of faith, the faith of Ibrahim, your father. He has

named you Muslims before and in this, so that the Messenger

may be a witness for you, and that you, yourselves, may be

witnesses for the people. Therefore establish Salat and pay

the Zakat and hold fast to Allah for He is your guardian. A

gracious guardian and a gracious helper."

|

Seventh Proof

|

We find the following verse in Surah Al-Nur:

|

Allah has promised those of you who believe and do

good deeds to make them masters in the land, as he had made

their ancestors before them, to strengthen the Faith he chose

for them, and to exchange their fear for peace and safety, so

that they should worship Me and hold no partners with Me.

Whoever denies after this, they are indeed the evil-doers.

|

The phrase "those of you" in the above verse indicates that the

above verse refers only to those few believers who were present at

the

time of its revelation. It is also evident from the Koranic words

"their ancestors before them" that this promise of their rule over

the

land will be fulfilled some time after the death of the Holy

Prophet,

for the Holy Prophet is the last of all the Prophets and there is

no

room for anyone to be a Prophet after him, therefore the promise of

rule must be for the caliphs. The use of the plural in all the

expres-

sions of promise in the above verse sufficiently proves that the

sub-

ject of the above promise should not be less than three, as the

Arabic

plurals are not applied to any lesser number. Therefore it requires

that

the number of the rulers should not be less than three. The above

verse also has promised that the faith would be strengthened

through

to them, necessitating their possession of worldly power to enable

them strengthen the faith.

|

Similarly the Koranic words in the above verse are clear in

implying that the faith preached by them would be the faith chosen

by

Allah, and that their ruling period would be a period of peace and

jus-

tice. The verse affirms that they will be true believers as long as

they

live.

|

In short, the above verse is a strong ARGUMENT of the sincerity of

all

the four caliphs in general, and of the companions Abu Bakr, "Umar

and "Uthman in particular, because it was in their period that

Islam

conquered many countries and had the most powerful and stable rule.

This was not the case in the period of the fourth caliph, "Ali. He

remained busy all his time in eliminating local problems. The

objec-

tions raised against the first three Caliphs by the Shi"ites are

therefore

ungrounded and invalid.

|

Eighth Proof

|

The following has been said in Surah Al-Fath about the Muhajirun

and Ansar who were present at the treaty of Hudaybiya:

|

While the unbelievers nourished in their hearts the heat

and cant of ignorance, Allah has sent down tranquillity on his

|

messenger and on the believers, and made them cling to the

|

command of taqwa, for they were most worthy and deserving

|

of it. Allah has knowledge of all things.l

|

This verse bears witness to the following four qualities of the

com-

panions of the Holy Prophet:

|

1. They shared the tranquillity that Allah sent down on His

Messenger.

|

2. They are believers.

|

3. The attribute of taqwa is an inseparable part of their

character.

|

4. They are the ones who most deserve this attribute of taqwa.

|

The above four qualities are proved more perfectly in the case

Abu Bakr, "Umar and "Uthman. Any belief or claim contrary to this

is

false and against the Koranic evidence.

|

Ninth Proof

|

We find the following verse in Surah Al-Fath:

|

Muhammad is Allah own Messenger and those with him are

hard on the unbelievers but merciful to one another. You see

them low (in Salat) and they prostrate themselves seeking the

grace of Allah and his pleasure. Their marks of prostration

are on their faces. 2

|

In this verse the companions of the Holy Prophet have been

described by Allah as being firm and determined against the unbe-

lievers in the battles, compassionate and merciful to each other,

great

worshippers and seekers of Allah own grace and pleasure. Now anyone

claiming to be a Muslim would be great sinner if he believed any-

thing contrary to this.

|

Tenth Proof

|

Allah has said in Surah Al-Hujurat:

|

But Allah had endeared the faith to you and beautified it

in your hearts, and made you detest unbelief, misdeed and

disobedience. They are the ones who are rightly guided."

|

The following qualities are here confirmed by the Koran for the

Companions:

|

1. Irnan or Belief was very dear to the Companions.

2. They had great dislike for disbelief, misdeed and disobedience.

3. The Companions were the people of guidance and were rightly

guided by Allah.

|

Any belief contrary to the above would therefore be absolutely

wrong.

|

Eleventh Proof

|

The following description is found in Surah Al-Hashr:

|

A part of spoils is also due to the indigent Muhajirun,

those who were expelled from their homes and their property,

who seek Allah own grace and bounty and support Allah and His

Messenger, these are the true believers. But those who, before

them, had homes (in Madina) and embraced the faith before

them, love those who came to them for refuge, and entertain

no desire in their hearts for things they are given. And they

rather prefer them above themselves though they are in want.

And those saved from covetousness of their souls are the ones

that achieve prosperity 2

|

The above verse has attested to the following six qualities of the

Muhajirun and the Ansar (Helpers of Madina):

|

1. Their migration to Madina was exclusively for seeking the

pleasure of Allah and not for worldly gains.

|

2. They were all supporters of the faith of Allah and His

Messenger.

|

3. They were truthful in their speech and in their actions.

|

4. The Ansar had great affection and love for those who came to

them for refuge.

|

5. The Ansar really rejoiced when their Muhajirun brethren

received any fortune."

|

6. The Ansar of Madina, in spite of being poor and in need them-

selves, preferred their Muhajirun brethren over themselves.

|

The above six distinctive features indicate the perfection of their

faith. The poor Muhajirun referred to by the Holy Koran used to

call

Abu Bakr the deputy or the Caliph of the Messenger of Allah, and

their truthfulness has been confirmed by Allah in this verse. This

requires that they must be true in their saying that Abu Bakr was

the

Caliph or deputy of Allah, which in turn proves his Caliphate to

have

been just and true.

|

Twelfth Proof

|

It says in Surah Ali-lmran:

|

You are the best nation that has ever been raised up for

people. You enjoin justice and forbid evil, and you believe in

Allah 2

|

The above verse testifies to the following three attributes of the

Companions.

|

1. They are the best of all people.

2. They always preach what is good and prohibit what is wicked.

3. They are true believers in Allah.

|

There are many other such verses in the Holy Koran but I have

confined myself to the above twelve examples, keeping them equal to

the number of the disciples of Christ and the Imams of the

Shi"ites. I

would, however, like to reproduce five statements of the Shi"ite

schol-

ars testifying to the status of the first three caliphs of Islam.

|

1. The following statement of the Companion, "Ali, has been

reported in Najhul Balagha, the most authentic book of the

Shi"ites:

|

How commendable and righteous is that "certain man",

because he straightened the devious, healed the severe dis-

ease, established the way of the Holy Prophet, opposed

heresy, died innocent, performed the best deeds, saved him-

self from evil, had little deficiency, lived in obedience to

Allah and was the most fearful of Allah in observing His

rights.

|

The phrase "that certain man" in the above verse refers to the

Companion, Abu Bakr, according to the most exegetes and particu-

larly al-Bahrani. Other commentators think that the Companion

"Umar, is the subject of this reference. The Companion, "Ali,

enumer-

ated ten attributesfound in Abu Bakr, according to the former opin-

ion, and in "Umar according to the latter. Since this statement was

made after the death of the two caliphs, it removes any doubts with

regard to their rightful succession to the Islamic caliphate.

|

2. The great Shi"ite scholar, Mu"tamad "Ali ibn "Isa, said in his

book Kashf Al-Ghumma:

|

Someone asked Imam Ja"far as-Sadiq about the use of

ornate swords. He said that it was permissible because the

Companion Abu Bakr had also used an ornate sword. The

questioner demanded, "How can you say such a thing?" Imam

la"far jumped from his couch and said with great enthusiasm,

"Certainly he was truthful, no doubt he was truthful, certainly

he was truthful, anyone not believing him to be truthful may

be refused by Allah."

|

The above statement confirms that the Companion, Abu Bakr, cer-

tainly enjoyed the status of own iddiq", the Truthful. Anyone denying

him this attribute is false, here as well as in the Hereafter.

|

3. The commentators of Nahj-al-Balagha have reproduced some

letters of the Companion, "Ali. The following description in favour

of

the Companions, Abu Bakr and "Umar, is found in one of these let-

ters:

|

I swear by my life that these two elders were great and of

high status. Their demise is, indeed, a great loss to Islam.

