

Journal of Biblical Apologetics

Number 3, Spring 2002, Volume 5

Front Cover Art

This superb prayer niche, which comes from a theological school in Isfahan, is extraordinary not only for the beauty of its tile work but also for its variegated inscriptions. The inscription in the outer panel contains a Koranic saying that speaks of the duties of the faithful and the heavenly recompense of those who build mosques. The inscription in the niche states that “the mosque is the house of every pious person.”

Islam Part 1: Allah

Journal of Biblical Apologetics
No. 3, Spring 2002, Vol. 5
© Christian Scholars Press 2002 All rights reserved.

ISBN No. 1-931230-06-4

Published by:
Christian Scholar's Press, Inc.
1350 E. Flamingo Road, Suite 97
Las Vegas, NV 89119-5263
christianscholarspress@hotmail.com
1-800-901-7416

Table of Contents

Introduction

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

An Open Letter to Muslims

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

The Origins of Islam

By Peter Salemi

Fact Sheet for Muslims

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Is Allah the God of the Bible?

By Sam Shamoun

Is 'Allah' Just Another Name for God?

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Allah—Immaterial Entity or an Invisible Man?

By Sam Shamoun

A Reply to Shabir Ally's Deceptive Attacks on Dr. Robert Morey

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Introduction

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

We are genuinely excited about the next three issues of the Journal of Biblical Apologetics because they gather together in one place the most powerful refutations of Islam ever written. These articles are a watershed in Muslim evangelism. Thousands of young people will learn the truth about Islam and will speak this truth in love.

You will notice that several well-known ministries, who supposedly minister to Muslims, are not represented in these journals. They were rejected because they fail to confront Muslims in love with the truth that Islam is based on a false god, a false prophet, and a false book. In the end, they deny the truth about Islam and water down the gospel.

Questions

If you want to know how to determine if a mission society or ministry has gone liberal, ask them:

“Was Allah originally the Moon-god in pre-Islamic times?”

“Is Islam a monotheistic version of old pagan fertility religions such as Baalism?”

“Do Jews, Christians, and Muslims worship the same God?”

We also reject those ministries that use deception in their evangelism of Muslims. They pretend that the Qur’an speaks of the same God, Jesus, prophets, apostles, etc. found in the Bible. They pretend that the Allah of the Qur’an is the God of the Bible and the Isa of the Qur’an is the Jesus of the Bible. But Paul warns us against accepting “a different Jesus” than the one revealed in Scripture (2 Cor. 11:4).

The Isa of the Qur’an is not the Jesus of the Bible—who is the Son of God who died on the cross for our sins. The Isa of the Qur’an was not any of these things. Thus whoever Isa was, he was not the biblical Jesus! So, don’t lie to the Muslims that the Qur’an tells him to believe in Jesus.

This first volume focuses on the crucial issue of the origin and nature of the “Allah” of the Qur’an. It is time the truth be told that the Allah of the Qur’an came from a pagan Arab deity and not from the monotheism of the Jews or the Christians.

We know that Muslims and the politically correct crowd deny this. But the historical evidence is so solid that we are prepared to debate this issue anytime anywhere with anyone who is qualified. Now is not the time for Christians to be wimps or cowards. The true people of God must stand up and shout the truth from the rooftops.

New Book

It is also our pleasure to announce the new book, *Winning the War Against Radical Islam*, is ready for distribution. It provides a tenpoint program for defeating Islamic terrorism. If America and the Western nations would implement this program, terrorism would be defeated. But if we continue to appease the Muslims, the end of Western civilization will be at hand. Radical times call for radical solutions. Thus our call to bomb Mecca and the other holy sites of Islam is the final solution to terrorism.

We had a meeting with General Shimon to share with him our idea on how to stop the suicide bombings in Israel. At the present time, whenever a Muslim fanatic blows himself or herself up to kill Jews, the U.S. and the Western powers demand that Israel give more land to the terrorists. In effect, Israel is asked to reward terrorism with land. Thus there is no incentive to stop killing Jews.

But what if we turned the situation around? Every time a Muslim terrorist kills Jews, Israel takes more land—where new Jewish settlements will be built. Thus Israel gets bigger each time it is attacked. The terrorists would soon realize that terrorism will only make Israel bigger and stronger instead of smaller and weaker.

General Shimon was interested in our suggestion and said that he would call the Prime Minister of Israel and tell him to take our idea under consideration. Let us remember to pray for the peace of Jerusalem and to keep our support for Israel strong in these dark days.

An Open Letter To Muslims

By Dr. Robert Morey

Dear Muslim Friend,

In an age when most people do not believe that Truth exists or that it is worth their time and effort to seek it, the mere fact that you have sought us out reveals that you want to know the Truth about who and what God is and how to find acceptance before Him.

The Truth is important because it sets us free from ignorance and superstition. And, once free from these things, Truth can then set us free from the fear of death and bondage to sin.

We too share the same desire and love of the Truth that you have. Let us then search for the Truth together as fellow travelers on the road of life.

Religious Truth Claims

All religions make Truth claims, i.e. they all claim to tell us the Truth about God, man, salvation, and the universe. Yet, they do not make the same claims. One religion may claim that man is God or that the universe is were created by God, and are not God or gods at all. One religion may claim that there is only one God while another religion may claim that there are millions or even billions of gods.

Obviously, the religions of this world make different Truth claims. In fact, they contradict each other on almost every point. This is a sad but true fact of life that we both already understand and believe.

Yet, we all know people who claim: “All religions worship the same God.” How foolish! How naive! The Hindu who worships millions of gods and goddesses is not worshipping the Allah of the Muslims. The Christian who worships one God in three Persons: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit, is not worshipping the Allah of the Muslims either. Each religion makes its own unique claim about the nature of deity.

What is a Religion?

By definition, a religion is a world view that tells us what to believe and how to live. It is composed of ideas, i.e. doctrines, and values, i.e. morals. A religion wants us to accept certain ideas as the True explanation of all that is, Intellectual assent to these ideas is what constitutes “faith.”

But a religion not only wants our intellectual assent that certain ideas or concepts are true, but it also wants us to obey a list of commands and prohibitions. In other words, a religion expects us to obey its laws and observe its rites and rituals.

Is Islam a Religion?

Is Islam a religion? Of course it is. It puts forth various ideas which it claims to be the Truth and it demands that all men believe them. It also demands that all men obey its laws and observe its rituals.

Common Ground

In order for us to dialogue, we have to begin with ideas that we both accept as true. The common ground that we have is the truth that “Islam is religion.” Do you accept that statement?

We do. It seems self-evident to us that Islam is a religion. If you do not accept this first point, then the rest of this letter will be a waste of time.

Question No.1: Is Islam a religion? Yes _____No _____

Islam's Truth Claims

Since we all agree that Islam is a religion, then we must also agree that it asks us to believe certain ideas or concepts as the truth. These ideas are its Truth claims. In other words, the teachings of Islam are either true or they are false. There is no middle ground. They are either one way or the other.

Question No. 2: Does Islam put forth various teachings that it expects us to accept as the Truth? Yes _____No _____

Blind Faith Will Not Do

Truth claims should not be accepted by blind faith. The issues are far too important for us to make a “leap into the dark” and just believe something because we were told to believe in it by our parents, some religious leaders or the state or our culture.

If we are all supposed to maintain whatever religion our parents taught us, then no one should convert from it to any other religion. But no one really believes this. Hindus accept converts from other religions just as Muslims do. As a matter of fact, people are changing religions all the time. We personally know Muslims who became Christians, Christians who became Jews, Hindus who became Buddhists, etc. Some people go from one religion to another as easily as they change cars.

Question No. 3: Do you know of people who left the religion they were raised in and converted to a different religion? Yes _____No _____

sb. People can and do change their religion. This is simply a fact of life that we must all deal with. Our own children may leave our religion and convert to another religion. It happens all the time. Only a fool would deny this.

Why would someone convert to another religion? Some people change religions because of marriage. They fall in love with a person of a different religion and they give up their religion to marry that person. It happens all the time.

Other people change religions due to coercion, such as threats of violence or bribes of money, sex or political advantage. If you change your religion because someone threatens to kill you if you do not accept their religion, this is not good. If you convert to a religion in order to obtain money, sex or a job, this is not good either.

The only moral reason to change your religion is on the basis of the Truth. If you find out that your former religion was not telling you the Truth, then you should leave it. To continue to believe in a religion that you know to be false is to live an intellectually dishonest life.

If you find that another religion is telling you the Truth, then you should be willing to join it no matter the price or consequences. To find and follow the Truth is the only way to get to ultimate reality.

The issue is thus reduced to whether you really care about the Truth. If you believe in a religion for any other reason than it is the Truth is to cheat yourself. Convenience, habit, upbringing, fear or greed do not constitute a sufficient basis for belief in any religion. Something is not true simply because you believe it. You should believe in something because it is true.

Question No. 4: Is your desire for Truth so strong that you would be willing to leave your present religion if the Truth led you to do so? Yes _____ No _____

This is where the “rubber meets the road.” This is the ultimate test of your character and love of the Truth. If you are not willing to follow the Truth if it leads you to leave your present religion, then you do not really care about the Truth. If your attitude is, “Don’t confuse me with the facts, my mind is already made up,” then you do not really want the Truth at all.

If you feel that you must blindly follow what your parents taught you until the day you die, then you will never know if what they taught you is really true or a lie. Why? For you it is irrelevant if it is true or a lie. It doesn’t really matter to you. You were born a Muslim and you will die a Muslim. That is all you care about.

How sad to live your entire life without ever seeking the Truth. To have a closed mind that will not accept anything that contradicts what you want to believe. An unexamined faith is a worthless faith. It is no better than no faith at all for it comes from prejudice and ignorance instead of the joyous search for and the acceptance of the Truth.

Question No. 5: Could Islam be false in its teachings and rituals? Yes _____ No _____

This question lays all the cards on the table. “All things are possible.” This means that you must accept the fact that what you have believed all your life could be a lie.

If this is not even a possibility to you, then why pretend that you want the whole Truth and nothing but the Truth? A deep commitment to finding and following the Truth regardless of where it takes you is the only attitude consistent with intellectual honesty and integrity.

Face it, Islam could be a false religion. Two thirds of the people on this planet think so. Are you even open to this fact of logic? If not, then why are you reading this letter? It is addressed to open-minded Muslims who are willing to examine the evidence against Islam with objectivity and intellectual honesty.

Question No. 6: Are you willing to examine the Truth claims of Islam? Yes _____ No _____

Question No. 7: Are you willing to entertain the possibility that Allah is a false god, Muhammad a false prophet and the Qur’an a false book? Yes _____ No _____

If you react to these questions by getting angry, what does this reveal about you? Are you open or closed to the Truth? If Islam is false, why in the world would you want to continue to believe in it?

If you are still with us at this point, hopefully you feel the same as we do: There is nothing more important in this life than the Truth. It is worth whatever price we have to pay. We will follow it wherever it leads us.

The Importance of Questions

How can we test the Truth claims of Islam to see if they are true or false? By honestly seeking the answers to crucial questions we can find out if Islam is true or false. Remember, the Truth is never afraid of the light of research.

The following questions require you to think objectively about Allah, Muhammad and the Qur'an. Don't just answer them off the top of your head without doing any research. Cheap answers will always cheat you out of the Truth. Instead, go to a library and look up the answers in encyclopedias and dictionaries. Find history books on Arabia and on Islam that answer these questions. We found them, so can you.

Crucial Questions

1. The Qur'an refers to people, places, things, and events which are nowhere explained or defined within the Qur'an itself. True _____ False _____
2. These things were not explained because it was assumed that the people hearing the Qur'an *already* knew of them. True _____ False _____
3. Some passages in the Qur'an would be unintelligible without recourse to pre-Islamic history. True _____ False _____
4. All Islamic scholars use pre-Islamic history to explain parts of the Qur'an.
True _____ False _____
5. Thus it is both legitimate and proper to use pre-Islamic history to explain the Qur'an
True _____ False _____
6. Yusuf Ali does this when it comes to such things as the she-camel, the elephant army, the twelve springs, the youths in the cave, the blind man, and many other things found in the Qur'an. True _____ False _____
7. Mecca was a pre-Islamic pagan center of worship. True _____ False _____ The Kabah in Mecca was a pagan temple filled with 360 idols. True _____ False _____
8. The Kabah in Mecca was a pagan temple filled with 360 idols. TrueFalse
9. Archaeologists have found three other ancient Kabahs in Arabia.
True _____ False _____ The pre-Islamic pagans prayed by bowing down toward Mecca several times a day. True _____ False _____
10. The pre-Islamic pagans prayed by bowing down toward Mecca several times a day. TrueFalse
11. The pre-Islamic pagans made a pilgrimage to Mecca. True _____ False _____
12. When the pre-Islamic pagan idolators got to Mecca, they ran between two hills.
True _____ False _____
13. The pre-Islamic pagans ran around the Kabah seven times. True _____ False _____
14. The pagans kissed and caressed a large black stone on the wall of the Kabah.
True _____ False _____
15. The pre-Islamic pagan idolators sacrificed an animal. True _____ False _____
16. The pre-Islamic pagans threw a magical number of stones at a pillar of the devil.
True _____ False _____
17. The pagans held their public meetings on Friday instead of Saturday or Sunday.
True _____ False _____
18. The pre-Islamic pagans fasted during the day and feasted at night for one month.
True _____ False _____

19. The pre-Islamic pagans fast began and ended with the moon in its crescent phase.
True _____ False _____
20. The pre-Islamic pagan idolators performed ritual washings before prayers.
True _____ False _____
21. As one of their washings before prayer, the pre-Islamic pagan idolators snorted water up and then out of their nose. True _____ False _____
22. The pre-Islamic pagans cut off the hands of thieves True _____ False _____
23. The pre-Islamic pagans forbade marrying sisters. True _____ False _____
24. The pre-Islamic pagans forbade the eating of swine's flesh. True _____ False _____
25. In pre-Islamic Arabian genealogies, Ishmael is nowhere mentioned as the father of the Arabs. True _____ False _____
26. Abraham, the father of Ishmael, was not an Arab. True _____ False _____
27. Hagar, the mother of Ishmael, was an Egyptian and not an Arab. True _____ False _____
28. Since his mother and his father were not Arabs, Ishmael was not an Arab.
True _____ False _____
29. Ishmael could not be the "father" of the Arabs because they already existed before he was born. True _____ False _____
30. According to the historical and literary evidence, Abraham and Ishmael lived in Palestine. True _____ False _____
31. They never lived in Mecca. True _____ False _____
32. They never built the Kabah. True _____ False _____
33. They never established the rituals connected with the Kabah such as the pilgrimage.
True _____ False _____
34. According to Arab history, the Kabah at Mecca was built by Kosia, the pagan great-grandfather of Muhammad. True _____ False _____
35. The title "Al-Ilah" was used by pagan Arabs in reference to one of the gods worshipped at the Kabah. True _____ False _____
36. The word "Al-Ilah" was shortened into "Allah." True _____ False _____
37. The Moon-god was called "Al-Ilah" and then "Allah" by some Arab pagans in southern Arabia. True _____ False _____
38. Al-lat, Al-uzza and Manat were worshipped by the pagan Arabs as "the daughters of Allah." True _____ False _____
39. Muhammad's father lived and died as a pagan and yet the word "Allah" was part of his name. True _____ False _____
40. Yusuf Ali points out in his translation of the Qur'an that pre-Islamic pagan Arabs worshipped the moon as a god. True _____ False _____
41. Many of the pre-Islamic pagan rituals associated with the worship of Allah and his daughters were incorporated into the Qur'an and are now part of Islam.
True _____ False _____
42. The religion of Islam has adopted the name, the rituals, and the crescent moon symbol of the pagan Arab Moon-god. True _____ False _____
43. Some of the material found in the Qur'an can be traced back to pre-Islamic pagan Arabian religions. True _____ False _____
44. Infidels are recorded in the Qur'an as saying that Muhammad took old wives' tales and myths and put them into the Qur'an. True _____ False _____

45. The Qur'an warns against asking questions about Islam because if the answers are revealed, you will lose your faith in Islam. True _____ False _____

Concluding Remarks

We have discussed together some very important issues which touch upon the origins of the rituals and beliefs found in the religion of Islam. The burning question that confronted us was whether Islam was created out of pre-existing pagan rituals and beliefs or was it revealed from heaven.

After studying the standard reference works on Islam, we must conclude that the rituals and beliefs of Islam are clearly earthly in origin, i.e. they were not brought down by Gabriel to Muhammad. The question of origins is the key to whether Islam is true or false. Your willingness to research this issue is an indication that you really do care about the Truth. Thank you for caring.

The Problem of Sin

While the issue of the origins of Islam is an intellectual question that can be answered only by research into the historical evidence, there is another issue that confronts us all. Regardless of your religion, there is the inescapable fact that we have all failed to live up to our religious convictions. Muslim, Christian, Buddhist, etc., it doesn't really matter. We have all violated whatever moral standards we have adopted.

This means we have to find a way to be forgiven or cleansed of our sins. Why? If you believe in an afterlife and that there is a hell to escape and a paradise to gain, how can you gain entrance into heaven?

Two Problems We All Face

Our problem is twofold. First, our hearts are prone to evil. Thus we find it very easy to feel lust, jealousy, hatred, anger, and greed. Even when we try to be good, our own heart will betray us.

Question: Do you admit that your heart is prone to evil? Yes _____ No _____

Second, God is keeping a record of all our evil thoughts, words and deeds. He will hold us accountable for these evils on the Day of Judgment. On that Day we will have to face the reality of our own failures and sins.

Question: Do you recognize that you will be held accountable for all your sins on the Day of Judgment? Yes _____ No _____

How can you change your heart and clear your record in heaven? In order to come before a holy God with acceptance, you have to do these two things. Well, how are you going to do them?

Will Good Works Do the Job?

Some people think that if they do good deeds that this will change their hearts and clear their record. But can good works really change anyone's heart? We tried it and found that no matter how much good we did, evil was still present in our hearts.

Question: Haven't you found this true of your own heart? Yes _____ No _____

No matter how many good deeds you perform, your heart still has evil thoughts and motives. No, doing good deeds will never stop your heart from thinking or feeling evil things.

The same problem confronts us if we think that we can erase the divine record of our sins by doing good deeds. How many good deeds are necessary to balance out our bad deeds? It all depends on whether you are thinking of the evil that God sees or the evil we see in ourselves.

When we look at our own lives, we all tend to cut ourselves some slack. We like to think that we are not as bad as some and better than most. We don't come off so bad as long as we compare ourselves to other people.

But what if we compare ourselves to a holy and righteous Deity? If we think in terms of all the sins that an all-knowing Deity sees and hears us do, we do not come off so well. Our sins are like the sand on the seashore—too many to count!

Question: Can doing a few good deeds really clear away the mountain of sin that is against us? Yes _____ No _____

Question: Haven't you found it true that even when you do a good deed, you had evil motives such as pride? Yes _____ No _____

Question: Can evil motives cancel out a good deed? Yes _____ No _____

When we give money to be seen of men, this cancels out the good deed. Thus good deeds will never change your heart or clear your record.

A Mediator Needed

Since we have sinned, we are not allowed to come into the presence of a holy God. But if we cannot go to God for forgiveness, how will we obtain forgiveness? If good deeds will not work, how will we ever enter paradise?

What if someone went before God on our behalf? What if there was a mediator who could intercede on our behalf?

Question: Wouldn't a mediator solve our problem with sin? Yes _____ No _____

Now, such a mediator must be sinless and without blame. Otherwise, he could not go before a holy God either. The mediator must be as righteous and as holy as God Himself or he cannot stand before God.

Even if this mediator could enter God's presence, how could he clear the record of all our sins? He would have to pay off our debt to justice somehow. One obvious way is for him to take upon himself the punishment due to us. In other words, in order for us to escape the fires of hell, he would have to smother the flames of hell in his own bosom.

This mediator would have to be the bridge between heaven and earth and between God and man. A mediator who is not quite God or not quite man is a bridge broken at either end. We need someone to represent God to us and us to God. This mediator has to be both God and man at the same time or salvation is not possible.

The Gospel

Have you ever heard the word "Gospel"? What is it all about? It is a word which means "good news." What is the good news? The good news is that Jesus Christ is the only mediator between God and man. He did what we could not do. He entered into the presence of God on our behalf to obtain forgiveness for us.

How could he do this? On what basis? He bore our sins and iniquities in his own body on the cross. He died for our sins according to the Gospel. This is why salvation is a gift of God's grace.

Jesus paid the price for our salvation. Thus God now offers us eternal life free of charge. We become a Christian simply by asking Jesus to be our Mediator—our Savior—our Redeemer. You don't become a Christian by joining a church, getting baptized or doing some other good deed. No, salvation is by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone. He brings us into the very presence of God.

Question: Haven't you ever wondered why the God of Islam seems so distant—so far off?

Yes _____ No _____

Without a mediator, God is far off and distant. A distant God is only feared, not loved. He is unapproachable and seems far away.

Question: Don't you see the need for a mediator to pay off your sins and clear your record?

Yes _____ No _____

Question: Does Islam offer you a mediator to take away your sins? Yes _____ No _____

Question: If Islam has no mediator and no atonement, does it have any gospel, i.e. good news? Yes _____ No _____

The End of the Matter

Dear Friend, Islam leaves you high and dry with no way to deal with the corruptions of your heart here on earth or the record of your sins in heaven. It does not build a bridge between you and God. It does not have a mediator who is both God and man. With no Savior and no atonement, it can never give you any sure hope of heaven.

But all these things are found in the Gospel. Stop right now and ask Jesus to be your Mediator. Ask Him to come into your heart as your Lord and Savior. Receive forgiveness through His atoning work. Pray this simple prayer:

Lord Jesus, I ask you to reveal Yourself to me. Save me and cleanse me of my sins. Pay off my debt to God. Come into my heart and save me from hell and make a home in heaven for me. I acknowledge that you are the Son of God and that you died on the cross for me and rose from the dead on the third day.

If you sincerely prayed this prayer, you have become a child of God by faith in Jesus Christ. Jesus has now cleared your record in heaven and the Holy Spirit will now come into your heart to deal with the corruptions found in it. God is no longer distant and far off. He is your Father and you are his child. Welcome to the family of God! Contact us so we can share your joy.

The Origins of Islam

By Peter Salemi

Many people believe that Islam, Judaism, and Christianity are connected in some way or another. Judaism and Christianity are connected, there is no question about that. But what about Islam? It is true that the Koran (the Bible of the Muslims) mentions Jesus, Mary, John the Baptist etc. But did this information come from God? Is the God of Islam, and the God of the Bible, the same God?

Who is Allah?

(Pre-Islamic Arabia)

The Muslims say that the God of the Bible, and the god of Islam, are one and the same God. But what are the origins of Allah? Did he come from the Bible? Or from Arabian paganism?

The word “Allah” is a contraction of “Al-ilah,” “al” meaning “the” and “ilah” meaning “god.” Early biographers said that “al-ilah” comes from “El” or “Elohim,” meaning the God of the Bible, but “early scholars attested the diffusion of this belief *solely to Christian and Judaic influences*. But now a growing number of authors maintain that this idea [of Allah] had older roots in Arabia...” (*Studies in Islam*, Swartz, p.12, emphasis mine).

Caesar Farah concludes:

“There is *no reason* therefore, to accept the idea that Allah passed to the Muslims from the Christians and the Jews” (*Islam*, p. 28, emphasis mine).

We must look for the origins of Allah among the Arabian deities, and not from the Judeo-Christian Bible!

The Arabs had tribal gods which they worshipped. Every tribe had its own God.

“The Quraysh tribe into which Muhammad was born was particularly devoted to ALLAH...” (*Islamic Invasion*, Morey, p. 51, emphasis mine).

Before Muhammad was ever born, his tribe worshipped Allah, and he was the chief god of Mecca:

“It’s been pointed out that Mecca was in control of the Quraysh tribe into which Muhammad was born” (ibid., pp. 39–40).

Since they were in control of Mecca, it was only right that their god was chief of the Kaaba in Mecca.

Zwemer writes:

“But history establishes beyond a *shadow of a doubt* that even the *pagan Arabs before Muhammad’s time*, knew the *chief god by the name of Allah*... ilah is used for any god and Al-ilah (contracted to Allah, i.e, the god), was the name of the *supreme god*. Among the Arabs this term denoted the *chief god* of three hundred and sixty idols... As final evidence, we have the fact that centuries *before* Muhammad the Arabian Kaaba, the temple at Mecca, was called Beit Allah, the House of God...” (*Muhammad in Mecca*, pp. 25–26, 31–36, emphasis mine).