May Allah shower His grace upon them and reward them for

their best deeds.

|

4. The great Shi"ite scholar and the author of Kitab-al-Fusul has

reported Imam Baqir as saying:

|

The respected Imam saw some people busy disparaging

the Companions Abu Bakr, "Umar and "Uthman. He asked

them, "Are you among the Muhajirun of Makka who left their

homes and possessions purely for seeking the pleasure of

Allah and his Messenger, and for supporting them?" They

answered, "No, we are not from among the Muhajirun." He

said, "Then are you from those who were living in Madina

and had accepted Faith, and loved every Muhajir who came

to them for refuge?" They admitted that they were not also

from among them. The Imam said to them, "You have admit-

ted that you do not belong to either of the two groups. Now, I

witness that you people do not also belong to the group of

people described by Allah in the Koran as follows:

|

Those that came after them (the companies) say:

Forgive us, our Lord, and forgive our brothers who

embraced the Faith before us. Do nor put in our hearts

any malice towards the faithful, Lord you are compas-

sionate and merciful.l

|

It is obvious that those speaking ill of the Companions, Abu Bakr,

"Umar and "Uthman are out of the above three groups whom Allah

praises in the Holy Koran.

|

5. The commentary of the Holy Koran which is attributed by the

Shi"ites to Imam Hasan al-"Askari contains:

|

Allah sent His revelation to Adam saying, I shall send

My mercy to every one having love of Muhammad and his

Companions and his family, so much so that, if it be divided

among those created from the beginning of the world up to

the last day, it would make them deserve Paradise through

accepting the faith and performing good deeds. And anyone

having malice and enmity for Muhammad and his family, and

his Companions will be so severely punished by Allah that if

it be divided among all those created, it would be enough to

kill all of them.

|

This implies that the faithful are required by Allah to love both

the

family and the Companions of the Holy Prophet and not only one of

them. This also confirms that bearing malice or enmity against

either

of the two calls for severe punishment from Allah. May Allah save

us

all from such misbelief and disregard against the family or

Companions of Holy Prophet, and may Allah keep our hearts filled

with love of them as long as we live.

|

Second Objection against the Hadiths

|

Their second objection against the traditions is that the scholars

of

hadiths (Muhaddiths) were bom long after the Holy Prophet. They

were, therefore, not eye-witnesses of the Prophet own mission and his

miracles. They did not hear the sayings of the Holy Prophet

directly

from him, rather they compiled them after more than one hundred

years, having heard them from an unbroken chain of reporters. Also

they rejected nearly half of these reports for not being authentic.

|

We have previously discussed how the oral tradition is accepted by

all the Christians and how its acceptability is also affirmed by

the pre-

sent Bible. There are a great number of doctrines, believed by the

Protestants, that are based on oral traditions. The number of such

injunctions is said to be not less than six hundred as admitted by

the

Bishop Manisek. Apart from this, five chapters of the book of

Proverbs were compiled through oral tradition in the period of

Hezekiah, that is two hundred and seventy years after the death of

the

Prophet Solomon. Similarly the Gospel of Mark, the Gospel of Luke

and nineteen chapters of the Book of Acts were written through the

oral tradition.

|

We have also discussed that things and events of special signifi-

cance usually make permanent impressions on people own minds, and

that the followers of the Companions had already started compiling

books of the traditions in their own period though their

arrangement

of chapters was not according to the method adopted by the

jurispru-

dents. Subsequently their disciples compiled the books of

Traditions

according to the standard arrangement of the jurisprudents.

Thereafter

the great Imams, al-Bukhari and Muslim, compiled their great works.

They included only the hadiths that were sahih, excluding all the

reports of weaker authenticity. These authors reported the

Traditions,

citing all the authorities right from themselves to the Holy

Prophet.

The Asma" al-Rijal, that is the complete life-records of thousands

of

reporters of hadiths, was collected by them enabling us to know

everything about each and every reporter of a hadith. Any objection

against the authenticity of hadiths on this ground, therefore, is

not

valid.

|

Their contention that the Traditions were collected by the people

much later through hearing them from the reporters, and that about

the half of such traditions were rejected by them for not being

authen-

tic, is simply not valid. They did not reject even a single hadith

that

was authentic. Any report supported by an unbroken chain of

reporters is called mutawatir which is technically the most

authentic

report and makes an injunction obligatory for the Muslims. They,

however, rejected only those reports that were found to have incom

plete transmission. This rejection cannot be objectionable to any

sen\_

sible person. We have already reproduced the following testimony of

Adam Clarke earlier in this book. He said:

|

It has been established that many false gospels were in

vogue in the early centuries of Christianity. This profusion of

untrue and false reports made Luke feel there was a necessity

to compile a new gospel. The number of such false gospels is

stated to have been more than seventy. Fabricius collected the

existing portions of these false gospels in three volumes.

|

Third Objection

|

They also contend that most of the hadiths do not correspond to

reality. We confidently claim that none of the sahih hadiths can be

presented as having anything against reason and reality. As for the

descriptions of miracles and realities related to the metaphysical

world like Hell and Paradise, these cannot be rejected simply

because

they are beyond our senses. Therefore any claim of disbelief in

these

realities requires more convincing ARGUMENTs. And if they

disbelieve

in them merely because such things are uncommon and rare, this

makes the objection invalid because if miracles become common-

place and a norm"al practice they are no longer miracles. The staff

turning into a serpent, its swallowing up all the serpents of the

magi-

cians, then its turning back into a staff is not a norm or a

common-

place.

|

Likewise it would be wrong to judge metaphysical realities by the

standards of our physical world. Anything related to the Hereafter,

however, can be denied only on the basis of clear and undeniable

ARGUMENTs. In the absence of such ARGUMENTs no one should deny the

existence of anything in the Hereafter.

|

It cannot be denied that some realities are unique and peculiar to

certain parts of the earth, and anyone belonging to another part

who

hears of those things that are absolutely strange to him finds it

diffi-

cult to believe in, and sometimes refuses to accept the existence

of those realities until he is incessantly informed of it by the

people.

imilarly some realties seem incredible in one period and become

ormal practice in another. Recent conquest of distance through car-

riages. locomotives and steamships was unimaginable for the people

of the past while it is a matter of routine in our times.

|

We fail to understand how the Christians can justify to themselves

their denial of everything that they do not understand. They reject

this

irrational behaviour when it comes from those they call heretics,

but

their own books are full of it. They treat the Muslims in the same

way. The heretics, who rejected the doctrines and the traditions of

the

Christians for being against reason, in fact showed more sense than

the Christians who failed to put any sense into their objections

against

the hadiths.

|

It is of interest to quote some examples of those passages in the

Bible which were rejected and laughed at by the heretics.

|

1. The Book of Numbers 22:28-30 says:

|

And the Lord opened the mouth of the ass, and she said

unto Balaam,l What have I done unto thee, that thou hast

smitten me these three times? And Balaam said unto the ass,

Because thou hast mocked me: I would there were a sword in

my hand, for now would I kill thee. And the ass said unto

Balaam, Am not I thine ass ... unto this day? Was I ever wont

to do so unto thee? And he said, Nay.

|

Horne said on page 636 of volume 2 of his commentary that the

infidels denied the truth of an ass speaking with a man. They make

a

mockery of this event.

|

2. I Kings, chapter 17, contains an account of how some ravens

kept feeding the prophet Elijah with bread and meat. This event is

considered to be gossip by various Christians denounced as

heretics.