Collier’s Encyclopedia under “Allah” writes:

“There were among the Arabs, *long before the emergence of Islam*, worshippers of a supreme god known as Allah, and the Koran (13:17; 29:61; 31:24. [These show that the pagan Arabs and Muhammad worshipped the same Deity]). This *leaves little doubt* that Meccans... recognized that Allah was creator and provider” (p. 570, emphasis mine).

The Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics under “Allah” writes:

“The origin of this [Allah] goes back to *pre-Islamic times* as Prof. Nokleke has shown... Muhammad found the Meccans believing in a supreme god whom they called Allah ... with Allah however they associated minor deities [called] the daughters of

Allah. *Mohammed's reform was to assert the solitary existence of Allah.* The first article of the Muslim creed, therefore, "LA-ILAHA ILLA-LLAHU, means only "There exists no god except the one whom you *already call Allah*" (*Hastings*, p. 326, emphasis mine).

"Islam owes the term 'Allah' to the *heathen Arabs*... Muhammad *did not* find it necessary to introduce an altogether novel deity but *contented himself of ridding the heathen Allah of his companions* [known as the daughters of Allah]... Had he not been accustomed from his *youth* to the idea of Allah as the supreme god in particular *in Mecca*, it may all be doubted whether he would have come forward as a preacher of monotheism" (Ibn Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 42, emphasis mine).

And Caesar Farah concludes:

"There were hundreds of such deities in Pagan Arabia, of all those mentioned, four appear to be most popularly revered on the eve of Islam: Al-Uzza, Allat, and Manat. All three female deities, popularly worshipped by the tribes of Hijaz, they were regarded as the daughters of Allah, the god who headed the Arabian pantheon when Muhammad began to preach that Allah was the paramount deity" (*Islam*, emphasis mine).

- So the Allah that the Meccans worshipped was chief god at Mecca in the Kaaba.
- The same god Muhammad was proclaiming and worshipped by him and the pagan Arabs.
- He was worshipped centuries before Muhammad.
- Allah was the tribal deity of the Quraysh, Muhammad's tribe, and was the supreme god of Muhammad's youth.

But now we seem to have a contradiction in history about the chief god of the Kaaba. Even though history shows that Allah was the chief god of the Quraysh, and the Kaaba, we also see a god called *Hubal who was the chief god of the Kaaba, and of the Quraysh tribe!* How can this be? Is there a contradiction in history? Let's look at some quotes from historians and scholars about Hubal, and then let's answer this question as addressed by him to the Meccans: logically and from the foundations of history.

"Among the gods worshipped by the Quraysh, the *greatest was Hubal*... The Quraysh had several idols in and around the Kaaba. *The greatest of these was Hubal* (F.E. Peters, *The Hajj*, pp. 24–25, emphasis mine).

"Hubal was the *principal deity* [in Mecca] *the god of the moon*..." (*Concise Encyclopedia of Islam*, p. 179, emphasis mine).

"...of the 360 idols set up in the Kaaba, the *most important was Hubal, the god of the moon*... *It was set up in the Kaaba, and became the principal idol of the Meccans*..." (ibid., p. 161, emphasis mine).

"*Hubal was the chief god of the Kaaba*" (George W. Braswell, Jr., *Islam*, p. 44, emphasis mine).

"...*the main god of the shrine [was]Hubal*" (*Neighboring Faiths*, Winfried Corduan, p. 78, emphasis mine).

Just Like Allah

- Hubal was the greatest god of the Kaaba.
- Supreme god of the Quraysh tribe.
- Hubal was the chief god of Mecca.

How do we reconcile this obvious contradiction in history? Is this a contradiction? *Absolutely not!* We have found in our research that *Hubal is Allah; they are one and the same god!*

The *Funk and Wagnall's Dictionary of Folklore, Mythology and Legend* says under "Allah":

"The pre-Mohammedan Arabic god *Hubal had as his title Allahu meaning 'the god'* ... As the *patron of the Kaaba at Mecca, already supreme, he was maintained in Mohammedan theology as the one god...*"(vol.1, p. 36, emphasis mine).

Under "Hubal" or "Hubal," the same dictionary says:

"Some say that Hubal, was the *real name of Allahu, the chief god of pre-Islamic times, who became the one god of Islam ...*" (ibid., p. 499, emphasis mine).

"In Mecca, a god Hubal was worshipped, who may be *identical with Allah*" (H. Ringgren and A.V. Strom, *Religions of Mankind*, p. 178, emphasis mine).

Muslims don't want to admit what history shows, that Hubal is Allah. Robert Morey writes:

"Religious claims often fall before results of hard sciences such as archaeology...the hard evidence demonstrates that the god Allah was a pagan deity. In fact he was the *moon god* [Hubal]..." (*The Moon God, Allah*, p. 1, emphasis mine).

People of religion can say and believe anything they want, but it's what the facts show, that prove whether you are right or wrong! Hubal is Allah!

In Ibn Warraq's book, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, he writes about Hubal, and who he really is:

"Hubal was worshipped at Mecca, and his idol...Hubal's position next to the black stone [Muslims kiss this stone today] suggests there is some *connection* between the two."

Wellhausen thinks that *Hubal was originally the black stone*. Wellhausen also points out that God is called "Lord of the Kaaba" and "Lord of the Territory" of Mecca in the Koran. The prophet railed against the homage rendered at the Kaaba to the goddesses Allat, Manat, and Al-Uzza, when the pagans called them the daughters of God, but Muhammad stopped short of attacking the cult of Hubal. From this Wellhausen concludes that *Hubal is none other than Allah 'the god' of the Meccans* (p. 39, emphasis mine). Why wouldn't Muhammad preach against the "chief of the deities," and say that Allah was the greatest?

Even the *Dictionary of Islam* had to admit:

"It's remarkable that there is *no distinct allusion to the idol* [Hubal] in the *whole Quran*"(*Dictionary of Islam*, Thomas Patrick Hughes, p. 181, under "Hubal," emphasis mine).

He's right! It is quite remarkable that the chief of the Kaaba is not even mentioned in the Quran at all. How can Muhammad totally exclude him?

In addition to the quote above about Allah being "Lord of the Kaaba," Muhammad evidently said that he "received commandments to worship the 'Lord of the House,' i.e. the Kaaba" (*Muhammad*, Tor Andrea, p. 31). So it's obvious he was talking about the pre-Islamic deity Hubal!

Well, Muhammad did not exclude him for the simple reason:

“There are stories in the *sira* of pagan Meccans praying to Allah while standing beside the *image of Hubal*” (Watt, *Mohammed’s Mecca*, p. 39, emphasis mine).

They are one and the same! Remember, the Allah of the Meccans is the same Allah that Muhammad was proclaiming to them!

Robert Morey writes on his Faith Defenders website:

“Was the title al-ilah (the god) used of the moon god? YES!

“Was the word ‘Allah’ derived from ‘al-ilah’? YES!

“Was the pagan ‘Allah’ a high god in the pantheon of deities? YES!

“Was he worshipped at the Kaaba? YES!

“Did they place the statue of Hubal on top of the Kaaba? YES!

“At the time was Hubal considered the moon god? YES!

“Was the Kaaba thus the ‘house of the moon god’? YES!

“Did the name ‘Allah’ eventually *replace* that of Hubal as the name of the moon god? YES!

“...Hubal the moon god, was the central focus of prayer at the KAABA and the people prayed to Hubal *using the name Allah*” (Morey at www.faithdefenders.com, emphasis mine).

This had to be the case that Hubal and Allah are one and the same as this source says:

“What deity did the Quraysh represent? The Meccan shrine accommodated Hubal... but Hubal is *not* mentioned in the Quran... a building accommodating Hubal *makes no sense around a stone representing Allah* [as Warraq noted originally, Hubal was the black stone] if Hubal *represented Allah*. What is Hubal doing in the shrine? Naturally Quraysh were polytheists, but they [the different gods] were housed separately. No *pre-Islamic sanctuary, stone or building is known to have accommodated more than one* [chief] *male god*, as opposed to one male god and a female... if Allah was a pagan god [as we have seen he is] like any other, *Quraysh would not have allowed Hubal to share the sanctuary with him*... One would have to fall back on the view that *Allah might simply be another name for Hubal*, as Wellhausen suggests, just as the Israelites knew Yahweh as Elohim, so the Arabs *knew Hubal as Allah, meaning god*” (*Muslim Trade and the Rise of Islam*, pp. 192–193, emphasis mine).

Origin of the Kaaba

The Kaaba is a cube-like structure built for Allah, where Muslims go to kiss the black stone, and pray to Allah. It is the central shrine for all Muslims.

Muslims believe that the shrine was built by Abraham and Ishmael, and the instructions were given to them by God. But history shows a different story.

“It is virtually certain that Abraham *never* reached Mecca” (Watt, p. 136, *Muslim and Christian Encounters*, emphasis mine).

“According to Muslim Tradition, Abraham and Ishmael built the Kaaba... But outside these traditions there is absolutely *no evidence* for this claim—whether epigraphic, archaeological, or documentary. Indeed Snouck Hurgronje has shown that Muhammad

invented the story to give his religion an Arabian origin... at the same time incorporating into Islam the Kabah with all its historical and religious associations for the Arabs” (Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 131, emphasis mine).

What is Its Real Origin?

“In pre-Mohammedan times it was believed that the stone had fallen from the moon and was sacred to the *old moon god Hubal*. The stone was enclosed in a small square temple known as the KABAHI, which contained many lesser gods...” (Robert Payne, *The History of Islam*, p. 4, emphasis mine).

“...the Kabah was in fact built as a shrine for the *moon god*” (Morey, *The Moon God Allah*, p. 9, emphasis mine).

Maxine Robinson Says:

“The Kaaba at Mecca, which may have been *initially a shrine of Hubal alone...*” (*Life of Muhammad*, p. 40, emphasis mine).

“At the time of Muhammad, the Kaaba was officially dedicated to the *god Hubal...*” (Karen Armstrong, *Muhammad*, p. 61, emphasis mine).

Muhammad’s Religious Background

When we look into Muhammad’s background we see that he was a worshipper of Hubal, the Allah of the Kaaba! And when we understand his background, Islam becomes more and more clear.

The religion of his grandfather was the religion of Hubal!

At Muhammad’s birth, Muhammad’s grandfather, who was the keeper of the Kaaba, did this in front of Hubal:

“After his [Muhammad’s] birth his mother sent to tell his grandfather Abd al-Muttalib that she gave birth to a boy... It is alleged that Abd al-Muttalib took him before (the idol) *Hubal in the middle of the Kaaba*, where he stood and *prayed to Allah*, thanking him for his gift” (A. Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad*, pp. 66–68; see also F.E. Peters, *A Reader of Classical Islam*, p. 45, emphasis mine).

This confirms Watt’s statement that:

“There are stories in the sira of pagan Meccans praying to Allah while standing beside the *image of Hubal*” (Watt, *Mohammed’s Mecca*, p. 39, emphasis mine).

It is interesting to note that Muhammad’s father was called “Abdullah,” meaning “the servant of Allah.” Now if Muhammad’s grandfather was a worshipper of Hubal, and named his son and Hubal, Allah, then Hubal is Allah!

In this story about Muhammad’s birth G.J.O. Moshay writes:

“In this revealing incident in the life of Mohammed’s grandfather: Who was ‘the Lord’? Was it Allah? What about Hubal?... From Ibn Ishaq’s account here, praying to Allah was the *same thing as praying to Hubal*. They could practically mean the *same*

thing. As Ha-Baal or Hu-Baal means “the Lord,” so ‘Al-ilah’ or ‘Allah’ means ‘the god’” (*Who Is This Allah?*, p. 136, emphasis mine).

Hubal is Allah!

Here is another example:

“For two years Muhammad remained in his [grandfather’s] house overlooking the Kaaba, while the old man *taught him the ceremonies attached to the worship of the moon god [Hubal] and told him the legends of the place* (Robert Payne, *The History of Islam*, p. 11, emphasis mine).

“Muhammad was raised in the religion of the moon god, Allah” (Morey, *The Moon God Allah*, p. 11, emphasis mine).

This is Muhammad’s background.

Here is an example of one of the legends that was taught to Muhammad by his grandfather. In the Koran we read about the Christian king of Abyssinia who wanted to take over the Kaaba, and make it Christian.

Look at what Muhammad says in the Koran:

“Have you not considered how God [Allah] dealt with the army of the elephant? Did he not confound their stratagem and send against them flocks of birds which pelted them with clay stones...” (Surah 105).

This happened in the year of his birth, and it was still fresh in the minds of the Meccans. Also his grandfather at the time witnessed it first hand, and taught Muhammad this story as a boy.

Look at what Robert Payne says in his book about this incident, for proof of who Allah really is, and what Muhammad learned from his grandfather:

“Abb al-Muttalib offered a last prayer to the *moon god [Hubal]* to preserve the Kaaba... The Meccans expected the Abyssinians to advance but *Hubal heard their prayers*, overnight, and an epidemic, perhaps an aggravated form of small pox, swept through the army... No one could doubt the power of the *moon god [Hubal]* who kept the army of the elephants at bay” (*The History of Islam*, p. 7, emphasis mine).

Now he told Muhammad that Allah, i.e. Hubal was the one that saved them. This incident was still fresh in the minds of the Meccans at the time of Muhammad. Why is it in the Koran, you don’t hear the Meccans rebuking Muhammad for saying that Hubal saved them and not Allah, if these two deities were different. Instead there is silence from the Meccans about Hubal, because they already knew who Allah was, Hubal, the Allah of the Meccans, and Muhammad understood it the same way. That’s why there is no dispute!

The Religion of Allah and Hubal are the Same

Payne noted that Muhammad was taught the “ceremonies” attached to Hubal. What are those ceremonies?

“Here at the time of the new moon, following the summer solstice, at the hottest time of the year, the ancient pilgrims worshipped the Moon God [Hubal]... and then

reverently kissed it [the black stone], and afterward they walked around the Kaaba seven times” (ibid., p. 4, emphasis mine).

“Allah is not a generic Arabic word for God but a name of a particular god among many deities traditionally honored in ancient times by nomadic tribes in Arabia.

Allah was the chief god among the approximately 360 idols in the Kaaba in Mecca... Allah is a contraction of Al-ilah, the name of the Moon God [Hubal] of the local Quraysh, Mohammed’s tribe... Allah’s symbol was a crescent moon, which Muhammad carried over into Islam. This symbol is seen on mosques, minarets, shrines, and *Arab flags*” (David Hunt, *In Defense of the Faith*, pp. 37–38, emphasis mine).

In the book *Behind the Veil*, it notes the ceremony about kissing the stone:

“Al-Bukhari records a famous statement made by Umar... which demonstrates the *confusion of the Muslims*. The Bukhari says: ‘When Umar ibn al-Khattab reached the black stone, he kissed it and said, “I know that you are stone that does not hurt nor benefit. If I had *not seen the prophet kiss you*, I would not have kissed you”... All scholars confirm this statement” (p. 285, emphasis mine)

Note: Authors of *Behind the Veil* could not give their names for fear of their lives, but you can find this book on line at <http://answeringislam.org/BehindVeil/index.html>

Why did Muhammad kiss the stone, the stone that was sacred to Hubal? If Allah was different than Hubal, that would have been blasphemy, “joining other gods with God” as the Koran says! Hubal and Allah are the same deity, there is no question about it!

What About the Pilgrimage?

“The Pilgrimage is a *survival of the ancient pilgrimages to the Holy Stones*. Almost none of the customs attended upon the pilgrimage *derive from Muhammad’s time*... Muhammad changed the sevenfold tawaf or circumambulation of the Kaaba only in one respect. *Before his time*, it was performed naked” (Payne, *The History of Islam*, p. 79, emphasis mine).

These customs were done to Hubal long before Muhammad, and none of these customs started in Muhammad’s time, they were already there. Muhammad just changed one thing, being naked, that’s all.

“...several pre-Islamic ritual practices, *especially those connected with the Kaaba cult in Mecca, were continued by Muhammad*...” (Frederick Denny, *An Introduction to Islam*, p. 56, emphasis mine).

“...important Muslim practices such as visiting the Kaaba, and the many details of the ceremony of Hajj, including visits of Safa and Marwa, and also throwing stones against the stone pillar symbolizing Satan, were *all pre-Islamic practices of pagan Arabia*” (Answering Islam, Norman Geisler, p. 309, emphasis mine).

“Pagan ritualism also *contributed* to the religious world into which Muhammad was born... The *pagans of pre-Islamic Arabia* taught that everyone should bow and pray towards Mecca during certain times of the day. Everyone should make a pilgrimage to Mecca to worship at the Kaaba at least once in their life. Once they arrived at Mecca, the

pagans ran around the Kaaba seven times and kissed the Black Stone... That these pagan rites comprised the religion into which *Muhammad was raised by his family* [who were worshippers of Hubal, the Allah of Mecca] *is acknowledged by all*. Thus it is no surprise to find that, as Arab scholar Nazar-Ali has observed: ‘Islam retained many aspects of the pagan religion’” (Morey, *Islamic Invasion*, pp. 42–43, emphasis mine).

“Middle Eastern scholar, E.M. Wherry in his monumental work, *A Comprehensive Commentary on the Quran*, shows that worship of Allah and the worship of *Baal (Hubal)* involved the worship of heavenly bodies, the moon, the stars and the sun” (Moshey, *Who Is This Allah?*, p. 137, emphasis mine).

Notice Allah and Hubal or Baal, the religions are exactly the same, because the deities are the same!

Here are some more quotes about the origins of the ceremonies in Islam:

“Islam owes many of its most superstitious details to old *Arabian paganism* especially in the rites and rituals of the pilgrimage to Mecca (see Suras 2:153; 22:28–30; 5:1–4; 22:37)... the superstitions connected with the jinns [genies] and old folk tales such as those of Ad and Thamud... The entire ceremony of the pilgrimage has been shamelessly taken over from *pre-Islamic practice*... Circumambulation of a sanctuary was a very common rite practiced in many localities. The pilgrim during his circuit frequently kissed or caressed the Idol. Sir William Muir thinks that the seven circuits of the Kaaba ‘were probably emblematical of the revolution of the planetary bodies.’ While Zwemer goes so far as to suggest that the seven circuits of the Kaaba, three times rapidly and four times slowly were ‘an imitation of the inner and outer planets’... It is *unquestionable* that the Arabs at a comparatively late period worshipped the sun and other heavenly bodies” (Warraq, pp. 35–36, 40, emphasis mine).

Alfred Guillaume, professor of Arabic, in London says:

“*The customs of heathenism* have left an indelible mark on Islam, notably in the *rites of pilgrimage*” (*Islam*, p. 6, emphasis mine).

Notice how all the sources note that the rituals are from Mecca, where the chief god of Muhammad’s tribe dwelt and worshipped Hubal, the Allah of the Kaaba! The religion of Hubal and Allah are one and the same, because Hubal and Allah are one and the same!

Lastly Warraq writes:

“Muhammad *did not* find it necessary to introduce an altogether novel deity, *but had contented himself with ridding the heathen Allah of his companions* [the daughters of Allah]... Wellhausen also cites pre-Islamic literature where Allah is mentioned as a great deity. Had he not been *accustomed from his youth* to the idea of Allah as the supreme god, in particular *in Mecca*, it may be all doubted whether he would have come forward as a preacher of monotheism” (p. 42, emphasis mine).

Remember, Muhammad did not say Allah was great, but that Allah was the greatest among the other gods, acknowledging the pre-Islamic origin of Allah, and his religion.

Arguments

Some authors don't think that Allah and Hubal are one and the same for the simple reason that Hubal is the god of the moon, and Allah is the creator of all these, and supreme ruler of the universe. They say that the characteristics of the two are different. But as we have shown, Hubal was called supreme and creator. There are more similarities than differences between the two. The only reason why there are some differences between the two, and that Allah now, as opposed to back then, resembles the God of the Bible in some, not most ways, is for the simple reason that:

“...Judaic and Christian *concepts* abetted the *transformation of Allah from a pagan deity* [Hubal] to the god of all monotheists... There is *no reason* therefore to accept the idea that Allah *passed to the Muslims from the Christians and the Jews*” (Caesar Farah, *Islam*, p. 28, emphasis mine).

The Jews and the Christians influenced Muhammad, and changed some of the characteristics of Allah to more resemble the God of the Bible. Then he proclaimed that Allah was the supreme god of all religions. As Morey puts it, “Islam is heathenism in monotheistic form” (*Islamic Invasion*, p. 43). Why do you think Muhammad destroyed the idol of Hubal when he took over Mecca? Because of the influences of the Jews and Christians. He knew that the Second Commandment said you shall not make any idols to represent God, so because he heard that from the Jews and Christians he destroyed the idol. He also did not at first preach that all gods were false, but that Allah was the greatest among them. It was only later as he was more and more influenced by the Jews and Christians about the concept of God that he began to preach that Allah was the only god. But in the beginning it was not so:

“This is seen from the fact that the first of the Muslim creed is not ‘Allah is Great’ but ‘Allah is the greatest’ i.e., he is the greatest among the gods. *Why would Muhammad say that...except in a polytheistic context?*” (*The Moon God Allah*, p. 12, emphasis mine).

In Morey's book *Islamic Invasion* he actually shows more differences than similarities between the God of the Bible and the god of the Koran.

Some try and compare this version of reverence to the stone at the Kaaba to Jacob's pillar stone in the Bible (see [Genesis 28](#)). But Jacob did not worship this stone, nor did he kiss it, or circle it. He set it up as a testimony to his faith. Also remember as we have seen time and time again, these practices of kissing the stone originated in Arabian paganism and not in the Bible! Robert Morey says:

“This fact answers the questions. Why is Allah never defined in the Koran? Why did Muhammad *assume* that the pagan Arabs already *knew who Allah was?*... While they [the pagans] believed that Allah, i.e. the moon god, was the greatest of all the gods and the supreme deity in the pantheon of deities, Muhammad decided that Allah was not *only* the greatest god but the *only god*” (*The Moon God Allah*, p. 11–12, emphasis mine).

The pagans and Muhammad worshipped the same deity! Allah or Hubal!

Origins of Hubal

What are the origins of Hubal? Where did He come from?

“It has been suggested by Pockcock that the word *Hubal* could be from HUBAAL or HOBAAAL in Hebrew meaning ‘the Lord’... God destroyed the Israelites for involving themselves in the worship of this god ([Numbers 25:1–3](#))”(Moshey, *Who Is This Allah?*, p. 136, emphasis mine).

Another source writes:

“Hubal was associated with the Semitic god *Ba’l* [Baal] and with Adonis or Tammuz” (*Fabled Cities, Princes and Jinn from Arab Myths and Legends*, by Khairat Al-Saleh, p. 28, emphasis mine).

Hubal is Baal, that God condemns the worship of all over the Bible. But Baal’s origins go back even further than this. He goes back to the Babylonian religion! The religion of Nimrod (see [Genesis 10](#)).

In his book, *The Two Babylons*, Hislop has done a wonderful job of tracing all heathen religions back to Babylon and the Tower of Babel (see [Genesis 11](#)). When the world was scattered, the people of the world kept their religion that originated with Babylon. This is how we find the Babylonian religion all over the world!

“Herodotus, world traveler and historian of antiquity, witnessed the mystery religions and its rites in numerous countries and mentions how Babylon was the *primeval source* from which *all systems of idolatry flowed*. Bunsen says: ‘the religious system of Egypt was derived from *Asia, and the primitive empire of Babel*’”(David Todd, *The Origins of Easter*, p. 11, emphasis mine).

Hislop says that the Babylonian god Bel and Baal, are one and the same deity:

“Belus or Bel... As *Baal* or Beltus with the name of the great male divinity of Babylon... Belus was *undoubtedly Baal* ‘The Lord’... the worship of the ‘*Sacred Bel*’ the mighty one who died a martyr for idolatry... the regeneration of his heart was the new birth or reincarnation of *Nimrod or Bel*... we learned that it was under Bel or Belus, *that is Baal*” (pp. 20, 25, 190–191, 232, emphasis mine).

Now notice this quote from the *Encyclopedia of Religion* and what it says about Allah, and really discovering the truth about who Allah is and who the Muslims today are worshipping:

“Allah is a pre-Islamic name... corresponding to the *Babylonian Bel* [Baal]” (Thomas O’Brian, 1:117, emphasis mine).

Hubal or Allah is Baal or Nimrod the first King of Idolatry. The Muslims are worshipping a man, Nimrod!

Is it any surprise that:

“The Daughters of *Baal* are three in number... The triad of Baal’s daughters is reflected in the triad of *Allah’s daughters* according to pre-Islamic Arabs. There is some outside confirmation that the three goddesses *are daughters of Baal* (see *Moslem World* 33, No. 1 1943, for the daughters of Baal and Allah)” (*Mythologies of the Ancient World*, Samuel Noah Kramer, p. 196, emphasis mine).

“And I heard another voice from heaven, saying, Come out of her [Babylon], my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues” (Rev. 18:4).

Muhammad a Prophet of God?

There are conflicting versions of the call of Muhammad in the Koran. Montgomery Watt says, “Unfortunately, there are several alternative versions of these events” (For a full treatment of this contradiction see W.Montgomery Watt, *Mohammed’s Mecca*, pp. 54–68).

There are four conflicting accounts of this original call to be a prophet.

We are told in Sura 53:2–18 and Sura 81:19–24 that Allah personally appeared to Muhammad and did signs in front of him.

Later on we see in Sura 16:104 and Sura 26:192–194 that the “holy Spirit” called him.

The third account of his call is given in Sura 15:8, where we are told “the angels” came down and called him. Later on, this account was amended, and we are told the only Gabriel called him.

The last account of his call is the most popular one. The angel Gabriel called him to be a prophet (Sura 2:92). In the Bible, however only God calls people to be prophets. So here we see the first of many differences between the Bible and the Koran.

Another problem that Muhammad creates for himself is, the prophethood according to Muhammad can only come from the line of Isaac and Jacob. In the Koran we read:

“And we bestowed on him Isaac and Jacob, and we established the prophethood and scripture among his seed” (Sura 29:27).

Yusuf Ali adds “Abraham” into the text so Muhammad can qualify, but “Abraham” is not in the Arabic text, which the Muslims claim is perfectly preserved. So according to the Koran, Muhammad cannot be a prophet. Prophets only come from Isaac and Jacob’s seed, and no other race of people can claim the office of prophethood. Also the scriptures are established with Isaac and Jacob. So according to the Koran the only ones who possess God’s word in a book are the Israelites, so the Koran is not the word of God!

Norman Geisler in his book *Islam* examines the call of Muhammad and he says:

“Muhammad himself questioned the divine origin of the experience. At first he thought that he was being deceived by a jinn or evil spirit. One of the most widely respected biographers, M.H. Haykal, speaks vividly of Mohammed’s plaguing fear that he was *demon possessed*: ‘Stricken with panic, Muhammad arose and asked himself, “What did I see? Did *possession of the devil which I feared all along come to pass*” ...? Haykal notes that Muhammad had feared demon possession before, but his wife talked him out of it” (p. 155, emphasis mine).

Even in the Koran the people of Mecca knew about his possession. In Sura 15:6 it reads: “They [the people of Mecca] say: ‘O thou to whom the warning hath been sent down, thou art surely possessed by a jinn [evil spirit].’” (see also Sura 8:23). Geisler also writes that:

“Another characteristic often associated with occult *revelations* is contact with the dead (cf. [Deuteronomy 18:18:9–14](#); [Isaiah 8:19](#), God condemns it). Haykal relates an

occasion when ‘the Muslims overheard him [Muhammad] ask, “Are you calling the dead?” and the prophet answered,

“They hear me no less than you do, except they are unable to answer me.” According to Haykal, he even frankly admits that ‘There is hence no reason to deny the event of the prophet’s visit to the cemetery of Baqi *as out of place considering Mohammed’s psychic power of communication with the realms of reality and his awareness of spiritual reality that surpasses that of ordinary men*’” (*Answering Islam* pp. 155–156, emphasis mine).

Muhammad was right, he was possessed by a demon!

Other proofs of soothsaying or the psychic ability of Muhammad are seen throughout his life. John Ankerberg says:

“Guillaume describes Mohammed’s other spiritualistic contacts and revelations: ‘On the way back to Mecca a number of *junn or spirits are said to have jostled him ...*’ From the books of tradition we learn that the prophet was subject to ecstatic seizures. He has reported to have said that when an inspiration came to him he felt as it were the painful sounding of a bell... At other times visions came to him in sleep ... in its early stages Mohammed’s verses were couched in the *Semitic form of mantic oracular utterance ... veiling of the head and the use of rhymed prose were marks of the Arabian soothsayer, while the feeling of physical violence and compulsion ... the outward appearance of ‘possession’ ... seemed to the onlookers to indicate madness of demon possession*” (*Facts on Islam* p.12, emphasis mine).

The seizures, the foaming at the mouth, the spirits hitting the person, can all be associated with the Occult and soothsaying.

This is also another form of Shamanism:

“Muhammad was a *shaman* who controlled the Jinn, i.e. the spirits who lived in rocks, waters and trees” (Hadith Vol. 1, No. 740; Vol. 5, No. 199) (*Islamic Invasion* section 2, Appendix A, p. 191, emphasis mine).

Shamanism is another form of the Occult religion!

Muhammad in the Bible?

Muslim apologetics, such books as *Muhammad in the Bible*, by Abdu L–Ahad Dawud, claim that the Bible predicts the coming of Muhammad. Let’s examine the evidence to see if that is so.

In [Deuteronomy 18:15–18](#) God promised Moses:

“I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee, and will put my words in his mouth; and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.”

Muslims believe this prophecy was fulfilled in Muhammad, as the Koran itself claims when it refers to the “unlettered prophet,” “whom they mention in their own scriptures, in the law and the Gospels” (Sura 7:156). Let’s see if this is true, since the Koran claims to be free from error (see Sura 18:1).

This prophecy could not be a reference to Muhammad for several reasons. First it is clear that the term “from among their brethren” means fellow Israelites in the Bible and not gentiles.

The term “brethren” when read in context can only refer to the twelve tribes of Israel as the opening verses of chapter 18 show:

“The Levitical priests, that is, all the tribe of Levi, shall have no portion or inheritance with Israel ... They shall have no inheritance among their brethren” (vv. 1–2).

Once more, in chapter 17:14–15, the Israelites are told to put one of their “brethren” as king over them, never a foreigner. The fact is that Israel at no time in its history has ever put an Ishmaelite “brother” as king, but always an Israelite, i.e. Saul, David, proving that the word does not refer to any nation outside of the twelve tribes of Israel.

Another scripture in Deut. 15:12 says: “And if thy brother, a Hebrew man or a Hebrew woman ...” The word “brother” is the exact word in Deut. 18:15 for “brethren.” So God is being specific about which brethren he is talking about, and Muhammad is not a Hebrew!

Notice also in verse 15 in a newer version of the Bible that make it clear:

“YHWH your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among your own people ... I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their own people” (verses 15, 18 NRSV).

The context is fellow Israelites.

As shown earlier, the prophethood, according to Muhammad, can only come from the line of Isaac and Jacob.

In the Korah we read:

“And we bestowed on him Isaac and Jacob, and we established the prophethood and scripture among his seed” (Sura 29:27).

He did not speak to God face to face the way Moses did. He did not perform signs and wonders the way Moses did (Deut 34:11), in fact Muhammad admitted he couldn’t do miracles (see Sura 2:111; 3:180–181), and he claimed to get his revelations from an angel not God (see Suras 25:33–34; 17:106–107).

Finally, the Quran bears witness that Muhammad was not the Prophet like Moses, since he could not do what the latter did:

But (now) when the Truth has come to them from Ourselves, they say, “Why are not (signs) sent to him (Muhammad), like those which were sent to Moses?” (Sura 28:48).

Even more amazing than the Quran bearing witness that Muhammad was unlike Moses, is the fact that the earliest Muslim biographer, Ibn Ishaq, in his Sira Rasul-Allah, testifies that Moses wrote of Jesus:

When the Christians of Najran came to the apostle, the Jewish rabbis came also and they disputed one with the other before the apostle. Rafi said, ‘you have no standing,’ and he denied Jesus and the Gospel; and a Christian said to the Jews, ‘you have no standing’ and he denied that Moses was a prophet and denied the Torah. So God sent down concerning them: ‘The Jews say the Christians have no standing; and the Christians say the Jews have no standing, yet they read the Scriptures. They do not know on the day of resurrection concerning their controversy,’ i.e., each one reads in his book the confirmation of what he denies, so that the Jews deny Jesus though they have the Torah in which God required them by the word of Moses to hold Jesus true; while in the Gospel

is what Jesus brought in confirmation of Moses, and the Torah he brought from God: So each one denies what is in the hand of the other (Alfred Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad*, p. 258).

The only person who fits this prophetic profile is Jesus Christ the Lord. This is due to the following reasons:

- Christ states that Moses wrote about him (cf. [John 5:46](#)).
- The Apostles quote this passage as being fulfilled in Christ (cf. [John 1:45](#); [Acts 3:17–24](#)).
- On both their births, infant deaths were enacted (cf. [Ex. 1:15–16, 22](#); [Mt. 2:13](#)).
- Both were rescued by divine intervention (cf. [Ex. 2:2–10](#); [Mt. 2:13](#)).
- Christ being the Son of God, knew God the Father “face to face” as did Moses. In fact, Christ is the image of God and is God’s exact representation (cf. [Mt. 11:27](#); [John 1:1–3, 14, 18](#); [John 14:9](#); [Col. 1:15–17](#); [Heb. 1:2, 3](#)).
- God prepared Moses for his mission by his wandering in the wilderness for forty years; Christ for forty days (cf. [Ex. 7:7](#); [Mt. 4:1](#)).
- Christ, like Moses, shone with glorious light at the Mount of Transfiguration (cf. [Ex. 34:29](#); [Mt. 17:2](#)).
- Christ performed greater miracles than Moses. An example would be raising the dead (cf. [John 11:25–26, 43–44](#)).
- Christ spoke the words of God alone (cf. [John 8:28](#)).
- Christ, like Moses, intercedes on behalf of men (cf. [Exodus 32:30–32](#); [1 Tim. 2:5](#)).
- Christ, like Moses, is the mediator of God’s covenant (cf. [Exodus 24:4–8](#); [Mark 14:24](#); [1Cor. 11:23–25](#)).
- Christ and Moses liberated their people from bondage; one from slavery, the other from sin (cf. [Exodus](#); [Isaiah 53](#); [John 8:32–36](#); [Gal. 5:1](#)).
- Christ, like Moses, is an Israelite from the tribe of Judah (cf. [Num. 26:59](#); [Luke 3:22–38](#)).

[Deut 33:2](#): The prophecy of Sinai, Seir and Paran is not a prophecy of Judaism, Christianity and Islam as Badawi erroneously assumes. Paran and Seir are located near Egypt in the Sinai Peninsula, as any good Bible map will demonstrate. It is purely wishful thinking to claim that Seir refers to Jesus’ ministry in Palestine, or that Paran is near Mecca, when Paran was thousands of miles away near southern Palestine in northeastern Sinai!

Proof of this can be found in the Holy Bible itself:

“And the children of Israel took their journeys out of the wilderness of Sinai; and the cloud (of God) rested in the wilderness of Paran.” ([Numbers 10:12](#)).

“And afterward the people (Israelites) removed from Hazeroth, and pitched in the wilderness of Paran” ([Numbers 12:16](#)).

“And Moses by the commandment of the Lord sent them from the wilderness of Paran ... And they went and came to Moses, and to Aaron, and to all the congregation of the children of Israel, unto the wilderness of Paran, to Kadesh ...” ([Numbers 13:3, 26](#)).

“These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on this side of Jordan in the wilderness, in the plain over against the Red sea, between Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Dizahab” ([Deuteronomy 1:1](#)).

All these verses prove that Paran could not possibly be Mecca but a locale near Sinai, since Moses and the Israelites never settled in that part of Arabia. Hence, Badawi's assertion fails in the light of the biblical evidence.

Furthermore the prophecy speaks of "Yahweh" coming, not Muhammad. And he comes with ten thousand of his saints, not soldiers as Muhammad did to Mecca. There is no basis in this text for Muhammad's invasion of Mecca.

Finally, this prophecy was for a "blessing to Israel" (v. 1), not for the Arabs.

For other Islamic Biblical references refuted go to the Answering Islam web site at www.answering-islam.org for a full examination.

Is the Quran the Word of God?

The Quran is at the heart of Islam. If its claims can be substantiated, then Islam is true, and all opposing religious claims, including Christianity and Judaism, are false.

Of course, the claims that the Muslims make for the Quran are that the Quran is errorless (Sura 18:1), and there is a copy of it in a table in heaven preserved (Sura 85:21–22).

The Quran also claims that:

"The revelation of this book is from God, The exalted in power, full of wisdom. It is we who have revealed the book to thee in truth" (Sura 39:1–2).

Muslim commentators say that the Quran is the final revelation from God (for more details, see Geisler's book, Answering Islam., p. 179–80).

Muhammad also makes the claim that:

"Can they not consider the Koran? Were it from any other than God, they would surely have found in it many contradictions" (Sura 4:84).

So according to the Quran, if there are contradictions in this book, then it is not the word of God!

Muhammad just helped us dig the grave for the Quran. The Quran is loaded with contradictions!

Let's examine some of the contradictions in the Quran.

1. The Quran differs whether a day is 1,000 years or 50,000 years (see Sura 32:4 and 70:4).
2. On the day of Judgment the infidels attempt to conceal something from God (Sura 6:22–23). But in Sura 4:45 we see that the infidels don't attempt to conceal anything.
3. In Sura 56 the people who follow Muhammad will be "a crowd of the former, and few of the latter generations" verse 14. But in verse 39 it says that the people of Muhammad will be "a crowd of the latter generations." Other translations have "multitude" as the word instead of "crowd." So which one is it, a few of the latter, or a crowd?
4. Commenting on the Exodus, God told the Israelites:

"And it was said to them, 'Dwell in this city, and eat therefrom what ye will, and say "Hittat" (forgiveness) and enter the gate with prostrations; then we will pardon your offences, we will give increase to the doers of good' " (7:162).

Now look at this verse about the same subject:

“And when we said, ‘Enter this city, and eat therefrom plentiful at your will, and enter the gate with prostrations, and say, “Forgiveness,” and we will pardon you your sins, and give an increase to the doers of good”’ (Sura 2:55).

Now if the Quran is without error, how do you explain the difference of these two statements? This is God talking to the Israelites, and both times God is quoted wrong. One could understand if this were two people witnessing what was going on and wrote it down, but this is not the case. The Quran is dictating what happened in the past.

5. In Sura 22:40–41 God says that people who are persecuted because of believing in God can take up arms and defend themselves. But in Sura 66:9, God commands to make war with people who don’t believe.

6. Because Judaism and Christianity were divided into sects, the Quran says that they were not of God (see Suras 30:30–32; 42:11–15).

Yet Islam is divided into many warring sects, and therefore Islam is false as well, according to the Quran.

7. In Sura 11:45, we read that Noah’s son “was among the drowned,” that is he died in the flood. But in Sura 21:76, we read that God saved “all his kinsfolk from the great calamity ...”

8. At first Muhammad was nice to the Christians and the Jews. The Quran says that if they try to convert you to “unbelief” to “forgive them” (Sura 2:59, 103). Then Muhammad says to slay all unbelievers (Suras 5:55; 9:29–30; 66:9).

9. There are conflicting views about the number of days of creation. In Sura 41:8–11 the Quran says that it took 8 days to create everything (4 days + 2 days + 2 days = 8 days). But it only took 6 days according to the Bible (**Gen. 1:31**). Also in the Quran in Suras 7:52; 10:3; 32:3–4, it says God created everything in 6 days. Then it says that everything was created in a twinkling of an eye (see Sura 54:50). So the Quran conflicts with itself and the Bible.

10. In the creation of Adam, God told his angels to worship Adam (see Sura 2:32). This breaks his own law, that you should only worship God (see Sura 2:77).

All over the Quran we read that God is an absolute one.

Sura 112 says:

“He is God alone: God the eternal! He begetteth not, and He is not begotten; and there is none like unto him.”

It also says that:

“And they say ‘God has a son.’ No! ... sole Maker of the heavens and the earth!” (Sura 2:111; 4:169).

Problem is, why does the Quran say that:

“Have WE not made the earth a couch? And the mountains tent stakes? ... And built above you seven solid heavens” (Sura 78:8, 11).

“And as to the earth, WE have spread it out...” (Sura 50:7).

“WE have not created the heavens and the earth and whatever is in between them in sport: We have not created them but for a serious end” (Sura 44:39).

Question: If God is alone, has no son, is sole maker of all things, they deny the Trinity saying God is one not three (see Sura 5:77). So the question is, Who is “WE” in these verses? Not just in these verses, but this is all over the Quran. It talks about how “we parted the sea,” and “we

made a covenant with Israel.” Some Muslim scholars say that this is the plural of majesty, like in [Genesis 1:26](#), where God says, “Let Us make man in Our image, after Our likeness.” Problem is, recently historians are starting to discover that the plural of majesty was never known among the Hebrews, and it came to be during the Medieval times of the kings of England, in Europe. So who is we? Was Muhammad claiming divinity, even though he denied it?

11. To drink wine (Suras 16:67; 2:219; 4:43), or not to drink wine (Sura 5:92)?

12. Did Jesus die (Sura 19:33; 3:55) or not? (Sura 4:157–158).

13. In one part of the Quran, God says that you need a mediator to talk to him (Sura 42:51–52), and that it “beffitteth not a man,” meaning all men. In another place, it says that Moses spoke directly to God (Sura 7:143; 4:164).

14. In one place, it says that Abraham was not an idolater (Sura 3:67; 6:62), but in another place, you see Abraham committing idolatry (Sura 6:75–78).

15. In one place, Muhammad is told not to bother in converting unbeliever (Sura 2:6–7), for their fate is sealed. In another place, Muhammad is told to attempt their conversion by peaceful means anyway (Sura 24:54).

16. Muhammad first said that it does not matter where you are facing to pray because God is everywhere (Sura 2:109). Then he changed his mind and said that we should pray towards Jerusalem, and then changed his mind again and said we should face Mecca (Sura 2:119–121, 138–144). And this contradiction is all in the same chapter.

17. Finally, one huge contradiction in the Quran that actually is embarrassing to the Muslims. The Quran claims that the book is written in pure Arabic (see Suras 12:2; 13:37; 16:105; 41:44).

Robert Morey says:

“The Quran is not perfect Arabic. It contains many grammatical errors, such as Suras 2:177, 192; 4:162; 5:69; 7:160; 13:28; 20:66; 63:10. etc ...” (*Islamic Invasion*, p. 119).

In his book, *The Foreign Vocabulary of the Quran*, Arthur Jeffery documents the fact that the Quran contains over 100 foreign (non-Arabic) words. There are Egyptian, Hebrew, Greek, Syriac, Akkadian, Ethiopian and Persian words and phrases in the Quran.

Back to Muhammad’s question: “Can they not consider the Koran? Were it from any other than God, they would surely have found in it many contradictions.” How would you answer Muhammad, if he were still alive today?

Do the Bible and the Quran Contradict?

The Koran says that the Bible and the Koran agree with one another, that there is no difference between the two:

“We believe in God and that which has been sent down to us [Quran], and sent down on Abraham and Ishmael, Isaac and Jacob, and the [Israelitish] tribes, and in that which was given to Moses [the law] and Jesus [the Gospel], and the prophets of their Lord; we make no division between any of them ...” (Suras 2:130; 3:78).

But there are many differences between the two books.

As we have shown earlier, the Quran says creation took place in 8 days, the Bible says 6 days. We showed you earlier that one of Noah’s sons died in the flood, but the Bible says all his sons were saved. Sura 11:4–6 says the ark landed on Mount Judi, the Bible says it landed on the Mountains of Ararat, which were east of the land of Shinar, most likely in Iran!

The Quran says that Abraham's father was called Azar (Sura 6:74), but the Bible says Terah (Gen 11:27).

Abraham did not live and worship in Mecca (Sura 14:38), but south of Bethel, according to the Bible (see Gen 13:3).

“It is virtually certain that Abraham *never* reached Mecca” (Watt, p. 136, *Muslim and Christian Encounters*, emphasis mine).

It was Abraham's son Isaac, not Ishmael that was sacrificed (see Sura 37:100–110 and Gen. 22).

He did not build the Kaaba, as history has shown us and it is not in the Bible (see Sura 2:121–122).

He was not thrown into the fire by Nimrod as the Quran claims (see Sura 21:60–69). This is a very serious error in Biblical and secular history. Nimrod was dead for centuries while Abraham walked this earth.

It was not Pharaoh's wife that adopted Moses (Sura 28:7–8); it was Pharaoh's daughter (Exodus 2:5).

Noah's flood did not take place in Moses' day (Sura 2:248–;9; 7:130–132, cf. 7:57 ff). This error cannot be easily swept aside.

The Quran says Haman lived in Egypt during Pharaoh's day in the time of Moses building the tower of Babel (Suras 28:5–7, 38; 29:38; 40:24–25, 38–39). But Haman actually lived in Persia 1,000 years later (see the book of Esther). This contradicts secular as well as biblical history.

Crucifixion was not used in Pharaoh's time, the time of Moses (see Sura 7:121). This also contradicts secular history. The Carthaginians are the ones who invented crucifixion, and then the Romans took it from them.

Mary, the mother of Jesus—her father was not Imram (Sura 66:12). Muslims say she was a descendant of Aaron, but Sura 3:30–43 plainly says that she [a woman of Imram] gave birth to Mary, and Imram said a prayer when she was born, and Zechariah took care of her when she was born. She is also called the “sister of Aaron,” Moses' brother (see Sura 19:29). Mary and Aaron lived thousands of years apart from each other! Muhammad confused her with Miriam, the sister of Moses and Aaron.

She did not give birth to Jesus under a palm tree, but in a stable (see Sura 19:20–23; Luke 2:1–20).

Muhammad made up fictional speeches of the people in the Bible, using such words as “Muslim” and “Islam,” which were not used in the languages of those people at that time. These people did not call themselves Muslims (see Suras 2:122–126; 3:45–52, 60; 7:120–126; etc.).

The test of how the soldiers would drink the water from the stream did not take place in the days of Saul when David defeated Goliath, but many years earlier with Gideon (cf. Sura 2:250 with Judges 7:1–8).

In Sura 20:87–88, 96 we are told that the Israelites built a golden calf at the suggestion of the “Samaritan.” Muhammad did not know that Samaria was founded by the Israelites under King Omri, and then when Assyria took them away captive in 721 B.C., they put other races of people into Samaria years after Moses was in the wilderness. This also contradicts secular as well as Biblical history.

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* says:

“The deviations [in the Quran] from the Biblical narratives are very marked, and can in most cases be traced back to the *legendary anecdotes of the Jewish Haggada and the Apocryphal Gospel*. Much has been written concerning the sources from which Muhammad derived his information; there is no evidence *that he was able to read*, and his dependence on *oral communication* may explain some of his misconceptions ...” (see samples above, 13:479, emphasis mine).

This is true, even in the Quran he is called the “Unlettered Prophet” (7:156). Arabic scholar Edward Sell says:

“He certainly did not get them from the Old Testament. The confusion of names is quite remarkable” (*Studies*, p. 225).

“As pagan, Jewish, and Christian traders sat around the fire telling each other favorite stories, they would get the names, times and events all jumbled up and confused” (Morey, *Islamic Invasion*, p. 141).

The worst way to preserve anything is through human memory. Our human memories are too fragile to remember details of history. This is why God commanded Moses and the prophets, and the whole Bible for that matter, to be “written in a book,” as eyewitness testimony!

Does the Quran Contradict Secular History?

There are many historical mistakes in the Quran. If the Quran is the word of God then it should not contain any mistakes. Let’s go through some of them.

In Sura 105 Muhammad claims that the army of the elephant was defeated by birds dropping stones of baked clay upon them. According to historical record, Arbah’s army withdrew their attack on Mecca after small pox broke out among the troop (see Guillaume, *Islam*, p. 21 ff).

The Kaaba was not built by Abraham, but by the pagans for Allah, or Hubal the moon god, to encase the black stone that fell out of the sky as we have proved earlier.

One of the greatest errors I have seen from a religious book, is the claim that Alexander the Great, who is called the “Two Horned One” in the Quran, was a Muslim, he worshipped Allah and lived to a good old age (see Sura 18:82–98). This error is ironclad. History shows that Alexander the Great was a pagan sodomite, and died at a young age. [Daniel 8](#) in the Bible gives you an accurate description of Alexander the Great. Now some try and dispute this account and say it wasn’t Alexander the Great but someone else. The problem with that is, the only person in all of history who was called the “two horned one” was Alexander the Great. Also this story matches exactly to the myth of Alexander the Great in a book called the *Romance of Alexander*. And even Muslim scholars recognized that this is speaking of Alexander the Great (see Yusuf Ali’s translation of the Quran).

Warraq says:

“The account of Alexander the Great (Sura 18:82) is hopelessly confused historically, and we are certain it was based on the *Romance of Alexander*. At any rate, the Macedonian was *not a Muslim*, and he did not live to an *old age*, nor was he *contemporary of Abraham*, as Muslims contend” (*Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 158–159, emphasis added).