Horne, the famous commentator, agreed with them, as we have dis-

cussed earlier in this book.

|

3. The book of Ezekiel 4:4-12 contains the following:

|

Lie thou also upon thy left side, and lay the iniquity of

the house of Israel upon it: according to the number of the

days that thou shalt lie upon it thou shalt bear their iniquity.

For I have laid upon thee the years of their iniquity, ... accord-

ing to the number of the days, three hundred and ninety days:

so shalt thou bear the iniquity of the house of Israel. And

when thou hast accomplished them, lie again on thy right

side, and thou shalt bear the iniquity of the house of Judah

forty days: I have appointed thee each day for a year.

Therefore thou shalt set thy face toward the siege of

Jerusalem, and thine arm shall be uncovered and thou shalt

prophesy against it. And behold, I will lay hands upon thee,

and thou shalt not turn thee from one side to another, till thou

hast ended the days of the siege.

|

Take thou also unto thee wheat, and barley, and beans,

and lentiles, and millet, and fitches, and put them in one ves-

sel, and make thee bread thereof, according to the number of

the days that thou shalt lie upon thy side, three hundred and

ninety days shalt thou eat thereof. And thy meat which thou

shalt eat shall be by weight, twenty shekels a day: from time

to time shalt thou eat it. Thou shalt drink also water by mea-

sure, the sixth part of a hin: from time to time shalt thou

drink. And thou shalt eat it as barley cakes, and thou shalt

bake it with dung that cometh out of man in their sight.

|

The Prophet Ezekiel has been enjoined in the above verse to per-

form the following three acts:

|

1. He should sleep on his left side for three hundred and ninety

days and bear the sins of the Israelites. Then he should lie on

his right side for forty days to bear the perversion of the house

of Judah.

|

2. He should face towards the siege of Jerusalem with his arms

bound and uncovered; and until the siege is over he should not

turn from one side to another.

|

He should eat bread baked with dung of man for three hundred

and ninety days.

|

Some Christians, denounced as heretics, make a joke of these

injunctions and deny them being revealed by God. They claim that

the above injunctions are absurd and against human reason. God is

far

from asking his Prophet to eat bread with dung for three hundred

and

ninety days. Was there nothing else for him to eat?

|

They may, however, contend that the dung of the pure is also pure.

This is what apparently seems to have been believed by Paul and is

understood from his epistle to Titus 1:15.1

|

Besides, the above passage is contradicted by 18:20 of the same

book of Ezekiel where it says:

|

The son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, neither

shall the father bear the iniquity of the son: the righteousness

of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the

wicked shall be upon him.

|

This refutes the commandment given to Ezekiel of having to bear

the sins of Israel and Judah for four hundred and thirty days.

|

4. Also he was commanded by God to walk naked and barefoot for

three years as described in the book of Isaiah 20:3:

|

And the Lord said, Like my servant Isaiah hath walked

naked and barefoot three years.

|

Some of the Christians also mock and laugh at this saying that God

cannot have commanded His Prophet, a perfectly sensible man, to

walk naked before all men and women for three years.

|

5. We find written in the book of Hosea 1:2:

|

Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms and children of

whoredoms.

|

Again in 3:1 of the same book we read:

|

Go yet, love a women beloved of her friend, yet an adul-

teress.

|

Contrary to the above the following commandment appears in

Leviticus 21:13-14 with regard to the holiness of the priests:

|

And he shall take a wife in her virginity. A widow, or a

divorced woman, or profane, or an harlot, these shall he not

take: but he shall take a virgin of his own people to wife.

|

Again in the Gospel of Matthew 5:28 we read the following:

|

Whosoever looketh on a women to lust after her hath

committed adultery with her already in his heart.

|

In the presence of the above commandments it seems impossible

that God could have commanded His Prophet to take a whore for a

wife. There are many other such inconsistent passages which can be

seen in their books.

|

Fourth Objection

|

Another objection they posit against the hadiths is that many

hadiths are in opposition to the Koran. For instance, they claim

that

the Koran testifies to the fact that Muhammad did not perform any

miracles while the hadiths speak of innumerable miracles performed

by him. The Koran speaks of Muhammad as having committed sins

while the hadiths claim he was perfectly innocent. Similarly the

Koran declares that in the beginning Muhammad was ignorant and

misguided (may Allah forbid) which they claim is indicated by cer-

tain Koranic verses in surahs Al-Shu"ara and Al-Dhuha: that is:

|

Thou knewest not (before) what was the Book and the

faith but we have made it (the Koran) a light wherewith we

guide whom we will of our servants.

|

The other verse reads as follows:

|

And did He not found thee wandering then guide thee?2

|

The above verse, according to them, has indicated that in the

beginning he was without faith and knowledge, while the hadiths

speak of him as being created with Iman which is indicated by many

miracles which appeared through him.

|

The first two aspects of this objection related to miracles and his

sins will be discussed in a later section, the most proper place

for

them as that is the section specially reserved for the examination

of

all objections against the status of the hadiths.

|

Here we will deal with the objections derived by them from the

Koranic verses quoted above. Let us discuss the second verse

first.

|

The word dhall (misguidance) in the second verse does not signify

deviation from the path of faith in a way that indicates

infidelity. This

verse has a background and therefore has been interpreted

differently

by the exegetes. An authentic report from the Holy Prophet goes:

|

Once, in my boyhood, I was separated from my grandfa-

ther and lost my way. I was so hungry that my life was endan-

gered, until Allah helped me find the right path.3

|

The verse is said to refer to this event.

|

Secondly, the verse in question has been interpreted to say that

Allah found the Prophet unaware of Islamic law and He gave that

knowledge to him through His revelation later on. That is to say,

Allah guided the Prophet through the minor or the major

revelation. Baydawi and the Jalalayn say that it means that Allah

found him

unaware of the knowledge of injunctions, and then gave him this

knowledge through His revelation. The same kind of statement is

found about the Prophet Moses in the following Koranic verse:

|

I did that when I was in error. I

|

The same Arabic word dhall is used here. In Arabic this word has

a variety of of meanings, for instance, it is used to mean mixed

with

something. For example, it is said, "The water mixed (dhall) with

milk."

|

In view of this idiom the verse might mean that Allah found him

mixed with the associators of Makka without being distinct from

them, Allah made him powerful and he preached guidance. The Holy

Koran has used this word in the above sense in the following

verse:

|

Once we are mixed (dhall) with earth how can we then

|

be created anew?

|

Fourthly, the word dhall in the above verse may also signify that

the Holy Prophet could not even think of being honoured with

prophethood, and to him it seemed impossible because the Christians

and the Jews had firm belief that prophethood was confined exclu-

sively to the Children of Israel, then Allah honoured him with it.

|

Fifthly, he did not know or guess that he would be commanded to

migrate from Makka, then Allah sent his commandment for migration

which proved to be a great event in history.

|

Sixthly, the word dhau is also often used for a tree that is found

alone and isolated in a desert. In this sense the verse would mean

that

Arabia was a lonely and deserted place where no tree of faith,

except

the Holy Prophet, existed, that is to say, Allah said to him: We

found

you alone and isolated, then we guided the people through you. This

is also confirmed by the following saying of the Holy Prophet:

|

A point of wisdom is the lost property of the mu"min

(belever).

|

Another interpretation of this verse is that the Holy Prophet

had a

keen desire that the Ka"bah should be appointed as qiblah (orienta-

tion) for the Muslims. Since he had no knowledge that his desire

would soon be granted by Allah, this lack of knowledge has been

expressed by the word dhall. Later the Holy Koran informed him in

these words:

|

We will make you turn towards a qiblah that will please

|

you.

|

The word dhall has also been used to signify love and affection, as

in the following verse:

|

You are surely in your old illusion (dhall).l

|

This would imply that the verse in question refers to the love of

the Holy Prophet for Allah and says that, as a return for this

love,

Allah guided him to His commandments so that he might draw closer

to Allah through them.

|

The verse has also been interpreted to say that Allah found the

Holy Prophet helpless and unsupported among his people in Makka.