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* writes:

“His [Mohammed’s] account of Alexander introduced as the ‘Two Horned One’ (Sura 18:82), is derived from the *Romance of Alexander*, which was current among the Nestorian Christians of the 7th century in a Syriac version” (15:479, emphasis mine).

How can we rely on a book that is filled with so many errors as the Quran!

The Quran denies the crucifixion of Jesus Christ (Sura 4:157–158). The crucifixion is an absolute historical fact. There are non-Christian, Roman, Christian, and Jewish sources that will testify that Jesus was actually crucified on that Passover day. Read Lee Strobel’s book, *The Case for Christ*. He has a law degree from Yale, and was a former journalist for the *Chicago Tribune* who denied Christianity, and put his law skills to the test. When he was done with his investigation he realized that the Bible is historically accurate and Jesus did die and was resurrected! See also this web site for the crucifixion being a historical fact! <http://answering-islam.org/Gilchrist/crucifixion.html> and <http://answering-islam.org/shamoun/documents.html>

Sources of the Quran

What are the sources of the Quran? Where did these versions of Biblical history and secular history come from? The answer is paganism, the Talmud, the Apocrypha, and other books of fables and legends!

Warraq writes:

“The prophet *transferred* to Islam the beliefs and practices of the *heathen pagan Arabs*, especially into the ceremonies of the pilgrimage to Mecca. And yet Muslims continue to hold that their faith came directly from Heaven, and that the ‘Quran is held to be of eternal origin recorded in heaven, lying as it does there upon a preserved table’ (Suras 85:21; 6:19, 97) ... Perhaps Muslims have the unconscious fear that if we can trace the teachings of the Quran to a purely *human and earthly source*, then the entire edifice of Islam will crumble” (*Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 34, emphasis mine).

Professor Jomier, one of France’s greatest Middle Eastern scholars says:

“Muslims receive these narratives as the word of God, *without enquiring about their historical background*. In fact we have here a popular poetic form of *legends, variants of religious themes known from other sources*” (Morey, *Islamic Invasion*, p. 147, emphasis mine).

Morey also notes that:

“Abraham Geiger in 1833, and further documented by another Jewish scholar, Dr. Abraham Katsh, of New York University, in 1954, that ‘many of the stories in the Koran come from the *Jewish Talmud, the Midrash, and many Apocryphal works*’” (ibid., pp. 148–149, emphasis mine).

The *Encyclopedia Britannica* also documents the same thing (15:648). And what is amazing is that:

“In spite of all the evidence, it is interesting that Muslim authors have been most unwilling to address the issue of the human origins of the Koran, but have simply repeated their dogmatic assertions about its divine origin. In fact, in our research of

Muslim authors we have not even come across an acknowledgment of such problems in the Koran, to say nothing of solutions” (*Answering Islam*, p. 309).

W. St. Clair-Tisdall is the best source for the origins of the Quran. He demonstrates the direct dependence of Quranic stories on the Bible, from the Talmud, the Apocrypha (Jewish and Christian), Zoroaster Buddhism, and also Hinduism. To read his book on-line go to <http://www.answering-islam.org/Quran/Sources/Tisdall/> Also this web site, where he answers his critics at <http://www.answering-islam.org/Quran/Sources/Tisdall/WW/>

Here is a brief summary of the sources of the Quran:

- The birth of Christ in Sura 19:22–34 came from the *The History of the Nativity of Mary and the Savior’s Infancy*.
- Alexander the Great, as we have seen, came from the *Romance of Alexander*.
- The Seven Heavens in Sura 17:46; 23:88; 41:11; 65:12, came from Indo-Iranian sources in both Hindu and Zoroastrian scriptures.
- In Sura 11:9 we find God’s throne above the waters. This comes from the Jewish Rashi.
- In Sura 7:44 there is mention of a wall called Aaraf. This comes from the Jewish Midrash.
- In Suras 15:17; 37:7; 67:5 we find Satan listening stealthily and being driven away with stones. This story we find in Jewish writings, about Genii “listening behind the curtain in order to gain knowledge of what is to come.”
- Sura 1:29 talks about hell being full. In the Rabbinic book Othioth Derabbi Akiba 8:1, we find the same thing.
- Sura 24:24 is found in the Jewish Talmud (Cheiga 16 Taanith 11).
- The traditions of Mount Caf is a garbled and misunderstood version of the passage in Hagigah.
- The Creation of Adam (Sura 2:28–33) resembles the Midrash Rabbah on Leviticus, Parashah 19, and Genesis, Parashah 8; and Sanhedrin 38.
- Various Suras also recount that God commanded the angels to worship Adam (Suras 7:10–26; 18:48; 20:115; 37:71–86). This agrees with the account in the Midrash of Rabbi Moses.
- Cain and Abel (Sura 5:35) resembles the Mishna Sandhedrin 4:5. The conversation of Cain and Abel is taken from the Targum of Jerusalem.
- The conversations of Noah when they were building the ark is from the Sandhedrin 108.
- The story of Abraham being saved from Nimrod’s fire (Suras 2:260; 6:74–84; 21:52–72; 19:42–50; 26:69–79; 29:15–16; 37:81–95; 43:25–27; 60:4 etc ...) All stories about Abraham have been shown to be from the Jewish Midrash Rabbah (see Tisdall and Geiger).
- Muhammad often refers to God as “rabb,” meaning “Lord.” Sometimes as “Lord of the Worlds” (see Suras 56:79; 82:29 83:6). Also at the head of each Sura we see God being called “The Merciful” (Suras 55:1, 78:3). This term was used before Islam, by the pagan Arabs. It has been found in South Arabian inscriptions.
- The story of the seven sleepers (Sura 18:8–26) comes from a legend that arose around the 5th century, and spread all over Europe and Asia. It originated from a Syrian Bishop named James Sarug.
- The denial of the crucifixion of Jesus (see Sura 4:157–158) comes from the apocryphal book Travels of the Apostles (see Abdul-Haqq *Sharing Your Faith With a Muslim*, pp.130–139 for a full study).

Warraq writes:

“These Old Testament characters ... mentioned in the Koran ... as the *Dictionary of Islam* puts it: ‘[are] with strange want of accuracy and a *large admixture of Talmudic fable*’” (*Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 54, emphasis mine).

Interestingly, the Quran in Sura 25:5 says that the unbelievers say:

“... tales of the ancients he hath put in writing! And they are dictated to him morn and even.”

Muhammad’s response:

“He hath sent it down who knoweth the secrets of the heavens and the earth” (v.6).

This reply does not deny the existence of myths in the Quran. It only denies that these myths were from Muhammad, which he dictated or had dictated to him. It emphasizes that, even though they were “fairy-tales,” yet they are from God! So Muhammad himself admits that he was borrowing from known stories. He does not refute the fact that he was borrowing from known myths!

This is the reason we admire the question al-Razi asks when he says: “How can the command of the Qur’an, ‘say, “He sent it down, who knows the secret in the heavens and earth,”’ (Sura Ta Ha 20:7) be a reply to the unbelievers’ accusation of the Quran that it was the fairy-tales of the ancients?” For what comes to one’s mind, which is what al-Razi and others also expected, is that the Quran should negate this accusation, not confirm it!

Even Muhammad admitted: “I am not an apostle of new doctrines...” (Sura 46:8, Rodwell Translation). And we see that in all the stories of the Quran was nothing new. They were all borrowed from myths legends and paganism.

And the origins of these sources are nothing more than:

“... *legendary and spurious ... which began to appear in the 2nd century. They were mostly forgeries, and we so recognized from the first. ‘They were so full of nonsensical stories of Christ and the Apostles, that they had never been regarded as divine ...’* Deliberate attempts to *fill the gaps* of the New Testament story of Jesus in order to further heretical ideas by *false claims ...* It is said that *Mohammed got his ideas of Christianity from these books*” (*Halley’s Bible Handbook*, p. 747, emphasis mine).

The Abrogator of Verses

In Sura 2:100 and 16:103 Muhammad says this, “Whatever verses we cancel, or cause thee to forget, we bring one better or like it.” First, what’s amazing is, in an earlier verse (v. 20), he challenges people to “produce an sura like it.” And here he is canceling them. Looks like God was violating his own law. But why would God have Muhammad cancel verses and bring other ones just like it or better? Isn’t God’s revelation good enough for all races and for all times, and to give it to us just once? Can’t he produce a verse that’s perfect one time? The Bible says, “The word of the Lord endures forever” (1 Peter 1:25). In the Quran, this is not the case! In the Bible there is not one case where a prophet cancelled any verses.

Secondly, notice in this verse that Muhammad “forgot” something God told him. So now we have some of God’s message lost because Muhammad had a bad memory.

Let's go through some of the verses that Muhammad cancelled to illustrate the change in the Quranic text.

Let's start with the Satanic verses. According to one version of these verses, Muhammad had an early revelation in Mecca, which allowed the intercession of idols:

“Do you consider Allat and Al-Uzza and Al-Manat, the third the other? Those are swans exalted; Their intercession is expected ...”

Some time after, Muhammad received another revelation canceling the last three lines and substituting them with what we find now in Sura 53:21–23, which omits the part about the pagan gods interceding. According to Watt, both versions had been recited publicly. Muhammad's explanation was that Satan had deceived him and inserted the false verses without him knowing it! (see Watt, pp. 60–61). Problem is, if Satan deceived him in this part of the Quran without him knowing it, how do we know that Satan did not deceive him in another place in the Quran without him knowing, and that verse is still in the Quran today?

The command to stone adulterers was changed to 100 stripes (Sura 24:2).

The “sword” verse (Sura 9:5) supposedly annuls the 124th verse that originally encouraged tolerance (cf. 2:256), yet in other places it urges Muslims to “fight those who believe not” (9:29) and fight and slay the pagans wherever you find them (9:5). Of course, here's a contradiction!

A contradiction can be found in the fact that the Quran claims that there can be “no changes to the word of God” (10:65). For there is none that can alter or change the words of God (6:34). But here Muhammad is canceling verses (Sura 2:100). Geisler writes that most of the time you see the corrected verses near the ones being corrected. The reason for the abrogation of verses is quite clear. There are many contradictions in the Quran, and Muhammad said you can't find any or else its not God's word:

“Can they not consider the Quran? Were it from any other than God, they would surely have found in it many contradictions” (Sura 4:84).

The Quran claims that humans are responsible for their own choices (18:28), yet it also claims that God has sealed the fate of all in advance (17:14; 10:99–100).

Scientific Errors in the Quran

Some critics question just how scientific the Quran really is. Take for instance the statement that humans are made from a clot of blood:

“Then we made the sperm into a clot of congealed blood; Then of that clot we made a (foetus) lump; then we made out of that lump bones and clothed the bones with flesh (Sura 23:14).

This is scarcely a scientific description of embryonic development. For a full explanation of this go to <http://www.answering-islam.org/Quran/Science/embryo.html>

Here are others:

- The Quran speaks of travelling west to “the setting of the sun, he found it setting in a muddy spring” (Sura 18:84). Of course this is absolutely impossible.

- The Quran claims the earth is flat! Yes flat! Now the Bible says the earth is “round” (Isaiah 40:22 Moffatt Translation). The Quran however:

“alludes to the fact that the earth is *flat* and its mountains are like poles which create a balance so that the earth does not tilt” (*Unmasking Islam*, p. 175, emphasis mine).

In Sura 88:17, 20, it is recorded:

“Will they not regard the camels how they are created ... and the earth how it is spread?”... In page 509, Jalalan says: “in his phrase, ‘how it is spread’ he denotes that the earth is *flat*. All scholars of Islamic law agree upon this. It is not round as the physicists claim” (ibid., p.175).

The Dawood Translation translates this verse as “The earth how it was leveled flat (88:20). See also the Suras that show the mountains, like poles, hold the earth in place so it won’t tilt (21:32; 50:7). Sura 2:20 says that the earth is a “bed” for us humans. Beds are flat, so in the Quran, the earth is flat! But is the earth flat? Absolutely not! And mountains do not hold the earth steady. Any geologist will tell you that mountains actually cause earthquakes!

The Quran also says that the sky is a solid dome or a roof (see Suras 2:20; 21:33). *The New Commentary on the Whole Bible* by Jamieson, Fausset and Brown says:

“...an allusion to the ancient Near Eastern cosmological thought that considered the earth flat with the sky a *vault*, sustained by pillars ...” (p. 940, emphasis mine). Scientifically the Quran fails.

Now there is a myth being spread by the Muslims that the Muslims were great men of science due to the Quran. But Muslims got their science from:

“... the works of ancient *Greeks*, and the Muslims are important as the *preservers* and transmitters of Greek (and Hindu) learning ... [but] most of the credit [for science] must go to the Persians, *Christians and Jews* ... There is a persistent myth that Islam encouraged science. Adherents of this view quote the Quran and Hadith to prove their point: ‘Say shall those who have knowledge and those who have it not be deemed equal?’ (Quran 39:12); ‘Seek knowledge in China if necessary;’ ‘The search after knowledge is obligatory for every Muslim.’ *This is nonsense* because the knowledge advocated ... *is religious knowledge*. Orthodoxy has always been suspicious of ‘knowledge for his own sake,’ and *unfettered intellectual inquiry is deemed dangerous to the faith.*” (Warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim*, pp. 272–273, emphasis mine).

Muslims boast that the Quran says that the universe is “expanding” and scientists only found this out 50 years ago, while the prophet wrote about this 1,400 years ago, so the Quran must be from God. Problem is, as we have pointed out, Muhammad borrowed many things from the Jews! When the Quran talks about the universe in many Suras, first it contradicts the Sura we have just quoted that the heavens are a “solid roof” or a “dome,” because domes or roofs don’t expand.

Secondly, these Suras that talk about the universe are very similar, and in some cases *identical to the book of Isaiah chapters 40–49*. Here God talks about how He “stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain” (*Isaiah 40:22*). This knowledge was around *long before Muhammad was born*. He borrowed this knowledge from the Jews!

They also boast about the Quran when it talks about creating man in different “stages” of development, and how science shows the evolution of man from its primitive form to our present day form. The problem here is, all the different bones like Cro-Magnon man and Neanderthal man and so on, have been disproven to be proof of the evolution of man (see *Bones of*

Contention by Marvin L. Lubenow)! This book is one of many that show these theories to be false. There is no evidence that man developed in stages!

But where did Muhammad get this theory that man was developed in “stages” as the Quran says? As we have noted above, the Muslims got their knowledge of science from the Greeks. The idea that man developed from “stages” is nothing new. That was around long before Muhammad was even born, just like the embryology in the Quran, which came from the Greeks as well!

“The Great Chain of Being ... patterned after *Plato*. According to this concept the Almighty had created a great ladder or chain of living things, from single celled organisms all the way up to humans, each organism being a bit more complex than the one below it... the Great Chain of Being we are dealing not with biblical concepts but with *pagan Greek philosophy*” (*Bones of Contention*, pp 93–94, emphasis added).

So again the Quran is scientifically inaccurate. And the accuracy it does show, comes from the Bible, from the book of Isaiah chapters 40–49. The Muslims should praise the Bible for its accuracy not the Quran!

Muhammad and the Occult

We showed you earlier how Muhammad talked to the dead, and visited cemeteries, and Haykal, one of the best biographers of Muhammad, admitted that he had psychic ability (see Norman Geisler, *Answering Islam*, pp. 155–56).

Mr. Ankerberg says:

“Oxford educated Alfred Guillaume was a professor of Arabic at both Princeton and the University of London ... He observes that Muhammad first considered himself as belonging to the category of shair-man with mysterious esoteric knowledge which was generally attributed to a familiar spirit called a jinn or shaytan” (*Facts on Islam*, p. 11).

He goes on to say:

“Mohammed’s inspiration and religious experiences are remarkably similar to those found in some forms of spiritism. Shamanism, for example, is notorious for fostering periods of mental disruption as well as spirit possession. Significantly Muhammad experienced Shaman-like encounters and phenomena. Further, many authorities have noted that spirit possession frequently leads to the kinds of experiences that Muhammad had” (*ibid.*, p. 10, see Arthur Jeffery’s *Islam: Muhammad and His Religion*, p.16).

Geisler says:

“Another authority describes the Quranic verse in this way: ‘The Shortest verses generally occur in the earliest Suras, in which the style of Mohammad’s revelation comes very close to the *rhymed prose (saj)* used by the *Kahins*, or soothsayers of his times ...’” (*Answering Islam*, p. 93, emphasis mine).

Warraq writes:

“The belief in angels and demons is said to have been acquired from the *Persians* (the Koranic word ‘ifrit’ meaning ‘demon’ is of Pahlavi origin). If this is the case then it was

acquired long ago, for the *Pagan Arabs before Islam already had confused the notion of a class of shadow beings* everywhere present yet nowhere distinctly perceived, the jinn or djinn... For the Heathen Arabs, the jinn were invisible but were capable of taking various forms, such as those of snakes, lizards and scorpions. If a jinn entered a man it rendered him mad or possessed [like Muhammad claimed]. Muhammad... *maintained a belief in these spirits*: ‘in fact the prophet went so far as to *recognize the existence of heathen gods*, classing them among the demons (see Sura 37:158) ... these primitive superstitions ... held their ground in [Muslim] Arabia ... [and] spread over the rest of the [Muslim] world ... Mohammed’s own beliefs in jinns are to be found in the Koran ... Sura 72 (entitled ‘The Jinn’) 6:100 ... 6:128... 37:158 ... 55:14 ... The angel Gabriel is spoken of as a companion of Muhammad, just as though he were a jinni accompanying a poet, and the same word ‘nafatha,’ blow upon, is used of an *enchanter, of a jinni* inspiring a poet and of Gabriel revealing to Muhammad” (*Why I Am Not a Muslim*, pp. 48–49, emphasis mine).

Muhammad also classed the Sabians and the people of Zoroaster as the “people of the book” Now these Sabians were those who were

“... the people of the book ... [who] worshipped the stars and admitted to the existence of astral spirits ... Insofar as the Sabians may have influenced Muhammad, we may note the prevalence of oaths by stars and planets in the Koran (Sura 56:75: ‘I swear by the falling of the stars ...’ Sura 53 entitled ‘The Start,’ verse 1: ‘By the star when it plunges ...’) ...” (ibid., p. 65, emphasis mine).

The God of the Bible condemns astrological observations (see [Deuteronomy 4:15, 19; 18:10–12](#)).

What is a soothsayer? One who practices divination, generally associated with the occult sciences. Hinduism, Zoroasterism, Mithraism all have elements of astrology in them. We see in Sura 15:16: “We set the signs of the Zodiac in the heavens ...” Islam condones, not condemns astrology. In Sura 53:45 Muhammad refers to “Sirius” the dog star worshipped by the pagan Arabs.

Here is a warning to Christians about the false prophets: “If there arise among you a prophet, or a dreamer of dreams, and giveth thee a sign [In Muhammad’s case the sign is the Quran] or a wonder, And the sign or the wonder come to pass, whereof he spake unto thee, saying, Let us go after other gods [The Quran which teaches us to worship the Moon God Hubal], Which thou hast not known, and let us serve them” ([Deut. 13:1–2](#)). Then God says it is a test to see if we love him and stay with his religion ([v.3](#)). Then it pronounces the death penalty on these false prophets ([v.5](#)).

Women in Islam

Women in Islam are second class citizens. The Quran declares that “Men are superior to women on account of the qualities with which God gave them” (Sura 4:38). Little does Muhammad know that women are stronger than men in the qualities that God gave them. The Bible teaches that men and women are equal ([1 Corinthians 11:11](#)). That they should love one another. The Bible says, “Husbands love your wives, even as Christ loved the church, and gave himself for it” ([Eph 5:25](#)). We should give our lives to the point of death to our wives. The Bible

says that the husband is the head of the wife (Eph. 5:23). But this has nothing to do with equality. The Prime Minister of Canada is the head of the country. Is he superior to us? No, he was appointed leader of the country. It has nothing to do with equality. And the Biblical definition of leadership is service (Matthew 23:11). For a full study on women in Islam and violence against women in Islam go to <http://answeringislam.org/Green/womenstatus.htm>

Homosexuality

Homosexuality: is it condoned or condemned in the Quran? There are two conflicting views of homosexuality in the Quranic verses. There are many scriptures that condemn it (see Suras 4:16; 7:80–81; 26:165; 27:55). But there are also Suras that condone it!

Warraq explains:

“A great tolerance for homosexuality in the Islamic world has been recognized for a long time. From the 19th century onward, many Westerners have been going to Muslim north Africa to look for homosexual adventure that their own society [Christian] condemned” (*Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 341, emphasis mine).

“However ambiguity creeps in, in the passage of the Koran describing the delights of paradise [Heaven] ...” (ibid., p.341).

Sura 52:24 says:

“We shall unite the true believers with those of their descendants who follow them in their faith, and shall not deny them the reward of their good works ... Fruits we shall give them, and such meats as they desire. They will pass from hand to hand a cup inspiring no idle talk, no sinful urge; and there shall wait upon them *young boys of their own as fair as virgin pearls*” (see also 56:17; 76:19).

In the book *99 Names for God* Judith Miller examines these scriptures about having sex with young boys. She demonstrates that these scriptures do mean homosexual relations with these boys.

“... are these boys available for sexual dalliance, or are they only to serve? (Warraq, p. 342).

Homosexual marriages were known among the Arabs:

“We have enough historical and philological evidence to show homosexuality was known in pre-Islamic Arabia. Our evidence is richer for the 7th century ... During the Abassid period there seems to have been many Caliphs who were homosexual ... As for Muslim Spain in the 11th century Henry Peres tells us: ‘Sodomy is practiced in all courts of the Muluk AlTawaif’” (ibid, p. 342).

The Ishmael Myth

Many Arabs today claim to be descendants of Ishmael, Abraham’s son. Is this true? McClintock and Strongs, a well-known encyclopedia of religion comments:

“There is a prevalent notion that the Arabs, both of the south and the north, are descended from Ishmael; and the passage [Gen 16:12](#) ... is often cited as if it were a prediction of that national independence which, upon the whole, the Arabs have maintained more than any other people. But this supposition ... is founded on a misconception of the original Hebrew ... these prophecies found their accomplishment in the fact that the sons of Ishmael being located ... *east of the other descendants of Abraham* whether by Sarah or by Keturah. But the idea of the southern Arabs being of the posterity of Ishmael is *entirely without foundation*, and it seems to have originated in the tradition invented by Arab vanity that they, as well as the Jews, are of the seed of Abraham—a vanity which besides disfiguring and falsifying the whole history of the patriarch and his son Ishmael, has transferred the scene of it from Palestine to Mecca ... The vast tracts to the country known to us under the name Arabia gradually became peopled by a variety of tribes in different lineage” (*Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, 1:339, emphasis mine).

Robert Morey writes:

“Most standard reference works on Islam *reject* the Arab claim to Abrahamic descent ... [The] *Encyclopedia of Islam* traces the Arabs to non-Abrahamic origins. Even the *Dictionary of Islam* questions the whole idea that the Arabs are descendants of Ishmael” (*Islamic Invasion*, p. 24, emphasis mine).

Warraq writes:

“As for the historian, the Arabs are *no more* descendants of Abraham, than the French are of Francus, son of Hector” (*Why I Am Not a Muslim*, p. 131, emphasis mine).

The Ishmaelites with the Midianites “formed a tribal league” (cf. [Judges 8:22–24](#)) (Jamieson, Faussett and Brown, p. 52; see also *Holman’s Bible Dictionary*, p. 961). They went away to “the east” and became “interrelated” with Midian and “their main homeland seems to be east of the Jordan and south of Edom” (Ibid., under “Midian” p. 961). You notice in the Bible that Midianites and Ishmaelites are used interchangeably (see [Gen. 37:25, 28](#) and [Judges 8:22–24](#)). These people lived in the Land of Midian that was right up against the land of Palestine to the east.

These people dwelt in Syria, Midian and Moab, and are:

“*Clearly distinguished from the descendants of Joktan who people the Arabian peninsula*” (*The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, under “Ishmaelites,” p. 749, emphasis mine).

The Bible even shows that the Ishmaelites “... settled from Havilah to Shur, which is opposite of Egypt, in the direction of Assyria...” ([Gen. 25:18](#) NRSV).

This is also confirmed by secular history. *The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible* writes that when the Assyrians and the Babylonians conquered the Middle East they found the people of Ishmael north of Arabia dwelling near Assyria (see under articles “Ishmael and Kedar”).

Josephus mentioned that one of Abraham’s great-grandsons joined with the Assyrians. (“Antiquities,” book I, ch. xv §1.) His name was Asshur, the son of Dedan, the son of Jokshan. Jokshan was the son of Abraham. See [Genesis 25:3](#). “And Jokshan begat Sheba, and Dedan. And the sons of Dedan were Asshurim, and Letushim, and Leummim.” From Sheba have come the

Swabian Germans. From Letushim are descended the Lettish people along the Baltic. Is it any surprise that in [Psalm 83:1–8](#) we find the Ishmaelites with “Asshur” in a “confederacy” meaning the United States of Europe, the ten nation combine called the Beast?