They persecuted and did not respect him. Allah gave him power and

strength through his mission and gave him authority over them.

|

The tenth interpretation of this verse is that he had no knowledge

of the Heavens before, through his Ascension, he was guided by

Allah to knowledge of them.

|

The word dhall is also used in the Koran for forgetting. The Holy

Prophet was so much overawed in the presence of Allah, on the night

of Ascension, that he forgot to praise Allah, then Allah Himself

reminded him of the proper prayer and then he praised Allah. The

following Koranic verse is an example of such use of this word in

the above sense:

So that if either of them forget, the other will remember.l

|

Sheikh Junayd said that the verse has referred to the difficulty in

which the Holy Prophet found himself in explaining the meaning of

the Koranic verses, then Allah taught him the proper way to

explain

the injunctions. The following verse bears witness to this:

|

And we revealed to you the Reminder (Koran) so that

you may make clear to men what has been revealed to them.2

|

The following verse also supports this view:

|

And do not move your tongue (with the revelation) so

that you may hasten (to preserve) it. It is for Us to see its col-

lection and recital. When We read it, follow its recital. Again

it is for Us to explain it.3

|

The following Koranic verse gives the word in another sense:

|

Your companion is neither in error (dhall), nor is he

deceived.4

|

Here the word dhall is used to negate error in thought or action on

the part of the Holy Prophet, saying that neither did he commit

error

of thought, that is unbelief, nor of action, that is misdeed.

|

Now as far as the second verse, speaking of the Prophet own igno-

rance of the Koran and faith, is concerned, it simply refers to

the

unawareness of the Holy Prophet with regard to Koranic injunctions

prior to their revelation. It is, no doubt, correct that the Holy

Prophet

always had an undefined faith in the unity of Allah, tawhid. He was

unaware of the detailed injunctions with regard to tawhid and other

Islamic laws until the Holy Koran imparted this knowledge to him.

|

Fifth Objection

|

Another objection against the authenticity of the hadiths is that

hadiths are inconsistent with each other.

|

We may point out that the hadiths included in the Sihah (the six

collections of the sahih hadiths) are the only books that are

consid-

ered authentic among the Muslims. The hadiths contained in other

books are believed to be inauthentic in the same way that seventy

gospels current in the early centuries of Christianity are not

consid-

ered authentic thus precluding any confrontation of those gospels

with the present ones.

|

Any apparent inconsistency ever found in sahih hadiths can usual-

ly be resolved with a little thought. Besides, it can never be as

serious

as are those specific examples that we have reproduced in the first

part of this book. The nature of the difference or inconsistency in

the

sahih hadiths presented by the Christians are of the kind that is

pre-

sent in every chapter of the Old Testament. Some of those denounced

as heretics by Protestant scholars have collected many such

inconsis-

tencies with their mocking remarks. Curious readers may refer to

their books.

|

We reproduce below some statements with regard to God and His

attributes from the Old and the New Testaments. These statements

are

enough to show that they depict God as being inferior to man,

ascrib-

ing to Him many things that are simply defied by human reason. We

have reproduced these examples from the book of John Clark, 1839,

and from Ecce Homo, printed in London, 1813.

|

They are reproduced here to show that the objections raised by the

Christians against the authentic hadiths are of little significance

com-

pared to the serious objections against their Holy books raised by

their co-religionists called heretics. We express our complete dis-

agreement with the views held by both parties, the Christians and

the

heretics, and thank our Lord for having saved us from such absurdi-

ties.

|

Contradictions of the Bible as Presented by Heretics

|

1. Psalm 145:8-9 has:

|

The Lord is gracious, and full of compassion; slow to

anger, and of great mercy. The Lord is good to all.

|

This is contradicted by the following statement in I Samuel 6:19:

|

And He smote the men of Beth-she-mesh, because they

had looked into the ark of the Lord, even He smote of the

people fifty thousand and threescore and ten men.

|

Note how easily their Lord killed fifty thousand and seventy men

simply for the fault of looking into the ark. Would He still be

called

gracious and compassionate as claimed by the first statement?

|

2. We read the following statement in Deuteronomy 32:10:

|

He found him in a desert land, and in the waste howling

wilderness; he led him about, he instructed him, he kept him

as the apple of his eye.l

|

And in the book of Numbers 25:3-4 we find this statement:

|

And the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel.

And the Lord said unto Moses, Take all the heads of the peo-

ple, and hang them up before the Lord against the sun, that

the fierce anger of the Lord may be turned away from Israel.

|

See how the Lord kept them as the apple of his eye by command-

ing Moses to hang all the chiefs and killing twenty-four thousand

people.

|

3. It says in Deuteronomy 8:5:

|

Thou shalt also consider in thine heart, that, as a man

|

1. The Prophet Moses is speaking of Cod own grace and kindness to the

Israelites.

|

chasteneth his son, so the the Lord thy God chasteneth thee.

|

And in the book of Numbers 11:33 we read:

|

And while the flesh was yet between their teeth, ere it

was chewed, the wrath of the Lord was kindled against the

people ... with a very great plague.

|

The contradiction found between the two passages is obvious and

requires no comment.

|

4. The book of Micah 7:18 speaks of God in these words:

|

He delighteth in mercy.

|

On the other hand Deuteronomy 7:2 has:

|

And when the Lord thy God shall deliver them before

thee; thou shalt smite them, and utterly destroy them; thou

shalt make no covenant with them, nor show mercy unto

them.

|

Also in verse 16 of the same chapter we find this statement:

|

And thou shalt consume all the people which the Lord thy

God shall deliver thee, thine eye shall have no pity upon

them.

|

The second statement obviously negates the first statement.

|

5. We find in the Epistle of James 5

|

And have seen the end of the Lord; that the Lord is very

pitiful, and of tender mercy.

|

And the book of Hosea 13:16 says:

|

Samaria shall become desolate; for she hath rebelled

against her God: they shall fall by the sword: their infants

shall be dashed in pieces, and their women with child shall be

|

ripped up.

|

Is there any act more inexorable and severe than killing infants

and ripping up pregnant women?l

|

6. We find in the Book of Lamentations 3:33:

|

For he doth not afflict willingly nor grieve the children of

men.

|

But his unwillingness for the grief of people is negated by the

event described in I Samuel chapter 5, where he is described as

hav-

ing killed the people of a great city, Ashdod, through "the disease

of

emerods in their secret part."2

|

Similarly, according to the tenth chapter of Joshua:

|

The Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them

unto Azekah, and they died; they were more killed with hail-

stones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the

sword.3

|

Also we read in chapter 21 of the Book of Numbers that God sent

fiery serpents among the people and a great number of the

Israelites

died of their bites.4

|

7. We find the following statement in I Chronicles 16:41:

|

Because his mercy endureth for ever.

|

r ,nl we read in Psalm 145:9:

|

The Lord is good to all: and his tender mercies are over

all his works.

|

But His enduring mercy over His works is plainly negated by the

historical event of Noah own flood in which all human beings and ani-

mals, except those present in the Ark with Noah, were killed.

Similarly the people of Sodom and Gomorrah were destroyed by

brimstone and fire, as described in Genesis 19.

|

8. In Deuteronomy 24:16 it says:

|

The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, nei-

ther shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every

man shall be put to death for his own sin.

|

This is contradicted by the event described in II Samuel, chapter

2,

where the Prophet David is stated to have delivered seven men to

the

Gibeonites so that they may be killed for the sin committed by

Saul. It

becomes more serious when we know that David had made a pact

with Saul that none of his family would be killed after his death.

This

can be ascertained from chapter 24 of I Samuel.

|

9. The book of Exodus 34:7 has:

|

Visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and

upon the children own children, unto the third and to the fourth

generation.

|

This is negated by Ezekiel 18:20:

|

The soul that sinneth, it shall die. The son shall not bear

the iniquity of the father, neither shall the father bear the iniq-

uity of the son: the righteousness of the righteous shall be

upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon

him.

|

According to the above statement, sons are not responsible for the

sins of their fathers, but this is refuted in the first statement.

The fol-

lowing statement in I Samuel 15:2-3 further says that sons will be

responsible for the sins of their fathers through generations:

|

Thus saith the Lord of hosts, I remember that which

Amalekl did to Israel, how he laid wait for him in the way

when he came up from Egypt. Now go and smite Amalek

and utterly destroy all that they have, and spare them not; but

slay both man and woman, infant and suckling, ox and sheep,

camel and ass.

|

The above statement makes us understand that, after about four

hundred years, God remembered what the Amalekites had done to

Israel. Now he commands the Israelites to kill men and women

infants and sucklings, sheep and oxen and asses of the present

gener-

ation of Amalekites for the sin of their forefathers. Further than

this,

God regretted the creation of Saul because he did not act on this

com-

mandment. The story does not end here. The Son, the second god,

went even further, he commanded the sons to bear the punishment of

their fathers after four thousand years. We read in Matthew

23:35-36:

|

That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed

upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the

blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, who ye slew between

the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, All these

things shall come upon this generation.

|

Then the Father, the first god, takes this responsibility even

further

and makes all the human beings present in Christ own time responsible

for the sin committed by Adam. According to Luke there are more

than seventy generations from Adam to Jesus. The father-god decided

|

1. The Amalek were a strong people. They stopped the Prophet Moses

and the

Israelites in their way at the time of the Exodus. The Prophet

Moses commanded

Joshua to fight them and h- defeated them. (Exodus 17:8-13) War was

declared

against them forever. (Exodus 17:16 and Deut. 25:17) Saul waged war

against them.

(I Samuel 14:48,15:8) The Prophet David killed their chief (27:9

and 30:17). Some

parts of this event have been confirmed by the Koran. (Taqi)

that until the original sin committed by Adam had been atoned for

in

some proper way, mankind would not be redeemed from the fires of

hell. Then he found no other way than having his son, the second

god,

crucified by the Jews. He could not think of a better way of

redemp-

tion for the people. He did not even hear the loud cry of his son

at the

time of his crucifixion." He cried for help in vain until he died.

Even

after his death he went to no other place than to hell.

|

We may point out here that it is not proved by any book of the Old

Testament that Zacharias the son of Barachias was killed between

the

temple and the altar. However we find it reported in II Chronicles

24:21, that Zechariah, the son of Jehoiada, was stoned to death in

the

court of the Temple in the reign of Joash. Then Joash own servants

killed him in his bed for Zechariah own blood.l The Gospel of Matthew

changed the name Jehoiada for Barachias and thus has distorted the

text. This is why Luke has reported the name of Zacharias without

the

name of his father.3

|

1. See Math 27:33-51, Luke 15:22,38,44,46, Marks 15:22-38. John

19:17-19.

|

1. II Chronicles 24:25.

|

3. It was Zechariah the son of Jehoiada who was killed, and not

Zacharias the son

of Barachias as reported by Matthew. The exegetes of the Bible are

highly embar-

rassed at this place and have presented strange and implausible

explanations for it.

R.A Knox, for instance, said that the person who was killed in the

house of the Lord

was Zechariah the son of Jehoiada. He thinks that Barachias must

have been one of

the forefathers of Jehoiada to whom Zechariah has been attributed,

because at two

other places Zechariah is mentioned as being the son of Barachias

(See Isaiah 8:2 and

Zechariah 1:1)

|

Later after more investigations another similar event was traced in

history that

one Zechariah the son of Baruch was also unfairly killed. This

incident belongs to the

period much before the fall of Jerusalem in 70 AD as decided by the

historian

Josephus. It may, therefore, be an addition from some enthusiastic

copier of the

gospel of Matthew. He might have added the name Barachias here,

presuming that

Christ would have known the event was to happen in the future, in

86 AD.

|

Both the above explanations by Knox are so obviously far removed

and unfound-

ed that they require no serious refutation. The second explanation

is even more

ridiculous as the event reported by Matthew is related to the past

and not the future.

His claim that Barachias would have been a remote forefather of

Jehoiada is again a

claim unsupported by ARGUMENT. And his reference to Isaiah 8:2 and

Zechariah 1:1

are wrong because the man described there is a totally different

person. The English

translation of the Bible, Knox version, has a marginal note at this

place admitting that

Isaiah 8:2 and Zechariah 1:1 are not relevent references. (Taqi)

|

The above nine examples are enough to negate the statement pro-

claiming God own mercy and kindness.

|

10. Psalm 30:5 says:

|

For his anger endureth but a moment.

|

The Book of Numbers 32:13 contains this statement:

|

And the Lord own anger was kindled against Israel, and he

made them wander in the wilderness forty years, until all the

generation, that had done evil in the sight of the Lord, was

consumed.

|

The contradiction in the above two statements is obvious.

|

11. Genesis 17:1 says:

|

I am the Almighty God.

|

While in Judges 1:19 we read this statement:

|

And the Lord was with Judah; and he drave out the

inhabitants of the mountain: but could not drive out the

inhabitants of the valley, because they had chariots of iron.

|

God, who is not powerful enough to drive out people simply

because they had chariots of iron, cannot claim to be Almighty.

|

12. The Book of Deuteronomy 10: 17 says:

|

For the Lord your God is God of gods, and Lord of lords,

a great God, a mighty, and a terrible.

|

The above is contradicted by Amos, 2:13:

|

Behold, I am pressed under you, as a cart is pressed that

is full of sheaves.l

|

The Persian translation also has the same statement. Is it not

strange that the God of gods, the Mighty and Great so helplessly

remains pressed under the Israelites?

|

13. Isaiah 40:28 says:

|

That the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the

ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary?

|

Contrary to this we read in Judges 5:23:

|

Curse ye Meroz, said the angel of the Lord, curse ye bit-

terly the inhabitants thereof; because they came not to the

help of the Lord, to the help of the Lord against the mighty.

|

See how the "everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator" is cursing

those who did not come to help him against mighty people.