The Midianites-Ismaelites are the modern day peoples of “White Russia (Byelorussians)” (*The Lost Races of the Ancient World*, Craig White).

Why is it in [Daniel 11:40–45](#) we find this beast in which the Ishmaelites are a part of going against the King of the South, which are the Arab nations that are south of Palestine? The Arabs are not part of the peoples of Ishmael.

Go to Germany in Prophecy for further details.

One more note. How can the Arabs be descendants of Ishmael, for when Ismael was born the Arabs already existed!

The Arabians are actually the descendants of Joktan, and partly of Cush (see [Gen 10:7, 26–30](#); [1 Chron. 1:20–23](#)).

“The descendants of Joktan peopled the Arabian peninsula” (*The Interpreter’s Dictionary of the Bible*, under “Ishmaelites,” p. 749, emphasis mine).

Unger’s Bible Handbook says:

Seba is connected with South Arabia and is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions in the 8th century B.C. Havilah was ancestor to a people in central and southern Arabia partly Cushite and partly Semitic Joktanite ...” (pp. 53, 56).

The New Bible Commentary says:

“In so far as they can be identified, Joktan and his descendants seemed to have lived in southern Arabia” (p.68).

Morey writes:

“Nowhere in the Koran does it state that Ishmael is the progenitor of the Arab race. Since it is not taught in the Koran, it cannot be a true Islamic belief ... Arabian literature has its own version of prehistoric times, but it’s entirely legendary” (*Britannica*, vol. 2:176).

“The pure Arabs are those who claim to be descended from Joktan or Qahtan, whom the present Arabs regard as their principle founder ... The ‘Arabu ‘1—Musta’ribah, the mixed Arabs, claim to be descended from Ishmael ... they boast as much as the Jews of being reckoned the children of Abraham. This circumstance will account for the preference with which they uniformly regard this branch of their pedigree, and for the many romantic legends they have grafted upon it ... The Arabs, in their version of Ishmael’s history, have mixed a great deal of romance with the narrative of Scripture”(A *Dictionary of Islam*, pgs. 18–19).

“Muhammad was not informed about the family of Abraham” (*Encyclopedia of Islam* 1:184. See also pages 544–546).

“There is a prevalent notion that the Arabs, both of the south and north, are descended from Ishmael; and the passage in [Gen. xvi. 12](#), ‘he (Ishmael) shall dwell in the presence of all his brethren,’ is often cited as if it were a prediction of that national independence which, upon the whole, the Arabs have maintained more than any other people. But this

supposition is founded on a misconception of the original Hebrew, which runs literally, 'he shall be before the faces of all his brethren,' i.e. (according to the idiom above explained, in which 'before the face' denotes the east), the habitation of his posterity shall be 'to the east' of the settlements of Abraham's other descendants ... These prophecies found their accomplishment in the fact of the sons of Ishmael being located, generally speaking, to the east of the other descendants of Abraham, whether of Sara or of Keturah. But the idea of the southern Arabs being of the posterity of Ishmael is entirely without foundation, and seems to have originated in the tradition invented by Arab vanity that they, as well as the Jews, are of the seed of Abraham—a vanity which, besides disfiguring and falsifying the whole history of the patriarch and his son Ishmael, has transferred the scene of it from Palestine to Mecca." (McClintock and Strong, *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, Vol. 1:339).

In the Qur'an, "**Gen. 21.17–21** ... are identified with Mecca" (*The Concise Encyclopedia of Islam*, p. 193).

It also states that the Southern Arabs come from Qahtan, not Ishmael (p. 48).

See also:

The Encyclopedia of Religion, Vol. 7, pg. 296 where the connection between the Midianites and the Ishmaelites is noted.

The Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam, pgs. 178–179.

A Popular Dictionary of Islam, p. 127 (Robert Morey at <http://www.faithdefenders.com>).

Why Muslims Don't Know

Why don't Muslims know any of these things that we have written and researched? Simply because

"... Muslim leaders are afraid of carrying out any thorough research into the origins of Islam, especially, the pre-Islamic Arabian religion, in case they discover anything that will cause their faith in Islam to wane" (*Who Is This Allah?*, p.136, Moshay, emphasis mine).

They also follow what Muhammad commanded them to do, and that is:

"O ye who Believe ask not questions about things which if made plain to you, may cause you trouble ... Some people before you did ask questions, and on that account lost their faith" (Sura 5:101–102).

He also says: "This book is not to be doubted" (Dawood Translation, Sura 2:1).

Why not? Why not put it to the test? God in the Bible actually challenges us to prove the Bible. God is confident that the Bible is true. "Prove all things" (**1 Thess. 5:21**).

Maududi in his commentary warns Muslims not to probe deeply into Islam:

"The Holy prophet himself forbade people to ask questions ... so do not try to probe into such things" (*The Meaning of the Koran*, vol. 3, pp. 76–77, emphasis mine).

Bukhari's Hadith tells us how Muhammad responded to those who asked questions:

“The prophet was asked about things which he did not like, and when the questioner insisted, the prophet got angry” (vol. 1. no. 92).

Muhammad just wanted people to believe on blind faith. “Take my word for it!” Muhammad implies.

The Myth of the Rise of Islam

It is commonly believed that Islam is the world’s fastest growing religion. Many writers report great leaps forward in the number of mosques in western countries, and they give numbers for immigration which would seem to sustain the terror that Muslims will soon control the U.S. House, the Senate, and the British Parliament.

I beg to differ. While Islam is certainly a growing religion (mostly by force in the third world), it is not the fastest growing cult at all. The myth of Islam’s rapid growth is moderated greatly by understanding how mosques come and go. Outside the Middle East, the majority of mosques are in homes and rented buildings. They flourish for a while, then the congregation regroups, as some abandon Islam, while new members immigrate into the Western world fresh from the Middle East. In this process, a new location is found for the house-mosque, and the old one is abandoned. I have seen very little evidence that Americans and Britons are being converted from Catholic, Baptist, or any other churches to Islam. Actually the immigration department in the U.S. is having trouble finding out how many Muslims are in the U.S. because many of them are converting to Christianity.

As far as the non-Western world, the new converts to Islam are often very secular. In Egypt, Coptics “convert” by going to Friday prayers. This is done so they can be seen by the Imam, and the potential employers, thus enhancing their job hunting status. The Coptic Orthodoxy is of the cheap variety anyway. This kind of “convert” to Islam becomes secularized very quickly if he moves out of Egypt to a neutral or democratic nation.

This applies to the vast majority of Muslims that you would meet all over the world. The problem is that the media never tells you about these Muslims. They only show the mad mob frenzy bigots screaming for blood on the streets of Tehran or Khartoum.

Whose Land?

The people in Palestine are fighting over the land of Israel today. The Jews say it’s their land, the Palestinians say it’s theirs. Who is right? The Bible says it’s Israel’s. And the Quran says it’s Israel’s (see Sura 5:25; 7:133).

Salvation in Islam?

Is the Muslim certain that he has salvation in Islam. Absolutely not! Even Muhammad wasn’t sure if he was saved as we read in the Quran: ”... nor do I know what will be done with me or you ... (Sura 46:8). A religion that can’t assure salvation of its own prophet will certainly disappoint its adherents in the last day.

The Quran teaches salvation by works (Sura 23:104–105), but the Bible teaches salvation by grace. The Quran teaches also that all Muslims go to hell first (see Sura 19:67–72).

New Revelation?

Was Muhammad one to bring us new revelations? Absolutely not! He said himself: “I am not an apostle of new doctrines ...” (46:8). And we see that in all the stories that he has given, and all the ceremonies that he has given in the Quran, we have seen that it was nothing new. They were all borrowed from myths, legends and paganism.

God’s Word is Complete

The Bible is complete. God’s last book is the book of Revelation. There are many prophecies in the Old Testament that show you that the Word of God would be complete in Jesus’ day, and the days of the Apostles.

In [Isaiah 8:16](#) it says: “Bind up the testimony; seal the law among my disciples ... Verse [20](#) says: “To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word [the Bible], it is because there is no light in them.” This prophecy is about Jesus Christ. It talks about the “rock of offense” in verse [14](#). This means Christ (see [1 Peter 2:8](#)). Then it says to bind up the law “among my disciples.” Who are the disciples? The disciples of Christ. The last one was John, who wrote the last book of the Bible. The Bible is now sealed. There is no more to be added to God’s word. It’s complete. So the Mormons and the Muslims and everyone else that claims extra revelation from God are claiming a total lie and going against scripture. Jesus is called the “... author and finisher of our faith” ([Hebrews 12:2](#)).

Fact Sheet for Muslims

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Introduction

The teachings of Muhammad are slowly making their way into Western society. In years past contact between Muslims and Christians was limited to Black Muslims selling newspapers on a street corner or Muslim students coming here to study. But two things have radically changed this situation.

First, every year thousands of Muslims are immigrating to the West from such places as Pakistan. They are here to stay and they need our respect and acceptance.

Second, oil-rich Middle Eastern countries such as Saudi Arabia are using billions of oil dollars to convert Westerners to Islam. They have been building thousands of mosques all over the United States, England and Europe in anticipation of millions of converts. They are giving a thousand dollars to any South African black who converts to Islam and then pay him even more for each person he brings with him!

The Issues

The issues which divide Christianity and Islam are very clear. When the historical and factual errors of the Qu’ran and the shortcomings of Muhammad are pointed out by scholars, this should not be taken as a personal insult by Muslims. When Muslims contradict the Bible and state that

Jesus Christ was not the Son of God, that Jesus was never crucified and that Jesus cannot save anybody, should their attacks on Christianity be taken as a personal insult by Christians? We hope not! After all, to disagree with someone is not the same as to insult someone.

I. Muhammad taught that Christians believe in three gods named the Father, the Mother (Mary) and the Son (Jesus) Sura V 116). Yet, the truth is that no Christian church has ever taught such a doctrine. Christians have always believed in one God eternally existing in three persons: the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. How Muhammad can be an infallible prophet and the Qu'ran inspired by God when they make such a blunder remains one of the great problems facing Islam.

II. Muhammad also denied that Jesus was the Son of God, that Jesus died on the cross and that Jesus was the Savior. He taught that Jesus was only one of many prophets of which he, Muhammad, was the greatest. Yet, how could he be greater than Jesus Christ? Jesus was born of a virgin and was sinless in nature and the doer of mighty miracles such as raising the dead. But there was nothing superior about Muhammad's birth or life. He never made the lame to walk, the blind to see or the dead to live. Allah even commanded him to repent of his many sins. How then can he be greater than the Christ?

III. The contrast between Jesus and Muhammad could not be greater. While Jesus forbade the use of force to convert people ([Matthew 26:51–54](#)), Muhammad commanded his followers in the Qu'ran (Sura IX.5) to force people to accept Islam by war, plunder, slavery or the threat of death!

IV. The Qu'ran itself is filled with every kind of self-contradiction, historical and scientific error known to man. In Sura XVIII.82–98, the Qu'ran tells us that Alexander the Great was a believer in the one true God and that he lived through two generations of men. Since Alexander was a pagan and died when only 33 in 323 B.C., the Qu'ran is obviously in error.

The use of circular reasoning on the part of Muslims cannot erase these errors. To argue: "The Qu'ran is inspired. Therefore it cannot contain any errors," is to put the cart before the horse.

A rational person cannot accept the Qu'ran or any other "bible" if it has historical and factual errors. This holds for Christians, Mormons, Jews or Hindus as well as for Muslims. Thus our Muslim friends should be willing to let the evidence decide the Truth.

V. Most Western scholars have always stated that Muhammad had mental problems. He was given to fits and spells as a child during which he claimed to have seen and talked to desert spirits including a goddess.

VI. He married over a dozen women, including taking another man's wife under "divine" command (Sura XXXIII.37–38). He even married a little girl six or seven years of age.

That Muhammad had thirteen wives is not denied by Muslim scholars. That Muhammad took a girl six or seven years old as one of his wives is admitted by such Muslim historians as Ibn Hisham (vol. iii, p. 94); Ibn Athir (vol. ii, pp. 117, 118); and Mishkat (pp. 262, 272).

As to taking another man's wife, Muslim writer Kausar Niazi admits:

"The Holy Prophet never married another man's wife except that of Zayd" (*Islam and the West*, p. 17).

VII. In terms of his beliefs, he held a strange combination of ideas from the Old Testament, the New Testament and his own pagan background. He never freed himself from such pagan rituals as running seven times around the "Black Stone" in Mecca. This stone is a rock which the

pagans in Muhammad's day worshiped as a god who "fell" from Heaven. This is not known by most Muslims.

Haykal's *The Life of Mohammed*, which is a Muslim work, states that the "black rock" or Ka'bah was:

" a pantheon full of statues for idol worship." The rocks "appeared to have fallen from Heaven" and were "worshipped as divinities" (p. 30).

The pagan ceremony included a pilgrimage to the rock, running around it seven times and praying toward it. This is what all Muslim scholars admit. That Muhammad took a pagan ceremony and changed its meaning does not alter the fact of the pagan origin of why Muslims pray toward Mecca, make a pilgrimage to it and run around it seven times. This is also stated in the *Encyclopedia Britannica*, vol. 15, p. 152, under "Mecca."

VIII. While a Muslim must work his way to paradise by repeating the Muslim prayer five times a day, fasting, giving money and going on a pilgrimage to Mecca, the Christian believes he is saved by grace alone through faith alone in Christ alone.

IX. The United States is a great country because it has a Constitution that guarantees civil rights to all beliefs. Islamic law does not recognize non-Muslims as having any civil rights. This is why the death penalty is mandated for any Muslim who chooses to convert to some other religion. This is why Jews and Christians are often put to death and their goods plundered in many Muslim countries such as Egypt as well as Iran.

Conclusion

America has room for all religions as long as they respect the lives, properties and rights of others. The conflict between Christ and Muhammad cannot be ignored. Either Jesus is Lord or Muhammad was a false prophet. But Muhammad is dead while Jesus is alive for evermore.

Is Allah the God of the Bible?

By Sam Shamoun

This study examines the crucial question that needs to be addressed, which is whether the God presented in the Quran is indeed the same God revealed in the Holy Bible. The Quran alleges that the God of Islam, Allah, is indeed the God of Abraham and hence the God of Scripture, Yahweh Elohim. But is this the case?

Are we to assume that just because the Quran states that Allah is Yahweh of the Bible that both Jews and Christians are obligated to believe this to be true? Or do we examine the nature and attributes of Allah in order to compare them with the biblical portrait of Yahweh to find if this is the case?

This process of examination is essential since our objective is to discover the true nature of God, a process whose outcome entails eternal consequences in regards to man's future destiny in the afterlife. After all, if Allah is the God of Abraham, then Jews and Christians are wrong for not embracing Islam. But if Allah is not Yahweh, then Muslims are not worshiping the same God only with a different name.

We will examine certain qualities of Allah as stated in the Quran and briefly compare them to Yahweh and see where the evidence leads us. The reason why we are comparing Allah to Yahweh as opposed to contrasting Yahweh to the quranic portrait of Allah, using the Quran as the standard, is due to the fact that it is Islam that claims to worship the same God of the Holy Bible. Thus, the burden of proof rests upon the Muslims to defend this contention since they believe Allah is the same as Yahweh.

Author of Evil

The Holy Bible teaches that God cannot be tempted by evil and neither tempts anyone with evil; evil being understood as referring to immorality and sin ([James 1:13](#); cf. [Psalm 5:4-5](#); [Habakkuk 1:13](#)).

Yet, the Quran teaches that Allah is the author of evil:

And (the unbelievers) schemed and planned, and Allah schemed also, and the best of schemers is Allah (S. 3:54).

Remember how the unbelievers schemed against thee, to keep thee in bonds, or to slay thee, or get thee out (of thy home). They scheme and plot, but the best of schemers is Allah (S. 8:30).

The term for scheme in Arabic is MAKARA which denotes one who is a deceiver, one who is conniving, a schemer. It is always used in a negative sense. Allah is thus seen as the best of deceivers, the premiere schemer and conniving one.

This is not simply a Christian perspective but one thoroughly endorsed by Muslim theologians as well.

For example Dr. Mahmoud M. Ayoub in his book, *The Quran and Its Interpreters*, Vol. II *The House of Imran*, brings up the question of:

“how the word *make* (scheming or plotting), which implies deceitfulness or dishonesty, could be attributed to “God” (Ibid. [1992 State University of New York Press, Albany], p. 165).

After listing several Muslim sources he quotes ar-Razi as arguing that “scheming (MAKR) is actually an act of deception aiming at causing evil. It is not possible to attribute deception to God. Thus the word is one of the MUTTASHABIHAT [multivalent words of the Quran]” (Ibid., p. 166).

In fact the Quran furnishes plenty of examples on some of the methods Allah adopts in devising evil:

Remember in thy dream Allah showed them as a few: if he had showed them to thee as many, ye would surely have been discouraged, and ye would surely have disputed in your decision: but Allah saved you: for He knoweth well the (secrets) of (all) hearts (S. 8:43).

Allah is said to have shown the opposing fighting forces as few to Muhammad since if he had shown them as they actually were, the Muslims would have been afraid to fight. Hence, Allah had to use deception in order to encourage the Muslims to fight in his cause.

And when We desire to destroy a city, We command its men who live at ease, and they commit ungodliness therein, then the Word is realized against it, and We destroy it utterly (S. 17:16).

Allah commands men to sin in order to destroy them completely.

They (Jinns—demon spirits) worked for him (Solomon) as he desired ... then when We decreed death upon him, nothing showed them his death except a little creeping creature of the earth, which gnawed away at his staff. And when he fell the Jinns saw clearly how, if they had known the unseen, they would not have continued in the humiliating penalty (of work) (S. 34:13–14).

Allah deceived the Jinns into working for Solomon by preventing the latter's death from being disclosed to them, otherwise they would have stopped their work.

Allah also deceived both Christians and Jews into thinking that Jesus was crucified when in fact "it was so made to appear unto them," seeing that he never was crucified or killed (S. 4:157).

According to S. 9:51, nothing befalls Muslims except what Allah has ordained. And in S. 14:4, we are told:

"Allah leads astray whomsoever He will and guides whomsoever he will."

And:

"Whomsoever Allah guides, he is rightly guided, and whom He leads astray, they are the losers! We have created for Hell many Jinns and men ... Do ye desire to guide him whom Allah led astray? Whom Allah leads away, you will find no way for him" (S. 4:87, 90; cf. S. 11:118, 120).

Not only does Allah guide people astray, but also has created men specifically for hell. To make matters worse, he even ordains the evil one commits as we have already seen in S. 17:16 and further clarified by this Muslim tradition:

Abu Huraira reported Allah's Apostle as saying:

"Verily Allah has fixed the very portion of adultery which a man will indulge in, and which he of necessity must commit (or there would be no escape from it)" (Sahi Muslim No. 6421, 6422).

To even imagine that Allah causes adultery is not only horrendous but disqualifies him from being the God of Moses.

A keen reader might raise the objection that the Bible itself indicates in several places that God had intended to do evil to certain nations and individuals such as Absalom in [2 Samuel 17:14](#). Or that Jeremiah had been deceived by God in [Jeremiah 20:7](#): "O LORD, thou hast deceived me and I was deceived" (King James Version).

Firstly, in regards to [2 Sam. 17:14](#) as we had noted earlier, God does not tempt anyone with moral evil in the form of sin but brings upon man calamity as a consequence of their sins. In fact, the term which the King James translates as evil is the Hebrew *ra*. Accordingly, some Hebrew scholars see it as being derived from the word *RA'A* which means to "break, smash, crush" (*Vine's Complete Expository Dictionary of Old and New Testaments*, p. 232).

Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible gives various meanings, some of which include adversity, affliction, calamity, distress, evil, grief (No. 7451 of the Hebrew dictionary section).

Thus, the evil God poured out upon these individuals was not immorality like that of the Quran but judgment upon the wicked due to their persistence in sin and a refusal to come into repentance.

The Hebrew term for deceive used in [Jeremiah 20:7](#) is *PATHATH*. Strong's lists it as No. 6601 in the Hebrew section with the following meanings: allure, enlarge, entice, deceive, flatter, persuade, silly. Based on the preceding translations, there is no reason to assume that Jeremiah meant that God was actually deceiving him.

This is based primarily on the passage itself, since the context is referring to God persuading Jeremiah to continue his ministry, in spite of the latter's reluctance to do so ([Jer. 20:8–9](#)).

God was therefore insisting that Jeremiah continue and did so by constant persuasion. This passage has nothing to do with deception whatsoever.

Another possible objection would be the King James rendering of [Ezekiel 20:25](#) where God says to Israel that he “gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgements whereby they should not live.” This strongly suggests that God is the author of evil.

The context of the passage is referring to Israel's reluctance in observing God's holy commands, which prompted God to hand them over to their own desires (all of chapter 20).

Scripture clearly teaches that when God sees that a nation refuses to embrace the truth he has revealed, the Lord then hardens their hearts that they might continue in their wickedness. This is done that he might bring upon them the judgement that they deserve for their evil (cf. [Romans 1:18–32](#); [2 Thessalonians 2:9–12](#)).

Therefore, God does not give them unholy commands but allows them to embrace statutes which are evil. This is the meaning of the Hebrew text as accurately reflected in the New King James Version: “Therefore, I also gave them up to statutes that were not good, and judgements by which they could not live.”

Yet, the Arabic MAKARA does not allow for other possible meanings. And the Quran itself gives examples of Allah using deception and sin to fulfill his will.

Author of Abrogation

According to the Quran, Allah reveals a verse only to have it canceled out a short time later:

None of Our revelations do We abrogate or cause to be forgotten but We substitute something better or similar—Knowest thou not that Allah has power over all things? (S. 2:106).

When We substitute one revelation for another—and Allah knowest best what He reveals (in stages)—They say, “Thou art but a forger”; But most of them understand not (S. 16:101).

This leaves us with the difficulty of having a God who does not remain consistent and often changes his revealed purpose. This being the case, how is one to know that the promises of such a Being in regards to eternal security can be trusted? Just as he changes his mind in relation to the revelation, he can also decide to change his mind in regards to the believer's ultimate destiny without anything stopping him from doing so.

This is different from Yahweh of the Holy Bible who does not change and as such can be totally trusted in fulfilling all his promises:

God is not a man that he should lie, nor a son of man that he should repent. Has he said, and will he not do? Or has he spoken, and will he not make it good? ([Numbers 23:19](#)).

For I, Yahweh, do not change ([Malachi 3:6](#)).

If we are faithless, he remains faithful; he cannot deny himself ([2 Timothy 2:13](#)).

Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, today, and forever ([Hebrews 13:8](#)).

Because the God of the Bible is immutable, he can promise, “Heaven and earth will pass away but my words will not pass” ([Matthew 24:35](#)).

Two responses can possibly be presented and often are by Muslims. This first is the fact that abrogation is not referring to the Quran but to previous scriptures such as the Bible.

Unfortunately, this interpretation cannot be defended in light of S. 87:6–8:

By degrees shall We teach thee (Muhammad) to declare (the Message) so thou shalt not forget, except as Allah Wills: For He Knoweth what is manifest and what is hidden. And We will make it easy for thee (to follow) the simple (Path).

It becomes obvious that certain parts of the revelation given to Muhammad will eventually be caused to be forgotten, since Allah later willed it.

The second response often presented is that the Bible clearly speaks of God regretting to create man or having repented of bringing on a certain disaster which he had planned to do (cf. [Genesis 6:6](#); [Exodus 32:14](#)).

There are basically two responses for this assumed Muslim allegation. First, both the Holy Bible and the Quran use anthropomorphic language in describing both the nature and acts of God. For instance, both books speak of God’s eyes, hands and feet without implying that these things are to be taken literally. The purpose of using such language is to communicate certain incomprehensible truths of God in human language in order for man to grasp certain realities of the divine nature. Hence, statements such as God having regrets is used to communicate certain realities to man in relational terms, i.e. that God identifies with our human condition and grieves for man’s fallen state, having compassion for him.

Secondly, the reason for indicating that God refrained from fulfilling an act he had decreed is an indication of his divine patience. God does not desire to destroy the wicked but to save them, desiring that they come into repentance:

Say to them: “As I live,” says the Lord God, “I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked, but that the wicked turn from his way and live. Turn, turn from your evil ways! For why should you die, O house of Israel?” [Ezekiel 3:11](#)).

Likewise, if a nation which has been promised prosperity turns to wickedness, God will also refrain from fulfilling his promises of blessing. This is pointed out in [Jeremiah 18:7–10](#):

“The instant I speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to pluck up, to pull down, and to destroy it, if that nation against whom I have spoken turns from its evil, I will relent of the disaster I thought to bring upon it.