Also we read in Malachi 3:9:

|

Ye are cursed with a curse; for ye have robbed me, even

this whole nation.

|

This verse also makes us understand that God was so weak and

helpless as to be robbed by the Israelites.2

|

14. The Book of Proverbs 15:3 says:

|

The eyes of the Lord are in every place.

|

Genesis 3:9 speaks differently about God:

|

And the Lord God called unto Adam, and said unto

him,Where art thou?

|

The all-seeing God was not able to see Adam who had hidden

himself behind a tree.

|

15. II Chronicles 16:9 says:

|

For the eyes of the Lord run to and fro throughout the

whole earth.

|

Again Genesis 11:5 negates the above:

|

And the Lord came down to see the city and the tower,

which the children of men builded.

|

He had to come down to see the city and the tower, and was

unable to see them from where He was (may God forbid).

|

16. Psalm 139:2 says:

|

Thou knowest my downsitting and mine uprising, thou

understandest my thought afar off.

|

This lets us understand that God knows every thing and every act

of His creation, but in the book of Genesis 18:20-21 we come to

this

statement:

|

And the Lord said, Because the cry of Sodom and

Gomorrah is great, and because their sin is very grievous; I

will go down now, and see whether they have done altogether

according to the cry of it, which is come unto me; and if not, I

will know.

|

God again was unable to know if the cry of the people of Sodom

and Gomorrah was real or not. He had to come down to know the

fact.

|

17. Psalm 139:6 says:

|

Such knowledge is too wonderful for me; it is high, I can-

not attain unto it.

|

God has again been reported to have such limited knowledge as

not to know what to do to the Israelites until they put off their

dress.

Again the book of Exodus 16:4 says:

|

Then said the Lord unto Moses, Behold, I will rain bread

from heaven for you; and the people shall go out and gather a

certain rate every day, that I may prove them, whether they

will walk in my law, or no.

|

And it says in Deuteronomy 8:2:

|

And thou shalt remember all the way which the Lord thy

God led thee these forty years in the wilderness, to humble

thee, and to prove thee, to know what was in thy heart,

whether thou wouldest keep his commandments, or no.

|

The implication of this statement does not require much thought.

God cannot be dependent on anything for knowing the minds of His

creation.

|

18. The book of Malachi 3:6 contains:

|

For I am the Lord, I change not.

|

Numbers 22:20-23 tells a different story:

|

And God came unto Balaam at night, and said unto him,

If the men come to call thee, rise up, and go with them; but

yet the word which I shall say unto thee, that shalt thou do.

And Balaam rose up in the morning, and saddled his ass, and

went with the princes of Moab. And God own anger was kindled

because he went.

|

It is very strange that God first commanded Balaam to go with the

|
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Moabites, then His anger kindled against him simply because he went

with them.

|

19. The following text appears in the Epistle of James 1:17:

|

Father of lights, with whom is no variableness, neither

shadow of turning.

|

We already know that God gave his commandment for the obser-

vation of the Sabbath forever," but the Christians have changed it

to

Sunday. Therefore they must admit the change in God own command-

ment.

|

20. Genesis 1:21 speaks of the creation of the heavens and stars

and says:

|

God saw that it was good.

|

While in the book of Job 15:15 we read:

|

Yea, the heavens are not clean in his sight.

|

And the book of Leviticus, chapter 11 speaks of many animals as

being unclean and prohibited.

|

21. The book of Ezekiel 18:25 says:

|

Hear now, O, house of Israel; Is not my way equal? Are

not your ways unequal?

|

The book of Malachi 1:2 says:

|

I have loved you, saith the Lord. Yet ye say, Wherein hast

thou loved us? Was not Esau Jacob own brother, saith the Lord:

yet I loved Jacob, And I hated Esau, and laid his mountains

and his heritage waste for the dragons of the wilderness.

|

Here God is reported as hating Esau and destroying his heritage

with none of his fault. This negates the former verse speaking of

his

being equal.

|

22. The book of Revelations 15:3 says:

|

Great and marvelous are thy works, Lord God Almighty.

|

But we find this statement in Ezekiel 20:25:

|

Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good,

and judgements whereby they should not live.

|

23. Psalm 119:68 has:

|

Thou are good, and doest good: teach me thy statutes.

|

And Judges 9:23 has:

|

Then God sent an evil spirit between Abimelech and the

men of Shechem; and the men of Shechem dealt treacherous-

ly with Abimelech.

|

God sent the evil spirit to create dissension between the two peo-

ples.

|

24. There are many verses that clearly speak of the prohibition of

adultery." If we believe the statements made by many priests, it

would

require that God Himself committed adultery (God forbid) with the

wife of Joseph the carpenter whereby she conceived a child. The

heretics make highly aggressive, shameful and derogatory remarks

against God at this point. The very thought of this makes a

sensible

man shudder.

|

Just for example I confine myself to one statement from Ecce

Homo. This heretic said in his book, printed 1813, on page 44:

The Gospel named "Nativity of Mary", now considered as

one of the false gospels, has reported that Mary was dedicat-

ed to serve the House of the Lord. She remained there for six-

teen years. Father Jerome, believing this statement, has

explained that perhaps Mary conceived the child through

some priest, and he might have taught Mary to attribute it to

the Holy Ghost.....

|

Further he said:

|

There are many absurd traditions in vogue among the

idolaters. For example, they believe that Minerval was their

Lord, Minerva was born of Jupiter own mind. Bacchus was in

Jupiter own thigh and Fo of the Chinese was conceived through

the rays of the Sun.

|

Another similar statement, relevant to this place, has been repro-

duced by John Milner in his book of 1838:

|

Joanna Southcott claimed to have received inspiration

from God and declared that she was the woman of whom

God said in Genesis 3:15:

|

It shall bruise thy head.

|

And that Revelations 12:1-2 says the following about her:

|

And then appeared a great wonder in heaven; a

woman clothed with the sun, and the moon under her

feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars: And

she being with child cried, travailing in birth, and

|

1. The Romans believed Minerva to be their goddess in the period

before Christ.

Up to 207 BC there was a temple in her name in Rome, and they used

to celeberate

her day on l9th March every year (Britauica vol 15, pages 533)

|

Jupiter, the great God of the Romans according to their belief, was

God of rains

etc. Some old temples erected in its name are still present in

Rome. The most pious

man among them was believed to be the vicegerent of Jupiter. The

people used to

celeberate the day of Jupiter on 13th Sept every year. (Briannica

vol 13. pages 187

and 188.)

|

pained to be delivered.

|

We never hear whether she delivered that child or not, and if she

did, was he divine like Jesus or not. In case he was God, did he

change the trinity into four gods, and was the father god the

Grandfather?

|

25. Numbers 23:19 says:

|

God is not a man that he should lie; neither the son of

man, that he should repent.

|

But we read in Genesis 6:6-7:

|

And it repented the Lord that he had made man on the

earth, and it grieved him at his heart. And the Lord said, I

will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the

earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the

fowls of the air, for it repenteth me that I have made them.

|

26. The book of I Samuel 15:29 says:

|

And also the Strength of Israel will not lie nor repent: for

he is not a man that he should repent.

|

And verses 10 and 11 of the same chapter contain:

|

Then came the word of the Lord unto Samuel, saying, It

repented me that I have set up Saul to be king: for he is

tumed back from following me, and hath not performed my

commandments. And it grieved Samuel; and he cried unto the

Lord all night.

|

27. The Book of Proverbs 12:22 has:

|

Lying lips are abomination to the Lord.

|

But Exodus 3:17-18 says:

|

And I have said, I will bring you up out of affliction of

Egypt unto the land of Canaanites, and the Hinites, and the

Amorites, and the Perizzites, and the Hivites, and the

Jebusites, unto a land flowing with milk and honey. And they

shall hearken to thy voice: and thou shalt come, thou and the

elders of Israel, unto the king of Egypt, and ye shall say unto

him, The Lord God of the Hebrews hath met with us: and

now let us go, we bcseech thee, three days" joumey into the

wildemess that we may sacrifice to the Lord our God.

|

Also in 5:3 of the same book we read:

|

And they said, The God of the Hebrews hath met with us:

let us go, we pray thee, three days" joumey into the desert,

and sacrifice unto the Lord our God; lest he fall upon us with

re.tilen. nr with hlo cwrr

|

And in 11:2 of the same book God has been reported to have

addressed Moses in these words:

|

Speak now in the ears of the people, and let every man

borrow of his neighbour, and every woman of her neighbour,

jewels of silver and jewels of gold.

|

Again in Exodus 12:35 we read:

|

And the children of Israel did according to the word of

Moses; and they borrowed of the Egyptians jewels of silver

and jewels of gold, and raiment.

|

It is strange that God, who is reported to hate falsehood, has

Himself commanded his Prophets, Moses and Aaron, to lie before

Pharaoh. Similarly every man and woman treacherously borrowed

jewels from their neighbours by the commandments of their Prophet.

There are many verses of the Pentateuch insisting on respect for

the

rights of one own neighbours. Do the Christians believe God teaches

them fraud and deception?

And also we read in I Samuel 16:1-4, God speaking with Samuel:

|

Fill thine hom with oil, and go, I wiu send thee to Jesse,

the Beth-lehemite: for I have provided me a king among his

sons. And Samuel said, How can I go? If Saul hear it, he will

kill me. And the Lord said, Take an heifer with thee, and say I

am come to sacrifice to the Lord ..And Samuel did that

which the Lord spake, and came to Beth-lehem.

|

Obviously God commanded Samuel to lie, as he was sent to find a

king and not to sacrifice to the Lord.

|

28. Jeremiah 9:24 says:

|

I am the Lord which exercise loving-kindness, judge-

ment, and righteousness.

|

Though these qualities have already been negated by the above

statements of the Bible, let us, however, have a view of his judge-

ment. Ezekiel 21:3-4 says:

|

And say to the land of Israel, Thus saith the Lord;

Behold, I am against thee, and will draw forth my sword out

of his sheath, and will cut off from thee the righteous and the

wicked. Seeing then that I will cut off from thee the righteous

and the wicked, therefore shall my sword go forth out of his

sheath against all flesh from the south to the north.

|

The killing of the righteous cannot be justified by any sensible

soul.

Jeremiah 13:13-14 has this statement of God:

|

Then shalt thou say unto them, Thus saith the Lord.

Behold, I will fill all the inhabitants of this land, even the

kings that sit upon David own throne, and the priests, and the

prophets, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, with drunken-

ness. And I will dash them one against the other, even the

fathers and the sons together, ... nor spare, nor have mercy,

but destroy them.

|

Is this the divine justice claimed by the former statement? This

act

|

of filling the people with drunkenness and then killing all the

inhabi-

tants of the land without showing mercy is a rare kind of justice

shown by God.

The book of Exodus 12:29 has this statement: I

|

And it came to pass, that at midnight the Lord smote all

the firstborn in the land of Egypt, from the flrstborn of

Pharaoh that sat on his throne, unto the firstborn of the cap-

tive that was in the dungeon; and all the firstbom of cattle.

|

This presents another example of God own justice that he killed thou-

sands of the innocent infants. I

|

29. Ezekiel 18:23 says:

|

Have I any pleasure at all that the wicked should die?

saith the Lord God: and not that he should return from his

ways, and live?

|

Also 33:11 of the same book has said:

|

Say unto them, As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no

pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn

from his way and live.

|

Both the above verses are clear in saying that Allah does not like

the death of the wicked but that they should repent and live a good

life for their salvation. However, we find the. following statement

in

Joshua 11:20:

|

It was God who hardened their hearts .........that He might

destroy them utterly.

|

30. I Timothy 2:4 has:

|

1. This is the translation of the text of Izhaul Haqq. The verse

according to the

King James version is this: "For it was of the Lord to harden their

hearts, that they

should come agariist Israel in baule, he might destroy them

utterly." (Taqi)

|

Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the

knowledge of the truth.

|

But in II Thessalonians 2 12 we read as follows:

|

And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion,

that they should believe a lie: That they all might be damned

who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteous-

ness.

|

31. The book of Proverbs 21:18 contains:

|

The wicked shall be ransom for the righteous, and the

transgressor for the upright.

|

But the First Epistle of John 2:2 has the following statement:

|

And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for our own

only but also for the sins of the whole world.

|

The former verse makes us understand that wicked people shall be

the ransom of the righteous, while the latter verse speaks of

Christ

having become the ransom for the sins of the whole world.

|

Some Christian priests say that the Muslims do not have any

atonement for their sins. This is wrong for many reasons. Christ is

the

propitiation of the sins of the whole world. The Muslims, who

believe

in the pure unity of Allah, and believe in the prophethood of Jesus

and in the truth and chastity of his mother, Mary, should more

reason-

ably deserve redemption of their sins. In actual fact, they are the

only

people on earth who are true believers in Allah and his Prophets.

|

32. The book of Exodus 20:13-14 has:

|

Thou shalt not kill. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

|

But in the book of Zechariah 14:2 we read this statement:

|

I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle; and

the city shall be taken, and the houses rifled, and the women

|

?avished.

T

|

Thus God is reported as gathering all the nations to get his own

people killed and get their women ravished. The former verse speaks

just contrary to it.

|

33. Habakkuk 1:13 has:

|

Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not

look on equity.

|

Whereas Isaiah 45:7 has:

|

I form the light, and create darkness; I make peace, and

create evil. I the Lord do all these things.

|

34. Psalm 34:15-18 says:

|

The eyes of the Lord are upon the righteous, and his ears

are open unto their cry .... The righteous cry, and the Lord

heareth, and delivereth them out of all their troubles. The

Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart; and saveth

such as be of a contrite spirit.

|

But Psalm 22:1-2 speaks as follows:

|

My God, My God, why hast thou forsaken me? why art

thou so far from helping me, and from the words of my roar-

ing? O my God, I cry in the daytime, but thou hearest not;

and in the night season and am not silent.

|

The Gospel of Matthew 27:46 has:

|

And about the ninth hour Jesus cried with a loud voice,

saying, Eli, Eli, lama sabachthani? that is to say, My God, my

God, why hast thou forsaken me?

|

We may be allowed to ask if the Prophet David and the Christ

were not among the righteous, broken-hearted and contrite? Why had

God forsaken them and why did he not hear their cry?

|

35. The book of Jeremiah 29:13 has this statement:

|

And ye shall seek me, and find me, when ye shall search

me with all your heart.

|

And we find the following contradicting statement in Job 23:3:

|

Oh, that I know where I might find him! I might come

even to his seat!

|

It is strange that God should witness to the righteousness, perfec-

tion and piety of Job,l and yet in spite of this, he has no

knowledge

even of the way to God, let alone the knowledge of God Himself.

|

36. The book of Exodus 20:4 has:

|

Thou shalt not make unto thee any graven image, or any

likeness of anything that is in heaven above, or that is in the

earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth.

|

And 25:18 of the same book has:

|

And thou shalt make two cherubims of gold, of beaten

work shalt thou make them, in the two ends of the mercy

seat.2

|

37. The Epistle of Jude verse 6 says:

|

And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left

their own habitation, he hath reserved in everlasting chains

under darkness unto the judgement of the great day.

|

From this we understand that the angels of evil have been bound

in chains until the Day of Judgement. Contrary to this, chapters 1

and 2 of the book of Job inform us that Satan is not bound but he is

free

and is often seen in the presence of God.

|

38. The second Epistle of Peter 2:4 has:

|

For if God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast

them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of dark- ;

ness, to be reserved unto judgement.

|

And the Gospel of Matthew chapter 4 reports that Satan once put

Jesus to test.

|

39. The book of Psalms 90:4 has this statement:

|

For a thousand years in thy sight are but as yesterday

when it is past, and as a watch in the night. I

|

And we find this statement in II Peter 3:8:

|

One day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thou-

sand years as one day.

|

40. The book of Exodus 33:20 reports God saying to Moses:

|

Thou canst not see my face: for there shall no man see

me, and live.

|

Contrary to it, in Genesis 32:30 Jacob has been reported to say:

|

I have seen God face to face, and my life is preserved.

|

Jacob survived even after he saw God face to face. The event from

which this sentence has been quoted, contains many incredible

state-

ments like Jacob own wrestling with God which lasted for the whole

night, none of the two could defeat the other, God could not

release

himself from Jacob own hand, rather he requested Jacob to release

him.