“And the instant I speak concerning a nation and concerning a kingdom, to build and plant it, if it does evil in My sight, so that it does not obey My voice, then I will relent concerning the good with which I would benefit it.”

An example of this is seen in [1 Kings 21:29](#) where God had sworn to destroy Ahab for his wickedness, but decided against it:

“See how Ahab has humbled himself before Me? Because he has humbled himself before Me, I will not bring the calamity in his days. In the days of his son, I will bring the calamity on his house.”

Or God deciding not to destroy Nineveh after seeing their sincere repentance and humbleness:

“Then God saw their works, that they turned from their evil way; and God relented from the disaster that He had said He would bring upon them, and He did not do it” ([Jonah 3:10](#)).

Hence, it is not God who changes his mind, but man who changes, resulting in God responding accordingly.

Author of Historical Errors

The Quran contains historical errors which implies that Allah is not an Omniscient Being, since an all-knowing Being would be able to accurately recall historical events. Below is a list of just some of the many problems we find in the Quran.

In S. 17:1 we are told that Muhammad was taken to the farthest Mosque, Masjid al-Aqsa. The problem with this is that Aqsa Mosque had not yet been erected, seeing that Abd al-Malik only finished building it in A.D. 691. It also cannot be referring to the Temple in Jerusalem since that had been destroyed by Titus’ Roman armies in A.D. 70.

S.18:9–26, alludes to several men and their dog who slept for approximately 309 years only to be awakened in perfect condition.

According to S. 18:83–98, Alexander the Great, called Zhul Qarnain, “the Two Horned One,” was a Muslim who traveled till he found the Sun literally setting in a muddy spring. When we keep in mind that the title “the Two Horned One,” was a title given to Alexander in pre-Islamic times, Muslim attempts in trying to deny this fact utterly fall.

According to S. 4:157 the unbelieving Jews boasted by saying, “We killed the Messiah Jesus the son of Mary, the apostle of Allah.” The only problem with this is that the unbelieving Jews never admitted that Jesus was Messiah, since the Jews would never have killed their long-awaited Messianic Deliverer. The reason Jesus was killed is because the Jews believed he was a false Messiah:

“And they began to accuse him, saying, ‘We have found this man subverting our nation. He opposes payment of taxes to Caesar and claims to be Christ, a king’ ” ([Luke 23:2](#), NIV).

Christians are accused of worshiping Mary and Jesus as two gods apart from the true God: And behold! Allah will say: “O Jesus the son of Mary! Didst thou say unto men, Worship me and my mother...” (S. 5:116).

Christ the son of Mary was no more than an apostle—many were the apostles that passed away before him. His mother was a woman of truth. They had both to eat their (daily) food. See how Allah doth make His Signs clear to them... (S. 5:75).

In blasphemy indeed are those that say that Allah is Christ the son of Mary. Say: “Who then hath the least power against Allah, if His Will were to destroy Christ the son of Mary, his mother, and allevery one that is on the earth... (S. 5:17).

This presumes that since Mary ate food and could be destroyed by Allah she could not possibly be divine, implying that Christians believe her to be more than simply human.

In fact, the Quran proceeds to accuse Christians of worshipping three gods:

“They do blaspheme who say: Allah is the third of three (INALLAAHA THAALITHU THALAATHA) S. 5:73.

“... so believe in Allah and His apostles. Say not three (THALAATHA): desist: It will be better for you: for Allah is one Allah...” (S. 4:171).

According to Muslim biographer Ibn Ishaq in his work, *Sira Rasulullah*, a Christian deputation from Najran came to debate Muhammad on the person of Jesus. Accordingly, these Christians allegedly believed that Jesus:

“is God; and He is the son of God; and He is the third Person of the Trinity, which is the doctrine of Christianity” (Alfred Guillaume trans., *The Life of Muhammad* [Oxford University Press, Karachi], p. 271).

He goes on to say:

“They argue that he is the third of three in that God says: We have done, We have commanded, We have created and We have decreed, and they say, If He were one He would have said: I have done, I have created, and so on, but He is He and Jesus and Mary. Concerning all these assertions the Quran came down” (Ibid., pp. 271–272).

The errors in the Quranic teaching on what Christians believe becomes apparent to anyone familiar with the basis of Christian doctrine. Firstly, Christians have never taken Mary as a goddess alongside God. Secondly, Christians have never said God is three or the third of three which is tritheism, three separate gods forming a unity; as opposed to Trinity, ONE God who exists in Three distinct yet inseparable Persons: Father, Son, and Holy Spirit.

Thirdly, Christianity has never taught as part of its doctrine that Jesus is the third Person of the Trinity. Rather, he is the Second Person, with the Holy Spirit being the third Person of the Godhead ([Matthew 28:19](#)).

Fourthly, Muslims believe that Allah of the Quran is the same as God the Father of the Holy Bible since they do not believe in God the Son, Jesus Christ, nor in God the Holy Spirit, who to Muslims is the angel Gabriel. This again causes a problem since if Allah is indeed the same Person as God the Father then the Quran is wrong in saying that Christians believe that the Father is the third of three. Christians teach that the Father is the First Person of the One True Godhead, not the third deity of three gods.

And finally, Christians do not believe that Allah is the Messiah, or that God is the Messiah, since this implies that Jesus is the entire Godhead, which would be modalism. The correct and biblical statement is that Jesus is God, since this suggests that although Jesus is fully God by nature he is not the only Person who shares the essence of Deity perfectly. The Bible also teaches that both the Father and the Holy Spirit are fully God.

Mary the Mother of Jesus is confused with Mary the sister of Aaron and Moses, the daughter of Amram:

Behold! The wife of Imran (i.e. Amram) said, “O my Lord! I do dedicate unto thee what is in my womb” ... When she was delivered, she said: “O my Lord! Behold! I am delivered of a female child ... I have named her Mary...” (S. 3:35, 36).

“And Mary the daughter of Imran, who guarded her chastity” (S. 66:12).

“... They said: O Mary! Truly an amazing thing hast thou brought! O sister of Aaron! Thy father was not a man of evil, nor thy mother a woman unchaste” (S. 19:27–28).

“Then Mary (Heb. Mariam), the prophetess, the sister of Aaron, took the timbrel in her hand ...” (Exodus 15:20).

“The name of Amram’s wife was Jochebed, the daughter of Levi, who was born to Levi in Egypt; and to Amram she bore Aaron and Moses and their sister Miriam” (Numbers 27:59).

This is an error of nearly 1,400 years! How could Moses’ sister Mary be Jesus’ mother, making Moses his uncle?

Muslims give two responses in trying to deal with this anachronism. First, it is assumed that sister of Aaron and daughter of Amram refers to lineage, i.e. that Mary was a descendant of Aaron and Amram of the tribe of Levi. Unfortunately, this assertion cannot possibly be the case since Mary was a daughter of Judah, a descendant of David:

“Now Jesus Himself began his ministry at about thirty years of age, being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, the son of Heli ... the son of David ... the son of Judah” (Luke 3:23, 31, 33).

The words, “as was supposed,” are given to clarify the fact that it is Mary’s genealogy which is being presented, with Joseph acting as the male representative. This is supported by extrabiblical documents such as the Jewish tractate of the Talmud, Chagigah, where a certain person had a dream in which he saw the punishment of the damned. There:

“He saw Mary the daughter of Heli amongst the shades” (John Lightfoot, *Commentary on the New Testament from the Talmud and Hebraica* [Oxford University Press, 1859; with a second printing from Hendrickson Publishers Inc., 1995], vol. 1, p. v; vol. 3, p. 55).

In the book of Hebrews we are told that:

“it is evident that our Lord (Jesus) arose from Judah, of which tribe Moses spoke nothing concerning priesthood” (Heb. 7:14).

And:

“I (Jesus) am the Root and Offspring of David, the Bright Morning Star” (Revelation 22:16).

It is therefore impossible for Mary to be a descendant of Levi, since both the orthodox Jewish understanding and the biblical record agree that Messiah would arise out of Judah (cf. Genesis 49:10–12; Matthew 22:42–45).

The second argument is actually a clarification of the first in that it is suggested that both the Bible and the Quran furnish further evidence for the term “sister of ” being used to imply ancestry:

“His (Zechariah) wife was of the daughters of Aaron, and her name was Elizabeth” (Luke 1:5).

It is obvious that the term “daughters” is speaking of Elizabeth’s lineage and is not to be taken to literally mean that her father was actually Aaron the brother of Moses.

Again it is unfortunate for Muslims that this argument does not help them, but actually serves to weaken their argument. Although the Bible does use the phrases “son of” or “daughter of” to refer to ancestry, it never uses the terms “brother of” or “sister of” to indicate this fact. A few examples of the former usage include:

“So ought not this woman, being a daughter of Abraham, whom Satan has bound—think of it—for eighteen years, be loosed from this bond on the Sabbath?” (Luke 13:16).

“And Jesus said to him, ‘Today salvation has come to this house, because he also is a son of Abraham’” (Luke 19:9).

“And behold, two blind men sitting by the road, when they heard that Jesus was passing by, cried out, saying, ‘Have mercy on us, O Lord, Son of David’ “ (Matthew 20:30).

Scripture never addresses a person as a “brother of Abraham” “or sister of David” when wishing to imply lineage. Hence, the Muslim position cannot be defended biblically.

The second example is from the Quran where Salih is called Thamud’s brother:

“We sent (aforetime) to the Thamud, their brother Salih...” (S. 27:45).

The term *brother* here refers to kinsmen, not actual bloodbrothers, exemplifying the many different ways the term is used.

Once again the problem is far from being resolved since the term “brother” is used to address Salih’s contemporaries, not his ancestors. This implies that to call Mary Aaron’s sister meant that Mary and Aaron were contemporaries, living at the same time.

Unlike the Quran, the Holy Bible contains no historical errors. Most attacks on the Bible stem from arguments from silence, i.e. the fact that no independent archeological research has been discovered in support of certain recorded biblical events. Yet, such arguments only prove that as of yet archeology has failed to furnish evidence in regards to an event related in the Bible.

This is far different from archeology providing evidence to show that certain events did not occur in the same manner in which the Bible says it did. In fact, not one archeological discovery has ever proven the Bible wrong; discovery after discovery has demonstrated the amazing historical accuracy of scripture. The following quotations from the world’s leading archeologists affirm this fact:

“Nowhere has archeological discovery refuted the Bible as history” (John Elder, *Prophets, Idols and Diggers* [New York: Bobbs—Merrill, 1960], p. 1).

“Near Eastern archeology has demonstrated the historical and geographical reliability of the Bible in many important areas. By clarifying the objectivity and factual accuracy of biblical authors, archeology also helps correct the view that the Bible is avowedly partisan and subjective. It is now known, for instance, that, along with the Hittites, Hebrew scribes were the best historians in the entire ancient Near East, despite contrary propaganda that emerged from Assyria, Egypt, and elsewhere” (E.M. Blacklock, editor’s preface, *New International Dictionary of Biblical Archeology* [Grand Rapids, MI; Regency Reference Library/Zondervan, 1983], pp. vii-viii).

The late William F. Albright, one of the world’s foremost archeologists, stated:

“There can be no doubt that archeology has confirmed the substantial historicity of Old Testament tradition” (J.A. Thompson, *The Bible and Archeology* [Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 1975], p. 5).

Nelson Glueck, world renowned archeologist, concurs:

“As a matter of fact, however, it may be clearly stated categorically that no archeological discovery has ever controverted a single biblical reference. Scores of archeological findings have been made which confirm in clear outline or exact detail historical statements in the Bible” (Norman Geisler & Ron Brooks, *When Skeptics Ask: A Handbook on Christian Evidences* [Wheaton, IL: Victor, 1990], p. 179).

It should be noted that both Albright and Glueck were not conservative Christians and did not believe in the inspiration of scripture. Their conclusions were based strictly on the archeological data, forcing them to make the above admissions.

This cannot be said of the Quran with all of its historical and scientific mistakes.

Author of Carnal Pleasures

The Quranic paradise is totally different from the biblical portrait of heaven. In Allah’s paradise, we find sexual and carnal pleasures for believers to engage in throughout eternity:

But give glad tidings to those who believe and work righteousness, that their portions is Gardens, beneath which rivers flow, every time they are fed with fruits therefrom, they say: “Why, this is what we were fed with before,” for they are giving things in similitude; And they have therein damsels (Arabic-Houris) pure (and holy); and they abide therein (forever)” (S. 2:25).

But to those who believe and do deeds of righteousness, We shall soon admit to Gardens, with rivers flowing beneath, their eternal home. Therein they have damsels pure and holy; We shall admit them to shades, cool and ever deepening (S. 4:57).

Of a rare creation have We created the Houris, and We have made them ever virgins, dear to their spouses, of equal age with them for the people of the right hand (S. 56:35–38).

But for those who fear Allah is a blissful abode, enclosed gardens and vineyards, and damsels with swelling breasts (Arabic-Kawa’eb), their peers in age, and a full cup (S. 78:31–34 Arberry: Rodwell trans.).

The orthodox Islamic understanding of these references are that Muslim men shall have a host of swelling breasted maidens to engage in sex with, who return to their virginal state after intercourse.

The paradise of Yahweh is one that is devoid of such carnality, being filled with the infinite love and joy of God instead. Hence, the believers’ reward is to dwell with God forever in eternal glory:

“Jesus answered and said to them, ‘The sons of this age marry and are given in marriage. But those who are counted worthy to attain that age and the resurrection from the dead, neither marry nor are given in marriage; nor can they die anymore for they are equal to the angels and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection” (Luke 20:34–36).

“The kingdom of God is not food or drink, but righteousness, peace and joy in the Holy Spirit” (Romans 14:17).

“And I heard a loud voice from heaven saying, ‘Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people. God Himself will be with them and be their God. And God will wipe away every tear from their eyes; there shall be no more death, nor sorrow, nor crying. There shall be no more pain, for the former things have passed away” (Revelation 21:3–4).

Author of Foreign Words

The Quran claims to be in pure Arabic speech:

We have sent it down as an Arabic Quran, in order that ye may learn wisdom (S. 12:2).

“An Arabic Quran, wherein there is no crookedness...”(S. 9:28).

And We know very well that they say, “Only a mortal is teaching him.” The speech of him at whom they hint is barbarous—and this is Arabic, pure and clear (S. 16:103).

But according to Arabic scholars the Quran is not in pure Arabic, containing dozens of foreign words:

ABARIQ

S.56:18

Persian

ADAM

S.2:34

Akkadian

ARAIK

S.18:31

Persian

FIRDAUS

S.18:107

Pahlavi

FIR'AWN

S.73:15

Syriac

HABR

S. 9:31

Hebrew (Haver)

ISTABRAQ

S.18:31

Persian (Istabar)

SAKINA

S.2:248

Hebrew

SIJJIL (baked clay)

S.105:4

Persian

TAGHUT (idols)

S.2:257

Syriac(Teghutha)

ZAKAT

S.2:1 10

Syriac (Zkhutha)
ZANJABIL (ginger)
S.76:17
Pahlavi

Muslims respond by presuming that all living languages adopt words from other cultures, and it is therefore not an error for the Quran to contain foreign words. This argument only works in regards to imperfect human beings who continually adopt and adapt to other cultures and customs.

Unfortunately, this argument will not work for an all-powerful Being who is the Originator of human language. Such a Being is capable of inspiring his word in perfect Arabic completely devoid of foreign words, especially when he himself states that he would.

Author of Grammatical Errors

Not only does the Quran contain foreign words, but according to Arabic grammarians it also contains grammatical mistakes:

The Qur'an contains sentences which are incomplete and not fully intelligible without the aid of commentaries; foreign words, unfamiliar Arabic words, and words used with other than the normal meaning, adjectives and verbs inflected without observance of the concords of gender and number—illogically and ungrammatically applied pronouns which sometimes have no referent—and predicates which in rhymed passages are often remote from the subjects...To sum up, more than one hundred Qur'anic aberrations from the normal rules and structures have been noted (Ali Dashti, *23 Years: A Study of the Prophetic Career of Muhammad* [Costa Mesa, CA 1994; Mazda Publishers], pp. 48, 50).

A few examples include the following passages:

S. 7:56: "The mercy of Allah is near." Arabic—"INNA RAHMATA ALLAHI QARIBUN MIN AL-MOHSENEEN."

The word QARIBUN is the predicate of RAHMATA ALLAHI, and as such should match in gender. Since RAHMATA is feminine, the word QARIBUN (which is masculine) should be QARIBAH, its feminine form.

S. 7:160; "We divided them in twelve tribes."
Arabic—"WA QATA'NAHOM 'ETHNATA 'ASHRATA ASBATAN."

In Arabic, any noun which is counted by a number above ten should be singular, as is the case in S. 7:142; 2:60; 5:12; 9:36; 12:4. As such the Arabic ASBATAN should be SEBTAN.

S. 5:69: "Surely they that believe, and those of Jewry, and the Sabians, and the Christians, whosoever believes in Allah and the Last Day, and works righteousness—no fear shall be on them, neither shall they sorrow."

Arabic—"INNAL-LAZIINA 'AAMANUU WALLAZIINA HAADUUU WAS-SABI'UUNA WAN-NASAARA MAN'AMAANA BILAAHI WAL-YAWMIL AAKHIRI WA 'AMILA SAALI-HANFALAA KHAW-FUN 'CLAY-HIM WA LAA HUM YAH-ZANUUN."

According to scholars, the Arabic SAABFUUNA has been wrongly declined. Compare the same grammatical structure found in the following suras:

S. 2:62: “Innal-laziina ‘aamanuu wallaziina haaduu wan-Nasaara was-Saabi’iina...”

S. 22:17: “Innal-laziina ‘aamanuu wallaziina haaduu was-Saabi’iina wan-Nasaara...”

In the last two suras the term was declined correctly, SAABFIINA, as opposed to Saabi’uuna. This is due to the word INNA found in the beginning of the sentence causing a form of declension called “nasb” (as in the cases of accusative or subjunctive) with the “yeh” being the “sign of nasb.” But the word SAABFUUNA is given the case of ‘uu’, a sign of “rafa” (as in cases of nominative and indicative). Accordingly, the verse in 5:69 is wrong.

S. 91:5: “By the heaven and that which built it.”

Arabic—“WAS-SAMAAA-I WA MA BA-NAA-HAA.”

The word *ma* is impersonal in Arabic. Yet, the subject of the verse is Allah, heaven’s Creator. As such the word *man*, meaning “him who,” should have been used instead of the impersonal *ma*.

It should be pointed out that it is not only Arabic scholars who have discovered dozens of grammatical mistakes within the Quran, but Muhammad’s very own companions in the past have also admitted this fact. The Muslim scholar Ibn al-Khatib in his book *Al-Furqan* quotes Muhammad’s wife Aisha as saying:

“There are three grammatical errors in the Book of Allah, they are the fault of the scribe: “In 20:63... And in 5:69... And in 4:162” (Muhammad M. abd al-Latif Ibn al-Khatib, *Al-Furqan* [Dar al-Kutub alelmiyah, Beirut], p. 91).

After seeing the first standard copy of the Quran, Islam’s third Caliph Uthman proclaimed:

“I see grammatical errors in it, and the Arabs will read it correctly with their tongues” (Ibid., p. 90).

For the Quran to be the word of Allah and for Allah to be God, one should find no grammatical mistakes, especially since Muslims claim that the Quran contains no human element whatsoever. The Muslim view is that the Quran was dictated word for word to Muhammad, which implies that Allah is the Author of these grammatical errors. This disqualifies Allah from being God, especially Yahweh God of the Holy Bible.

To avoid this problem, Muslims assert that the Quran was revealed in a style called BALAAGHA, which is an eloquent method of expressing the Arabic. Due to this feature, the Quran is not required to be grammatically correct since its aim is at eloquence.

Once again this assumption serves to undermine the Muslim position. It is true that a document written by man cannot be both grammatically correct and still retain an optimum level of eloquence, since a human writer most often sacrifices one literary feature over the other. But this cannot be said of God since he can easily produce a book which contains both perfect grammar and eloquence without ever sacrificing one for the other. This the Quran fails to do.

Allah and Oaths

A real point, of difference between Allah and Yahweh is that Yahweh swears by himself, since there is nothing greater for him to swear by:

“For when God made a promise to Abraham, because He could swear by no one greater, He swore by Himself” ([Hebrews 6:13](#)).

“For men indeed swear by the greater, and an oath for confirmation is for them an end of all dispute” ([Hebrews 6:16](#)).

Hence, every time God makes a pledge, he swears only by himself to insure believers that he will do all that he promises:

“I have sworn by Myself; the word has gone out of My mouth in righteousness, and shall not return, that to Me every knee shall bow...” ([Isaiah 45:23](#)).

“I swear by Myself, says the LORD” ([Jeremiah 22:5](#)).

Yet, Allah swears by things less than himself:

Swears by the Quran

By the Quran, full of wisdom (S. 36:2).

By the Quran, full of admonition (S. 38:1).

Swears by the Sky and Constellations

By the sky and the night visitant (S. 86:1).

Nay verily: By the moon, and by the night as it retreateth, and by the dawn as it shines forth (S. 74:32–34).

By the star when it goes down (S. 53:1).

Swears by the Pen

By the pen and by the record which [men] write (S. 68:1).

Swears by the City

Nay I do swear by this city (S. 90:1).

Swears by the Creation

By the night as it cancels [the light]; by the day as it appears in glory; by the Creation of male and female. (S. 92:1–3).

The fact that Allah swears by practically anything and everything, while Yahweh swears only by himself, makes it very difficult for the two to be the one and the same God.

Allah is Not Triune

The final proof that Allah is not Yahweh Elohim of the Holy Bible is that Allah is not a trinity.

According to the Holy Bible, there is only One true God—[Deuteronomy 6:4](#); [Galatians 3:20](#).

Yet, at the same time Scripture affirms that this One God eternally exists in three Persons:

The Father

“...elect according to the foreknowledge of God the Father...” ([1 Peter 1:2](#)).

The Son

“...looking for that blessed hope and glorious appearing of our Great God and Savior Jesus Christ...” (Titus 2:13).

The Holy Spirit

“But Peter said, ‘Ananias, why has Satan filled your heart to lie to the Holy Spirit ...you have not lied to men but to God’ (Acts 5:3–4).

Three in One

“...baptizing them in the Name (singular—implying unity) of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit...” (Matthew 28:19).

But the Allah of the Quran is not any of the three Persons mentioned above. For example S. 112 states:

Say: He is Allah, the One and Only; Allah, The Eternal, Absolute-, He begetteth not, Nor is He Begotten; And there is none like unto Him (S. 112:1–4).

Allah does not “beget,” meaning that Allah has no children either in a spiritual or carnal sense. Thus, Allah can never be the Father. Nor does he allow himself to be “begotten,” i.e. does not take on human nature such as God the Son did when he became man for our salvation. Finally, in orthodox Islam the Holy Spirit is not God, but the angel Gabriel. This fact separates Allah from ever possibly being the same God that Christians worship.

Finally, we read in 1 John 2:22–23:

“Who is a liar but he who denies that Jesus is the Christ? He is Antichrist who denies the Father and the Son. Whoever denies the Son does not have the Father either; he who acknowledges the Son has the Father also.”

Thus, to the Christians, Allah cannot be the biblical God since the inspired New Testament record teaches that anyone denying the Father and Son as God is Antichrist.

One common Muslim allegation needs to be briefly addressed before concluding. In Exodus 31:17 it says that after Yahweh created the universe, he rested on the Sabbath and was refreshed.

This description is not befitting God since he never fatigues nor does he need to be refreshed.

In response to this, as we have already noted, scripture often uses anthropomorphic language in describing God’s relations with man. The context of this passage deals with the necessity of Sabbath observance as a sign between God and Israel, and as such God is speaking to his covenant people in relational terms.

Just as God rested on the seventh day, it is important for Israel to do likewise especially in light of the fact that they are the chosen people of God and must imitate him by observing all his commands.

Furthermore, the term for Sabbath in Hebrew is *SHABAT*. It is listed in Strong’s as No. 7673 with the following meanings: to stop, to cease, to rest, to end. Thus, the term does not necessarily imply rest but that after the formation of man God stopped his work of creation since he saw that everything was very good at that point. (cf. Genesis 1:31).

Finally, the Bible clearly affirms that God is in no need of rest or sleep:

“He will not allow your foot to be moved. He who keeps you will not slumber. Behold, He who keeps Israel shall neither slumber nor sleep” (Psalm 121:3–4).

“Have you not known? Have you not heard? The everlasting God, the LORD the Creator of the ends of the earth, neither faints nor is weary. His understanding is unsearchable” (Isaiah 40:28).