Jacob released God in retum of blessings from him. God asked Jacob

his name, which ascribes ignorance of God concerning his name.

|

41. The first Epistle of John 4:12 has:

|

No man hath seen God at any time.

|

But we read a different story in Exodus 24:9

|

Then went up Moses, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and

seventy of the elders of Israel: And they saw the God of

Israel: and there was under his feet as it were a paved work of

sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in his clear-

ness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel he laid not

his hand: also they saw God, and did eat and drink.

|

The Prophet Moses and Aaron and the seventy elders of the

Israelites not only saw God with their eyes but also had a feast

with

him. The above statement makes the Christian God similar to the

gods of the idolaters of India, like Krishna and Ramchander as they

too are reported to be of sky colour.

|

42. I Timothy 6:16 has:

|

Whom no man hath seen, nor can see.

|

But in chapter 4 of Revelations, we read John describing his own

experience of seeing God sitting on the throne and that he looked

like

a jasper and sardine stone.

|

43. The Gospel of John 5:37 reports Jesus as saying to the Jews:

|

Ye have neither heard his voice at any time, nor seen his

shape.

|

We have already seen the statement claiming that God was seen by

many people. The following statement of Deuteronomy 5:24 speaks

of his voice being heard by many people:

|

The Lord our God hath shewed his glory and his great-

ness, and we have heard his voice out of the midst of the fire.

|

44. The Gospel of John 4:24 has this sentence:

|

God is a Spirit.

|

Also we read in Luke 24:39:

|

A spirit hath not flesh and bones.

|

The above two statements conclude that God has no flesh and

bones. Contrary to it, the Christian texts speak frequently of all

the

limbs of God from head to foot. They have tried to prove them

through examples. We have discussed this earlier in the book. Still

they find themselves unable to decide what in fact their God is. Is

he a

gardner, a mason, potter, a tailor, a surgeon, a barber or even a

butcher

or a midwife or a farrner, as they find him mentioned differently

in

their books?

Genesis 2:8 says:

|

The Lord planted a garden eastward in Eden.

|

Isaiah 41:19 also has a similar statement. I Samuel 2:35 has:

|

And I will build him a sure house.

|

Isaiah 64:8 has:

|

O Lord, thou art our father, we are the clay, and thou art

potter.

|

Genesis 3:21 attributes tailoring to Him:

|

Unto Adam also and to his wife did the Lord God make

coats of skins, and clothed them.

|

Jeremiah 30:17 says:

|

I will heal thee of thy wounds.

|

Isaiah 7:20 has this statement:

|

In the same day shall the Lord shave with a razor that is

hired, namely by them beyond the river, by the King of

Assyria, the head, and the hair of the feet: and it shall also

consume the beard.

|

Genesis 29:31 and 30:23 speak of God as being a midwife or a

nurse. Isaiah 34:6 has:

|

The sword of the Lord is filled with blood, it is made fat

with fatness, and with the blood of lambs, and goats, with the

fat of the kidneys of rams.

|

Chapter41:15 of the same book says:

|

I will make thee a new sharp threshing instrument having

teeth: thou shalt thresh the mountains, and beat them small,

and shalt make the hills as chaff.

|

The Book of Joel 3:8 speaks of him as a trader:

|

And I will sell your sons and your daughters into the

hand of the children of Judah.

|

Isaiah 54:13 describes him as a teacher:

|

And all thy children shall be taught of the Lord.

|

And chapter 3 of Genesis depicts him as a wrestler.

|

45. II Samuel 22:9 describes God in the following words:

|

There went out a smoke out of his nostrils, and fire out of

his mouth devoured: coals were kindled by it.

|

But Job 37:10 speaks of him as follows:

|

By the breath of God frost is given: and the breath of the

waters is straitened.

|

46. Hosea 5:12 has:

|

Therefore will I be unto Ephraim as a moth, and to the

house of Judah as rottenness.

|

But 13:7 of the same book has this statement:

|

Therefore I will be unto them as a lion: as a leopard by J

the way will I observe them.

|

47. Lamentations 3:10 has:

|

He was unto me like a bear lying in wait, and as a lion in

secret places.

|

While Isaiah 40:11 has this description:

|

He shall feed his flock like a shepherd.

|

48. Exodus 15:3 says of God:

|

The Lord is a man of war.

|

The Epistle to the Hebrews 13:20 says:

|

The God of peace.

|

49. I John 4:8 has:

|

God is love.

|

But Jeremiah 21:5 has a different view:

|

I myself will fight against you with an outstretched hand

and with a strong arm, even in anger, and in fury, and in great

wrath.

|

We have cited forty-nine differences above.

|

1. We may once again point out that many of the above differences

reproduced by

the heretics are vrong, urfounded and even absurd. The author has

reproduced them

here only to demonstrate the fact that the objections raised by the

Christians against

the hadith are equally weak and absurd as those raised by the

heretics against the

Bible. It is strange that the Church authoriiies reject these

objections as being absurd

and wrong, but do not hesitate to put forward the same objections

against the hadifhs.

|

Anyone wanting more of such differences can find them in Christian

books in abundance.

|

Polygamy, Slavery and Eunuchs in the Bible

|

The book of Deuteronomy 21:15 has:

|

If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated.

|

As for slavery we find the following statement in Joshua 9:27:

|

And Joshua made them that day hewers of wood and

drawers of water for the congregation, and for the altar of the

Lord, even unto this day, in the place which he should choose.

|

The book of Isaiah 56:4-5 says:

|

For thus saith the Lord unto the eunuchs that keep my

sabbaths, and choose the things that please me, and take hold

of my covenant; Even unto them will I give in my house and

within my walls a place and a name better than of sons and of

daughters. I will give them an everlasting name that shall not

be cut off.

|

These verses are explicit in permitting polygamy and slavery and

show that God is pleased with the eunuchs, while these things are

considered wrong by the Christians.

I Corinthians 1:25 has said:

|

Because the foolishness of God is wiser than men; and

the weakness of God is stronger than men.

|

The book of Ezekiel 14:9 speaks of God in these words:

|

If the Prophet be deceived when he hath spoken a thing, I

the Lord have deceived that Prophet.

|

The above two verses are obvious in attributing foolishness, weak-

ness and deception to God. John Clark, after citing this and ma.\_,

other similar statements, remarked:

|

The God of the lsraelites is not only a murder, a tyrant, a

liar and a fool but also a burning fire. It has been admitted by

Paul. For our God is a consuming fire.

|

Being under the power of such a God is really dangerous

as Paul himself said in Hebrews 10:31:

|

It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the liv-

ing God.

|

Therefore, the sooner one gets freedom from such a God

the better. When the life of His only and beloved son is not

safe in His hands, who can expect mercy and kindness from

Him. The God depicted by these books cannot be a reliable

and trustworthy God; rather He is the product of their whims.

He has nothing to do with reality. He is even reported to mis-

guide his own Prophets.

|

The defective concept of God presented by these books is respon-

sible for this kind of opposition by the heretics.l

|
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