To then try and use Exodus 31:17 as a proof-text while neglecting the overall context of scripture is rather poor exegesis and unscholarly, since the Bible is clear that God has inexhaustible power and energy.

Our brief examination of Allah as presented in the Quran leads us to conclude that he cannot possibly be the same God worshiped by Abraham and as described in the Holy Bible. The contradictions in attributes and nature between Yahweh and Allah are too numerous to pass over, and cannot be reconciled.

With that in mind, we must point out another major difference between the two; namely that the God of the Holy Bible gives an assurance of salvation through Jesus Christ the Lord, something which Allah never guarantees:

“For God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son that whoever believes in him should not perish, but have everlasting life” (John 3:16).

“Most assuredly, I say to you, he who hears my word and believes in him who sent me has everlasting life, and shall not come into judgement, but has passed from death into life” (John 5:24).

“And if anyone hears my words and does not believe, I do not judge him; for I did not come to judge the world but to save the world” (John 12:47).

The Bible clearly teaches that there is no other way for man to be saved, since Jesus alone can guarantee eternal life, something which the Quran cannot promise any Muslim:

“Jesus said to him, ‘I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life. No man comes to the Father except through me’” (John 14:6).

“Nor is there salvation in any other, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12).

The reason why Christ alone can promise salvation is because he alone paid the penalty for sin, which is death. By his death on the cross Christ provided the only acceptable sacrifice to God on behalf of sinners:

“Being justified as a gift by His grace through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; whom God displayed publicly as a propitiation (a sacrifice offered which satisfies the divine justice of God) in his blood ...” (Romans 3:24–25).

“For the wages of sin is death, but the gift of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ our Lord” (Romans 6:23).

It is therefore up to Muslims to decide whether to accept Jesus Christ as Yahweh’s Son and the Savior of the world and receive the assurance of eternal salvation. Or continue to worship Allah of the Quran who never promises Muslims the joy of knowing that their sins have been forgiven, giving them the assurance of eternal salvation. The choice is left for the reader to decide.

Note to the Reader

We are well aware that the name Allah is used by Arab-speaking Christians for the God of the Bible. In fact, the root from which the name is derived from, *ILAH*, stems from the ancient Semitic languages, corresponding to the Mesopotamian *IL*, as well as the Hebrew-Aramaic *EL*, as in Ishma-el, Immanu-el, Isra-el. These terms were often used to refer to any deity worshiped as a high god, especially the chief deity amongst a pantheon of lesser gods. As such, the Holy Bible uses the term as just one of the many titles for Yahweh, the only true God.

Yet the problem arises from the fact that Muslims insist that Allah is not a title, but the personal name of the God of Islam. This becomes problematic since according to the Holy Bible the name of the God of Abraham is Yahweh/Jehovah, not Allah:

“God spoke further to Moses and said to him, ‘I am Yahweh (YHVH) and I appeared to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as God Almighty; BUT BY MY NAME, YAHWEH, I did not make myself known to them’”(Exodus 6:2–3).

Therefore, Christians can use Allah as a title but not as the personal name for the God of the Bible.

Is ‘Allah’ Just Another Name for God?

By Dr. Robert A. Morey

Introduction

The essence of religion is to tell people what to believe and how to live. The motive that is given as to WHY we should believe and live according to the dictates of a particular religion is that it is telling us the “truth.” Thus the making of “truth claims” is part of the essence of any religion.

The religion of Islam is no exception to this general observation. Islam demands that we believe its creed and practice its rituals because it is the “true” religion in opposition to all other religions that they declare are “false”. Its creed makes various truth claims concerning a deity called “Allah.” Our goal in this article is to examine those claims in the light of logic, linguistics, history, and biblical revelation.

1. The Deity of Islam

First, Islam claims that the Arabian deity called “Allah” is the one “true” God as opposed to all the other “false” gods of pagan religions. For example, in India the Muslims tell the Hindus that their three billion deities are all “false” gods. Second, Muslims in the West claim that the Arabic word “allah” is just another name for the same god that Christians worship.

A. The Question Before Us

Those who enjoy the freedom of religion in the West need to be educated to see why this freedom is not granted in Muslim countries. They also need to understand the contradiction between what the Muslims say in the West and what they do in the Middle East.

B. Two Basic Errors

Why do so many Westerners fail to understand the danger Islam poses to our most basic civil and human rights? They fail to be alarmed because they assume two very basic errors. What are these two errors?

1. All religions worship the same God under different names.
2. Muslims worship the same God Christians do.

Since the second error proceeds from the first, we will deal with them in the order given above.

II. Part 1: The First Error

Do all religions worship the same God just under different names? Are all religions “true” in the sense that they worship the same God? Since it is claimed that the God of the Bible can be worshiped under any name, it would only be logical to examine the scriptures to see if it does in fact teach this. But when we look into the Bible we find that it does not teach that all religions worship the same God just under different names. That this is true is demonstrated by the following propositions:

A. In the First and Second Commandments, the Bible says that we are not to worship any other God than the One who has revealed himself in the Bible. ([Exodus 20:3–4](#)).

B. If all religions worshiped the same God just under different names, there would be no idolatry, no false prophets, and no false religions. Yet, the Bible condemns all three. For example, Jesus warned us about “false prophets” in [Matthew 7:15](#). Yet, if all religions were true, there would be no “false” prophets.

C. Throughout biblical history, the worship of Baal, Molech, or any of the other gods of the Fertile Crescent was not viewed as the worship of the God of Israel just under different names. Any attempt to mix other gods with the God of Israel was condemned by the Prophets and the Apostles. For example, [2 Cor. 6:14–17](#) condemns any attempt to mingle Christ and Baal as if they were the same deity.

D. According to [Romans 1:18–25](#), all the gods of other religions were invented by those who rejected the light of natural revelation and created gods in their own image. Thus pagan religions are not the result of man’s search for God but the result of his running from God. As a matter of fact, no one is searching for the true God according to [Romans 3:10–18](#).

E. The God of the Bible revealed the names by which he wishes to be addressed and worshiped (YHWH, Elohim, Adonai, Theos, Kurios, etc.). The Jews were not allowed to make up their own names for God but were limited to revealed names.

F. Even though some of the names of the pagan gods such as Baal (A1) may have come from the same basic Semitic linguistic root as Elohim (E1) this does not linguistically, logically, or historically imply that Baal was just another name for the God of Israel. While a linguistic root may imply a common language, this does not logically imply a common deity. The prophets never viewed Baal as the God of Israel because of a shared linguistic stem.

G. When the Jews and Christians translated the biblical names for God into other languages they never used the specific names for specific pagan deities. For example, the Septuagint did not use the Greek names Zeus or the Egyptian name Ra as a translation for the Hebrew YHWH as that would confuse pagan gods with the true God.

H. When a word for a pagan “god” evolved into a generic term for “deity” in general, and it no longer had a specific reference to a specific pagan deity, the Jews and Christians would use it as a translation for the names of God found in the Hebrew and Greek bible. Thus YHWH became Kurios and Elohim became Theos.

I. The use of a generic term for “deity” in a foreign language translation of the Bible does not logically or historically imply that the translators believed that the God of the Bible was synonymous with the old original pagan god whose name was now a generic term. Thus the use of Theos as a translation of Elohim did not logically imply that the Jews believed that Zeus or some other Greek god was the God of the Bible.

J. The fact that Jews and Christians would translate the names of God into different languages long after the Bible was completed does not logically imply that the pagan god whose generic name was used was viewed as being the God of the Bible. They could have done this out of ignorance, fear, or to conform to the culture.

K. In logic, a *formal similarity in name* does not imply a *substantial agreement in concept*. For example, all major pagan religions such as Hinduism and all the cults such as Jehovah’s Witnesses and Mormons use the English word “God” when referring to their deity. Yet, while they use the same English word for deity that Christians use, they do not worship the same God that Christians worship.

L. The God of the Bible is not a vague “thing” that can be defined any way you please. The true God has revealed propositional facts about Himself in the Bible. For example, the God revealed in the Bible is a personal, infinite, and Triune Being of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Any concept of “God” that is less than that is not true according to the Bible.

M. The Apostle John used the concept of the Trinity as a way to test differing concepts of God. He tells us in [1 John 2:22](#) that:

“Such a man is an anti-Christ—he who denies the Father and the Son.”

John’s words cannot be any plainer. Any religion that denies the Father and the Son is an “anti-Christ” religion and cannot in any way be confused with true biblical religion. But what if someone claims that he worships the Father while denying the Son? John answers this in [1 John 2:23](#):

“No one who denies the Son has the Father; whoever acknowledges the Son has the Father also.”

The Bible is clear that any religion that does not teach the doctrine of the Trinity is an anti-Christ religion.

Lastly, since all religions contradict each other on all essential concepts such as God, man, sin, and salvation, either one religion is true and all the others are false or they are all false. But they cannot logically all be true.

Conclusion

No matter how you look at it, the idea that all religions worship the same God just under different names is a very ignorant and foolish belief. It contradicts logic, history, and the science

of comparative religion. It is actually an insult to the major religions of this world who have very carefully defined their concept of deity so as to distinguish their god from all other gods.

II. Part 2: The Second Error

In the West, Islam claims that its god called “Allah” is not only the true God but also that it is the same God that Christians worship. Is this true?

Given the laws of logic, linguistics, history, and exegesis, the answer is “NO”!

“Allah” is not just another name for the Christian God. In reality, in its name and concept, Allah is as pagan as Baal or Zeus. That this is true can be seen from the following propositions.

A. The Facts of History

Perhaps the best way to answer these two claims is to look at them from the viewpoint of how Islam has actually treated Christians throughout history.

First, Islam’s treatment of Christians underwent a drastic change as Muhammad’s ministry developed. In the early days, when Muhammad wanted the Christians to accept him as their “apostle,” he claimed that the Arabian deity “Allah” was actually the God of the Bible. Thus Muslims supposedly worshiped the same deity that Christians worship.

In the early Surahs of the Qur’an, Muhammad praised the Christians and even called them the “people of the book.” These early statements were made in the hope that the Christians would convert to Islam.

But when it became obvious that the Christians were not going to acknowledge him, Muhammad then called for their destruction. This is why the armies of Islam have always slaughtered Christians whenever they conquered a nation. One can think of what the Muslims did in Armenia as a historical example of this.

B. An Inherent Contradiction

There is thus an inherent contradiction in the teaching of Muhammad concerning Christians. When Islam first comes into an area where there are Christians, the Muslims will say: “We Muslims worship the same God you do. Allah is the God of the Bible.” Now, if this were true, then Christianity would be as “true” as Islam and you would not expect that Muslims would persecute them. After all, they supposedly all worship the same deity.

But instead of leaving Christians free to practice their religion, as soon as Islam is in control of a country and establishes Islamic law, it then changes its approach and seeks to destroy Christianity in one Jihad after another.

C. A Present Example

What has now happened in Malaysia is a good example of how Muslims change in their attitude toward Christians depending on who is running the government. When Malaysia was under Colonial rule, the Muslims said that their god “Allah” was the God of the Bible. They encouraged Malaysian Christians to use the Arabic word “Allah” when worshipping the Christian God. But now that Islamic law has been imposed on the country, the Muslims have made it illegal for Christians to use the word “Allah” in reference to the Christian God!

The Islamic government of Malaysia is presently confiscating and destroying all Bibles, hymnals, books, and tracts that use the word “Allah” to refer to the Christian God. Why? The Islamic government of Malaysia has ruled by decree that since “Allah” is NOT the God of the Christians but only the god of the Muslims, then Christians cannot use “Allah” in reference to their God!

The Problem as We See It

Any rational person can see that the Muslims are trying to have it both ways. In the West, they tell Christians that Muslims worship the same God Christians worship. But in countries under Islamic law, the Christians are persecuted as “infidels,” their churches burned, and their people murdered because they are NOT worshipping the same God! This is why Christians are now forbidden by Islamic law to even use the word “Allah” as a name for the God of the Bible. This is why Christians in Saudi Arabia are not allowed to build any churches. This is why the Pakistani Islamic government has passed Penal Codes 294 and 295 that mandate the death penalty for the “crime” of insulting Muhammad or Islam.

The Name ‘Allah’

Having examined the history of Islam and its persecution of Christians, we now turn our attention to the Arabic word “Allah” Is it really a proper name for the God that Christians worship?

The following propositions will reveal that the word “Allah” should not be used as a name for the God of the Bible.

1. It is not a BIBLICAL name for God. The patriarchs, prophets, Jesus, and the apostles never at any time prayed to or worshiped a god that they called “Allah.”
2. It is not a REVEALED name for God. God revealed to the prophets in the Bible many different names by which He wanted men to call Him. But not once in the Bible did He ever reveal that “Allah” was his name.
3. If, as some believe but others deny, the linguistic root or stem of Allah may share a common origin with other gods of the Fertile Crescent such as Baal or El, this does not logically imply that they are all the same God. A common linguistic stem does not logically imply a common deity: otherwise Allah is Baal and Baal is Allah or Elohim is Baal and Baal is Elohim.
4. In pre-Islamic times, “Allah” was a pagan name for a pagan deity among pagan Arabians.
5. In Southern Arabia, “Allah” was the name of the moon god who was married to the sun goddess. Together they had three daughters who were called the “daughters of Allah.”
6. Throughout Arabia, Allah was viewed as only one of the “High” gods who were worshiped at the Kabah in Mecca.
7. The “daughters of Allah” were worshiped by the tribe into which Muhammad was born.
8. The Qur’an does not explain who “Allah” was because Muhammad assumed that the pagan Arabians already knew who he was. He was right. Allah was one of the 360 pagan gods worshiped at the Kabah!
9. As “Allah” slowly became a generic name in the Middle East and in Asia for deity in general, other religions used it as an Arabic name for their gods. But this does not logically imply that they believed that the god of Islam was their god. The name may have been the same but the concept different.

10. By the 9th Century, because of the dominance of Islam in the Middle East, the word “Allah” was used as a generic name for deity in the Arabic Bible. But this was done by Christians who out of fear for their lives used “Allah” as a means to appease their Muslim oppressors and to escape death. But the time has come to correct their error and to tell the truth that “Allah” is a pagan name for a pagan god.

11. Modern Islamic countries such as Malaysia have decreed that the name “Allah” is the exclusive name of the god of Islam and not the God of Christians. Thus the Malaysian government has decreed that Christians may NOT use “Allah” in their Bibles, books, or hymns. They are in the process of confiscating and destroying all non-Muslim literature which uses the word “Allah.”

IV. Conclusion

Since the Muslims are now saying that the word “Allah” is NOT a generic term for deity in general but it is a name that refers specifically to their anti-Christ concept of deity, the intelligent Christian cannot use the word “Allah” for God.

A. The Concept of Allah in Islam

The use of the generic Arabic word “Allah” in translations of the Bible or a common Semitic root with Elohim does not have any logical bearing on the issue of whether or not the god of Islam and the God of the Bible are the same God. In logic, formal similarities mean nothing.

The real issue is whether the concept of “Allah” in Islam is the same as that of the Christian God. If they are defined differently and if they have different and contradictory attributes, then there is no logical way to escape the conclusion that they are different deities.

The fact is that the Triune God of the Bible is not Islam’s Allah. Thus the god of Islam is not the God of the Bible any more than it would be proper to say that the “God” of the Jehovah’s Witnesses is the Christian God.

The following propositions demonstrate to the rational mind that Allah is not the God of the Bible. For the documentation, please consult the book *The Islamic Invasion* (Harvest House).

1. Since Islam denies that Jesus is the Son of God and that God is a Father, it “denies the Father and the Son” (1 John 2:22–23). Thus Islam is an
2. anti-Christ religion. It cannot be both a biblical religion and an anti-Christ religion at the same time.
3. Allah’s attributes are radically different from the biblical God. For example, Allah is unknowable and unpredictable. He is not a Trinity. He did not become incarnate for man’s salvation. He is not a person or a spirit. He is not limited by anything, not even by his own nature; it is impossible to enter into a personal relationship with Allah, etc.
4. Just because you believe in one god does not logically imply that you have the right one. A Greek pagan could have proclaimed Zeus the one true God just as Muhammad proclaimed Allah.

The irrefutable fact that Muslims have consistently persecuted Christians as “infidels” reveals that when “the rubber meets the road” Muslims believe that their god “Allah” is NOT the same God that Christians worship. Otherwise, Christians would have never been viewed or treated as infidels.

B. Conclusion

The Muslim god “Allah” is not the same God that Christians worship. The vast majority of Muslims know this to be true. This is why they call Christians “infidels” and persecute them. Those Muslims in the West who claim otherwise, do so as an evangelistic tool to convert ignorant and unwary Westerners to Islam. That they knowingly and openly use deception is not right and it doesn’t speak well of the religion of Islam.

Allah—Immaterial Entity or an Invisible Man?

By Sam Shamoun

A common point of disagreement between Muslims and Christians is the Christian belief that God does take on a human form and actually became man in the person of Jesus Christ without ceasing to be God. Yet, Christians do not believe that God in his essential nature is man, but only became man at the Incarnation.

According to the Holy Bible, God created all things from nothing:

“In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth” ([Genesis 1:1](#)).

“By the word of the LORD the heavens were made, And by the breath of His mouth all their host” ([Psalm 33:6](#)).

“All things came into being through Him, and apart from Him nothing came into being that has come into being” ([John 1:3](#)).

“and saying, Men, why are you doing these things? We are also men of the same nature as you, and preach the gospel to you that you, should turn from these vain things to a living God, WHO MADE THE HEAVEN AND THE EARTH AND THE SEA AND ALL THAT IS IN THEM” ([Acts 14:15](#)).

“The God who made the world and all things in it, since He is Lord of heaven and earth, does not dwell in temples made with hands” ([Acts 17:24](#)).

“(as it is written, A FATHER OF MANY NATIONS HAVE I MADE YOU) in the presence of Him whom he believed, even God, who gives life to the dead and calls into being that which does not exist” ([Romans 4:17](#)).

“For by Him all things were created, both in the heavens and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones, or dominions or rulers or authorities—all things have been created through Him and for Him. He is before all things, and in Him all things hold together” ([Colossians 1:16–17](#)).

Scripture hints to the fact that God created time also:

“in these last days has spoken to us in His Son, whom He appointed heir of all things, through whom also He made the world” (Greek—*AIONAS*, literally, the ages, [Hebrews 1:2](#)).

According to the *Lexical Aids to the New Testament*, compiled and edited by Spires Zodhiates, Th.D., the Greek word *AIONAS* is derived from:

165. Aion; age, refers to an age or time in contr. to *kosmos* (2889), referring to people or space. Derived from *AEI* (104), always, and on, being. Denotes duration or continuance of time, but with great variety. (1) Both in the sing. or pl. it signifies eternity whether past or to come ([Mt. 6:13](#); [Mk. 3:29](#); [Lk. 1:55](#); [Jn. 4:14](#); [6:51](#); [Acts 15:18](#); [Eph. 3:11](#), etc.); for ages, of ages ([Rev. 1:6, 18](#); [5:14](#); [10:6](#); [14:11](#); [15:7](#); [20:10](#)). (2) The

duration of this world (Mt. 28:20; Jn. 9:32; Acts 3:21); since the beginning of the world (Mt. 13:39, etc.). (3) *Pl.HOI AIONES*, the ages of the world (1 Cor. 2:7; Eph. 3:9; Col. 1:26). (4) *HO AION HOUTOS*, this age generation (Lk. 16:8; 20:34, cf. Mt. 13:22; 1 Cor. 1:20; 2:6; Gal. 1:4; Eph. 2:2; 1 Tim. 6:17; 2 Tim. 4:10; Tit. 2:12). (5) *HO AION HO ERCHOMENOS*, the age, the coming one, meaning the next life (Mk. 10:30; Lk. 18:30, cf. Lk. 20:35) (6) An age or dispensation of providence (Mt. 24:3. cf. Mt. 12:32; 1 Cor. 10:11; Heb. 1:2; 6:5; 9:26). (7) Aiones, ages, in Heb. 11:3 refers to the great occurrences which took place in the universe. *AION* primarily has physical meaning (time) but also ethical. Signifies time, short or long in its unbroken duration, all of which exists in the world under conditions of time, ethically, the cause and current of this world's affairs. It has acquired, like *kosmos* (2889), an unfavourable meaning (Lk. 16:8; 20:34; Eph. 2:2; Gal. 1:4). (New American Standard Bible, Hebrew-Greek Key Word Study Bible [AMG Publishers; Chattanooga, TN 1990], p. 1,801).

Strong's gives the following definitions:

Number: 165 ahee-ohn' Noun Masculine

Definition: 1. for ever, an unbroken age, perpetuity of time, eternity; 2. the worlds, universe; 3. period of time, age.

NAS Word Usage—Total:95 age 20, ages 6, ancient time 1, beginning of time 1, course 1, eternal 2, eternity 1, ever* 2, forever 27, forever and ever 20, forevermore 2, long ago 1, never* 1, old 1, time 1, world 7, worlds 1.

Hence, a plausible interpretation of **Hebrews 1:3** is that God created both the universe along with time through the agency of his Son, the Lord Jesus Christ.

This point is solidified by the following NT citations:

“who has saved us and called us to a holy life—not because of anything we have done but because of his own purpose and grace. This grace was given us in Christ Jesus before the beginning of time, but it has now been revealed through the appearing of our Savior, Christ Jesus, who has destroyed death and has brought life and immortality to light through the gospel” (2 Timothy 1:9–10).

“Paul, a servant of God and an apostle of Jesus Christ for the faith of God's elect and the knowledge of the truth that leads to godliness—a faith and knowledge resting on the hope of eternal life, which God, who does not lie, promised before the beginning of time, and at his appointed season he brought his word to light through the preaching entrusted to me by the command of God our Savior” (Titus 1:1–3).

The fact that God and Christ both precede time itself strongly argues that time was created by God. Therefore, seeing that God created time implies that he is timeless. Seeing that God created matter makes him an immaterial Being. Seeing that God also created the dimensions of space implies that he is spaceless. Being spaceless implies that God must be absolutely one, since for there to be more than one God would necessitate spatial dimensions. Therefore God is one eternal, omnipresent. Spirit having no type of body whatsoever. This would also make him invisible, having no visible form. This is precisely the description that the Holy Bible gives of God:

“Hear, O Israel! The LORD is our God.
the LORD is one!” (Deuteronomy 6:4).

“Where can I go from Your Spirit? Or where can I flee from Your presence? If I ascend to heaven, You are there; If I make my bed in Sheol, behold, You are there. If I take the wings of the dawn, If I dwell in the remotest part of the sea, Even there Your hand will lead me, And Your right hand will lay hold of me. If I say, Surely the darkness will overwhelm me, And the light around me will be night, Even the darkness is not dark to You, And the night is as bright as the day. Darkness and light are alike to You” (Psalm 139:7–12).

“Am I a God who is near declares the LORD, ‘And not a God far off? Can a man hide himself in hiding places so I do not see him?’ declares the LORD. ‘Do I not fill the heavens and the earth?’ declares the LORD” (Jeremiah 23:23–24).

“He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of all creation” (Colossians 1:15).

“Now to the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen” (1 Timothy 1:17).

“which He will bring about at the proper time—He who is the blessed and only Sovereign, the King of kings and Lord of lords, who alone possesses immortality and dwells in unapproachable light, whom no man has seen or can see. To Him be honor and eternal dominion! Amen” (1 Timothy 6:15–16).

Yet, the Holy Bible also states that God would often assume visible form allowing his servants the ability to see him visibly:

“Micaiah said, ‘Therefore, hear 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 and on His left. The LORD said, “Who will entice

Ahab to go up and fall at Ramoth-gilead?’ And one said this while another said that. Then a spirit came forward and stood before the LORD and said, “I will entice him.” The LORD said to him, “How?” And he said, “I will go out and be a deceiving spirit in the mouth of all his prophets.” Then He said, “You are to entice him and also prevail. Go and do so.” Now therefore, behold, the LORD has put a deceiving spirit in the mouth of all these your prophets; and the LORD has proclaimed disaster against you” (1 King 22:19–23).

“In the year of King Uzziah’s death I saw the Lord sitting on a throne, lofty and exalted, with the train of His robe filling the temple. Seraphim stood above Him each having six wings: with two he covered his face, and with two he flew. And one called out to another and said, ‘Holy, Holy, Holy, is the LORD of hosts. The whole earth is full of His glory’ And the foundations of the thresholds trembled at the voice of him who called out, while the temple was filling with smoke. Then I said, ‘Woe is me, for I am ruined! Because I am a man of unclean lips, And I live among a people of unclean lips; For my eyes have seen the King, the LORD of hosts’” (Isaiah 6:1–5).

“I kept looking until thrones were set up, And the Ancient of Days took His seat; His vesture was like white snow And the hair of His head like pure wool. His throne was ablaze with flames, Its wheels were a burning fire. A river of fire was flowing And coming out from before Him; Thousands upon thousands were attending Him, And myriads upon myriads were standing before Him; The court sat, And the books were opened” (Daniel 7:9–10).

Furthermore, according to the NT, God actually became man in the person of Jesus Christ without ceasing to be God:

“In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God... And the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we saw His glory, glory as of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth” (John 1:1, 14).

Hence, God in his essential nature is immaterial, invisible and spaceless. Yet, God assumed visible form and actually took on a physical body at the Incarnation of Jesus Christ without this affecting his invisible, immaterial divine nature:

“For in Him all the fullness of Deity dwells in bodily form” (Colossians 2:9).

This is precisely the point that Muslims refuse to accept. Muslims think it inconceivable that their god, Allah, could or would assume a visible form or actually become man.

Yet, interestingly both the Quran and hadiths affirm that Allah actually has a visible form and that Allah actually moves from place to place. Here is a sampling of Quranic passages affirming that Allah has a visible body.

The Quran Attributes Movement to Allah

“Nay! When the earth is pounded by power, AND THY LORD COMETH, and His angels, rank upon rank, and Hell, that Day, is brought face to face—On that Day will man remember, but how will that remembrance profit him?” (S. 89:21–23).

The Quran Gives a Visible Form to Allah

“By the Star when it goes down, —You Companion is neither astray nor being misled. Nor does he say (aught) of (his own) Desire. It is no less than inspiration sent down to him: He was taught by one Mighty in Power, Endued with Wisdom: FOR HE APPEARED (in stately form); While he was in the highest part of the horizon: THEN HE APPROACHED HIM AND CAME CLOSER, And was at a distance of but two bow-lengths or (even) nearer; SO DID HE (God) CONVEY THE INSPIRATION TO HIS SERVANT—(conveyed) what He (meant) to convey” (S. 53: 1–10, Yusuf Ali’s translation).

This passage clearly states that Muhammad saw Allah approaching him in visible form. Muslims have claimed that the person whom Muhammad saw was the Angel Gabriel. This interpretation will not work since the passage claims that the person that appeared to Muhammad was Muhammad’s sovereign as indicated by the last part of the sentence. “TO HIS SERVANT.” Unless Muslims want to claim that Muhammad is the servant of Gabriel, there is no avoiding the inescapable conclusion that the person whom Muhammad saw in visible form was none other than Allah himself.

“Verify this is the word of a most honourable Messenger, Endued with Power, with rank before THE LORD OF THE THRONE, With authority there, (and) faithful to his trust. And (O people!) And without doubt HE SAW HIM IN THE CLEAR HORIZON. Neither doth he withhold grudgingly a knowledge of the Unseen. Nor is it the word of an evil spirit accursed” (S. 81:19–25).

Again, the person whom Muhammad saw is none other than the Lord of the Throne, i.e. Allah. There is no other referent in the context of the passage and therefore the burden of proof is

upon the Muslims to show that Muhammad did not see Allah visibly, but rather the Angel Gabriel. Noted Islamicist, F.E. Peters comments on the preceding Suras, specifically 53:1–12:

“None of the pronouns is identified in these verses, though there is little doubt that the recipient of the vision was Muhammad. Who was seen is less clear, and if Muhammad’s being referred to as his ‘servant’ in verse 10 suggests that is God Himself, the Muslim tradition preferred to understand that it was Gabriel in all the other instances, chiefly because later in his own career Muhammad, as we shall see, had unmistakably come to the same conclusion. But there is no other mention of Gabriel in the Meccan suras, and it appears far more likely that God Himself first appeared to Muhammad ‘on the high horizon’ and then on a second occasion by the lotus tree near the ‘garden of the dwelling’ to show him ‘the signs of his Lord.’ Muhammad was clearly earthbound when he had his first experience, but where the latter vision took place, whether in a known locality in Mecca or, as is often thought, in some heavenly venue, is not further indicated. Neither is there anything to suggest that it was on either of these occasions that Muhammad received the words of the Quran.

“If Sura 53:1–18 seems to say that Muhammad believed that on two distinct occasions he had a vision of God, who thereby prompted him and showed to him His signs, the second vision is referred to only in briefly in passing” (Quran 81:19–27).

“Although verse 10 appears to refer back to the same vision ‘on the high horizon’ mentioned in 53:7–9, the Muslim commentators saw in the first three verses of this passage from Sura 81 an unmistakable reference to Gabriel. But there is abundant evidence that Muhammad not only did not identify Gabriel as the agent of revelation until his Medina days, but that while at Mecca he was criticized for the fact that God had not sent an angelic messenger: They said: ‘If your Lord had so pleased, He would certainly have sent down angels; as it is, we disbelieve your mission’” (Quran 41:14).

“Muhammad’s earliest response did not encourage them to think that there was in fact an angel in God’s revelation to him: They say: ‘You to whom the Reminder is being sent down, truly you are jinn-possessed! Why do you not bring angels to us if you are one of those who possess truth?’ We do not send down the angels except when required, and if they came, there would be not respite” (Ibid., 15:6–8).

“And before you as well the Messengers we sent down were but men, to whom We granted inspiration. And if you do not understand that, ask the people who possess the Reminder” (Ibid., 16:43) (F.E. Peters, *Muhammad and the Origins of Islam* [State University of New York Press, Albany 1994], pp. 142–143).

The Quran also applies human qualities and characteristics to Allah:

The Quran Gives Allah a Face

“Every one upon it will disappear while your Lord’s face will remain full of majesty and splendor” (S. 55:26–27, T.B. Irving, *The First American Version of the Quran*).

The Quran Gives Allah a Hand

“The ones who swear allegiance to you merely swear allegiance to God. God’s hand rests above their hands...” (S. 48:10).

The Quran Gives Allah an Eye

Allah said: “Granted is thy prayer, O Moses! And indeed We conferred a favour on thee another time [before]. Behold! We sent to thy mother, by inspiration, the message: ‘Throw [the child] into the chest, and throw [the chest] into the river: The river will cast him up on the bank, and he will be taken up by one who is an enemy to Me and an enemy to him: But I endued thee with love from Me: And [this] in order that thou mayest be reared under Mine eye’” (S. 20:36–39, King Fahd Holy Quran).

The Quran Seats Allah in Throne

“He it is who created the heavens and the earth in six days; then He mounted the throne” (S. 57:4, M.M.Pickthall English Translation).

The fact that Allah mounts the throne implies movement. To say that mounting the throne is a metaphorical term indicating that Allah assumed sovereign control over the creation leaves more problems. If it is only after creation that Allah assumed sovereign rulership, then this implies that previous to this specific point in time Allah was not sovereign. Yet, if he was not sovereign prior to this point, then this implies a change in the nature and experience of Allah. Yet, if Allah can change and experience new events this implies that he is not omniscient. We leave it to the Muslims to solve this paradox.

The Hardith also attributes body parts and movement to Allah.

Allah Actually Moves

Narrated Abu Hauraria:

Allah’s Apostle (pbuh) said, “Our Lord, the Blessed, the Superior, comes every night down on the nearest Heaven to us when the last third of the night remains, saying: ‘Is there anyone to invoke Me, so that I may respond to invocation? Is there anyone to ask Me, so that I may grant him his request? Is there anyone seeking My forgiveness, so that I may forgive him?’” (Sahih al-Bukhari 2:246).

Allah Has a Face

Narrated Jabir bin ’Abdullah:

“When this verse:—‘Say (O Muhammad!): He has Power to send torments on you from above,’ (6.65) was revealed; The Prophet said, ‘I take refuge with Your Face.’”

“Allah revealed:— ...‘or from underneath your feet.’ (6.65) The Prophet then said, ‘I seek refuge with Your Face!’ Then Allah revealed:— “...or confuse you in party-strife.’ (6.65) Oh that, the Prophet said, ‘This is easier.’” (Sahih al-Bukhari 9:503).

Allah Has a Hand and Fingers

Narrated Abu Hurraira

“Allah’s Apostle said. ‘Allah’s hand is full, and (its fullness)is not affected by the continuous spending, day and night.’ He also said. ‘Do you see what He has spent since

He created the Heavens and the Earth? Yet all that has not decreased what is in His Hand,' He also said, 'His throne is over the water and in His other Hand is the balance (of Justice) and He raises the lowers (whomever He will)'" (See Hadith No.206, Vol. 6) Sahih al-Bukhari 9:508).

Narrated Abdullah:

“A Jew came to the Prophet and said, O Muhammad! Allah will hold the heavens on a Finger, and the mountains on a Finger, and the trees on a Finger, and all the creation on a Finger, and then He will say, “I am the King.”” On that Allah’s Apostle smiled till his premolar teeth became visible, and then recited: —‘No just estimate have they made of Allah such as due to him...’ (39.67).

“Abdullah added: Allah’s Apostle smiled (at the Jew’s statement) expressing his wonder and belief in what was said”(Sahih al-Bukhari 9:510).

“A man from the people of the scripture came to the Prophet and said, ‘O Abal-Qasim! Allah will hold the Heavens upon a Finger, and the Earth on a Finger and the land on a Finger, and all the creation on a Finger, and will say, “I am the King! I am the King!” ’ I saw the Prophet (after hearing that), smiling till his premolar teeth became visible, and he then recited:— ’No just estimate have they made of Allah such as due to him... ’ ” (39.67) (Sahih al-Bukhari 9:511).

Allah Actually Writes

The following is taken from the Fortieth Hadith Qudsi:

“On the authority of Abu Hurayrah (may Allah be pleased with him), who said that the Messenger of Allah (PBUH) said: ‘When Allah decreed the Creation He pledged Himself by writing in His book which is laid down with Him: My mercy prevails over my wrath.’ It was related by Muslim” (also by al-Bukhari, an-Nasa’i and Ibn Majah). (Hadith Qudsi 1—see the following link).

Narrated Abu Huraira:

“The Prophet said, ‘When Allah created the Creation, He wrote in His Book—and He wrote (that) about Himself, and it is placed with Him on the Throne-“Verily My Mercy overcomes My Anger”” (Sahih al-Bukhari 9:501).

The following hadiths are taken from *Al-Ahadith Al-Qudsiyyah-Divine Narratives* translated by Dr. Abdul Khaliq Kazi and Dr. Alan B. Day, published by Dar Al Kitab, Arabi-USA, 1995.

Allah Has a Waist

Hadith 34:

Abu Hurayra narrated that the Prophet said: “Allah created mankind and when He had finished, the womb stood up and took hold of Allah’s waist. Allah: Stop! The womb said: I seek Thy refuge from being severed. Allah said: Would you not be happy if I do good to one who does good to you and sever links with one who severs links with you. The womb said: Yes my Lord. Allah said: And so shall it be.”

Abu Hurayra said: Read if you like the following verse: “Would ye then, if ye were given the command, work corruption in the land sever your ties of kinship?” Quran: 47.22 [Bukhari] (p. 65).

Allah Has a Visible Form

Hadith 43:

Ibn Abbas reported that the Prophet said: “My Lord came to me in the best form, whilst I was asleep, and said: O Muhammad, do you know what the angelic assembly is disputing about? I said: I do not! Then Allah placed His Hand between my shoulders until I felt Its coolness in my chest and I became aware of what was happening in Heaven and on earth...” [Al-Tirmidhi] (pp. 82–83).

Hadith 134:

Jabir b. Abdullah narrated that the Prophet said: “Whilst the people of Paradise were enjoying their blissful state, a light will appear above them. They will raise their heads and lo! The Lord has risen above them and would say: Peace be upon you, O people of Paradise! That would be in accordance with the Quranic verse ‘Peace! A word from the Merciful Lord’ ” (Quran: 36:58). The Prophet said: “Then Allah would look at them and the people will look at Him, and they will not be distracted by the joys of Paradise as long as they were looking at Him, until Allah became veiled from them. His Light and Blessing over them will remain in their dwellings” [Ibn Majah] (p. 191).

Interestingly, this hadith indicates that Allah is not visibly present in Paradise. Only his light and blessings are present with believers. The fact that Allah appears to Paradise dwellers and then disappears from their sight implies that Allah is also not omnipresent.

Hadith 113:

Abu Hurayra narrated that some people said to the Prophet: “O Messenger of Allah, shall we see our Lord on the Day of Judgement? He said: Do you have any doubt about seeing the sun when it is not covered by the clouds? They said: No, O Messenger of Allah! Do you have any doubt about seeing the moon on the night of the full moon, when it is not covered by clouds? They said: No, O Messenger of Allah! Then likewise you shall see Him on the Day of Judgement... And this nation will remain along with its hypocrites, and Allah would come to them IN A FORM OTHER THAN THE ONE THEY KNOW, and would say ‘I am your Lord.’ They would say: We seek refuge in Allah from you. This is our place until our Lord comes to us. And when our Lord comes to us, WE SHALL RECOGNISE HIM. Then Allah will come to them IN THE FORM THAT THEY KNOW, and would say ‘I am your Lord.’ They would say: ‘You indeed are our Lord,’ and they would follow Him... The man would say: O my Lord, do not make the most unfortunate of your creatures! And he will continue to supplicate until Allah laughed. When Allah laughed, He gave him permission to enter...” [Bukhari] (pp. 158–161).

According to this hadith Allah has a form in which Muslims are expected to know and recognize on the Day of Judgment. Furthermore, Allah is said to have laughed, which implies that he either assumes a form where he gives off the impression that he is actually laughing or Allah in fact has a mouth! In fact, one hadith claims that Muhammad laughed at Allah laughing:

“...Man would say: ‘O my Lord, do you mock me, and You are the Lord of the Universe?’ Ibn Mas’ud (the narrator) laughed and said: ‘Do you not want to ask me what makes me laugh?’ The listeners then said: ‘What makes you laugh?’ He said: ‘This is how the Prophet laughed and the Companions asked: “What made you laugh, O Apostle of Allah?” The Prophet said: “I laughed on the account of the laughter of the Lord of the Universe at the man asking: Do you mock me and You are the Lord of the Universe?” “ ‘Allah would then say: “I do not mock you; I have power over what I will” ’ ...” (Hadith 117, p. 169).

What is most disturbing is not that Allah laughed, but that someone could actually stand before the Holy God and accuse him of mockery.

Note what the following Muslim translator states in relation to Allah having a face, hands, etc.:

(1) All that has been revealed in Allah’s Book [the Quran] as regards the [Sifat...] Qualities of Allah..., the Most High,—like His Face, Eyes, Hands, Shins, (Legs), His Coming, His Istawa (rising over) His Throne and others; His Qualities or all that Allah’s Messenger... qualified Him in the true authentic Prophet’s Ahadith (narrations) as regards His Qualities like [Nuzul...] His Descent or His laughing and others, etc. The religious scholars of the Quran and the Sunna believe in these Qualities of Allah and they confirm that these are really His Qualities, without Ta’wil... (interpreting their meanings into different things etc.) or Tashbih... (giving resemblance or similarity to any of the creatures) or Ta’til... (i.e. completely ignoring or denying them, i.e. there is no Face, or Eyes or Hands, or Shins etc. for Allah).

These Qualities befit or suit only Allah Alone, and He does not resemble any of (His) creatures. As Allah’s Statements (in the Quran): (1) “There is nothing like unto Him, and He is the All-Hearer, the All-Seer” (V. 42:11).

(2) There is none comparable unto Him (V. 112:4). (Al-Imam Zain-ud-Din Ahmad bin Abdul Lateef Az-Zubaidi, *The Translation of the Meanings of Summarized Sahih Al-Bukhari Arabic-English*, translated by Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan [Maktaba Dar-us-Salam Publishers & Distributors, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia], p. 842).

Therefore, according to this Islamic source a Muslim cannot just claim that the qualities of Allah, his face, hands, etc., are simply metaphorical. A Muslim must affirm that these things are actual. Yet, at the same time a Muslim must not assume that Allah’s face, hands, feet, etc., are anything like what we see and find in creation.

In light of these preceding factors we are left with two possibilities: Allah has an actual body. If so, this either makes Allah an exalted and glorified man. Or, Allah’s body is spiritual not material. If so, then this implies that Allah cannot be omnipresent, spaceless or timeless. Hence, the dimensions of time, space and matter become binding upon Allah. This being the case we end up with a Greek pagan concept where both God and matter are eternal!

Allah assumes a visible body without this actually being his form. If so, then Muslims have no basis to reject the OT theophanies of God and the Incarnation of God in Christ Jesus our Lord. If Allah can appear visibly, then the God of the Bible can appear as a man and actually take on human nature at the Incarnation without Muslims having a legitimate basis to argue against this fact.

In either case, Muslims have no valid objection against the doctrine of the Trinity and the Deity of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ.

Seeing that Islam poses more problems than solutions, we invite Muslims to embrace the truth of God as recorded in the Holy Bible. The Holy Bible is the only inspired and inerrant Word of God for all times and for all men, leading everyone to the knowledge of God's complete truth.

Jesus Christ is Lord to the glory of God the Father. Amen. Come Lord Jesus.

Note

Muslims might object at our uncritical use of certain hadiths in this article, which they may feel are not sound. In case such an argument is presented we simply would like to point out that the reliability of the Hadith is not the issue. The issue is that both the Quran and early Islamic scholarship affirm the visible and bodily nature of Allah. Hence, even if some of the hadiths were questionable this still would not refute our arguments. This is due to the fact that it is Muslims who wrote down even these weaker hadiths, affirming that these Muslims had no problem in attributing a body to Allah. Hence, no matter from what angle one looks at it the conclusion that Allah has a body becomes inescapable.

A Reply to Shabir Ally's Attack On Dr. Robert Morey By Dr. Robert Morey

Introduction

I have had the honor of Muslim terrorists following me around lately. In Canada, they threw acid at a car in which they thought I was riding. In Texas, they broke into a church building where they thought I was hiding. In San Diego, the FBI foiled an assassination attempt on my life. One even infiltrated my ministry and the FBI had to take him out.

Some terrorists show up at my lectures and protest outside the building or they run inside to disrupt my lecture. Lately they have been giving out a booklet entitled: *A Reply to Dr. Robert Morey's Moon-God Myth & Other Deceptive Attacks on Islam* by Shabir Ally.

It is also an example of terrorism. But this time, thankfully, its goal is only character assassination. Since I defeated Shabir in a public debate in Toronto, Canada (Contact Faith Defenders, P.O. Box 7447, Orange, CA 92863 to obtain a video copy of this debate), it is obvious to me that this booklet is an *emotional* response to my book, *The Islamic Invasion*. This is self-evident from his using such *ad hominem* slurs as "deceptive" and "dishonest." His booklet was an attack on me personally!

Let every Muslim terrorist please take note of the fact that I, Robert Morey, did not invent the idea that Allah came from Il or Ilah. Nor did I invent the idea that Allah in pre-Islamic times can be traced back to the Moon-God. Even if I had never been born, those ideas would have been voiced by many scholars and can be found in many reference works. This means that I am not personally your enemy. So, please stop running around like Shabir shouting insults at me. The emotionalism displayed in his booklet is "full of sound and fury, signifying nothing."

Shabir argues most of the time about irrelevant points that have nothing to do with the issue at hand. This is called in logic the “red herring” fallacy. In order to stop the hounds from following the trail of their prey, someone would drag a smelly old red herring across the trail and the dogs would be led astray on a false trail.

This is Shabir’s main logical fallacy. For example, instead of focusing on the crucial issues raised in the citations I give, he spends his time dealing with whether I quoted enough of the passage to suit him or whether I used ... before or after the quote. In other words, Shabir wastes a great deal of time focusing on HOW I quoted a scholar instead of WHAT that scholar said. He is clearly guilty of using a red herring to divert people from WHAT I quoted. The rule of logic is: *The validity of what is quoted does not depend on whether ... is placed before or after it or whether the entire passage is quoted.*

In My Many Books, Lectures and Debates, I Set Forth the Following Points:

1. In Pre-Islamic times, “Allah” was used by pagan Arabs in reference to one of 360 gods worshipped at the Kabah.

2. This “Allah” may have been a high god or even the top deity among the gods but he was not viewed in the monotheistic sense as the only true deity.

3. Many scholars trace this “Allah” back to Il and Ilah and from there to the Moon-God.

Do these points seem difficult to understand? I don’t think so. The only crucial question is whether these points are supported by the citations I produce. It is irrelevant whether I quoted the entire paragraph or whether I put ... before or after the quote. If what I quoted supports the point I am making at that time, that is all that matters.

Since my points concern the *pre*-Islamic origin and meaning of “Allah,” what it meant in post-Islamic times is *logically* irrelevant. Shabir seems completely ignorant of this point of logic.

He also doesn’t understand that it is only necessary to quote that part of a page or paragraph or sentence that applies directly to the point you are making. Thus when Shabir constantly whines, “Morey did not quote the whole passage,” he failed to understand that if the rest of the passage is irrelevant to the point being made, I don’t have to quote it.

The same is true of Shabir’s focus on if I used ... enough times to suit him. Yet, he failed to use ... when quoting me on several occasions! The point is: The presence or absence of ... in a citation has no logical bearing on the validity of what is quoted.

Shabir’s canard is immediately evident at this point. Take his treatment of my citation from Coon who wrote:

“The god Il or Ilah was originally a phase of the Moon God” Carleton S. Coon,
Southern Arabia (Washington, D.C. Smithsonian, 1944) p. 399.

I used Coon to illustrate that some scholars trace “Allah” back to Il or Ilah. Then from there they find its original meaning in Pre-Islamic times to refer to the Moon-God. That this is what Coon is saying is quite clear. Now, why does Shabir object to my quotation from Coon?

1. He claims that I “misquoted” Coon. But did I in fact misquote him? No. He quotes the *exact same words* that I quoted! We both quote Coon’s statement that the word *ILAH* originally referred to a phase of the Moon-God.

2. What Shabir means by “misquotation” is actually *partial* quotation. He thus confuses partial quotation for misquotation. This is sad as it reveals he has no command of the English language or the laws of logic.

3. Thus Shabir's whole argument is based on the idea that since I did not quote the whole paragraph, this somehow means that what I did quote should be ignored! This is irrational.

After tracing Allah back to Il or Ilah and from there to the Moon-God, Coon goes on to discuss his idea of how the meaning of the word evolved *later* on in history. For example he states:

“under Mohammed's tutelage, the relatively anonymous Ilah, became Al-Ilah, The God, or Allâh, the Supreme Being.”

Notice that Coon says that under “Muhammad's tutelage” (i.e in *Post-Islamic* times):
“the relatively anonymous Ilah *became* Al-Ilah, the God, or Allâh, the Supreme Being.”

Notice his words very carefully. Coon is saying that Muhammad *changed* the meaning of Allah. Coon says that the *original* meaning of Allah goes back to Il and from there back to the Moon-God. That the meaning of Allah was later CHANGED by Muhammad is further proof that Allah did NOT originally mean the only true God. After all, if it *changed* to the Supreme God, then it did not originally have that meaning!

Shabir makes the same mistake with my quote from Caesar Farah:

“There is no reason, therefore, to accept the idea that Allâh passed on to the Muslims from the Christians and Jews” (Farah p. 28).

Shabir once again confuses partial quotation with misquotation. He claims that I was in error for not quoting more of Farah. Well, here is the rest of Farah's statement:

Allâh, *the paramount deity of pagan Arabia*, was the target of worship in varying degrees of intensity from the southernmost tip of Arabia to the Mediterranean. To the Babylonians he was “Il” (god); to the Canaanites, and later the Israelites, he was “El”: the South Arabians worshipped him as “Ilah,” and the Bedouins as “al-Ilah” (the deity). *With Muhammad he becomes Allâh, God of the Worlds*, of all believers, the one and only who admits no associates or consorts in the worship of Him. Judaic and Christian concepts of God abetted the *transformation of Allâh from a pagan deity to the God of all monotheists*. There is no reason, therefore, to accept the idea that “Allah” passed to the Muslims from Christians and Jews (Farah p. 28, emphasis mine).

Shabir does not realize that rather than refuting me, the expanded quotation actually supports what I say!

1. Farah begins by saying that Allah was the “paramount deity of pagan Arabia” and “a pagan deity.” This means Allah was one of the gods worshipped by the pagans. Notice that he says “deity” and not “Deity.”

2. Farah then clearly states that “with Muhammad” Ilah “BECOMES Allah,” in that Allah is “TRANSFORMED” from being “a pagan deity” to a monotheistic Being. Again, this is what I also believe.

3. According to Farah, Allah began as a pagan deity and is later “transformed” by Muhammad into a monotheistic deity. This is the point I have been making all along.

The expanded quotes from both Coon and Farah support what I believe. The red herrings used by Shabir are revealed as a sham and a hoax. He should have focused on what I quoted and not just on how I quoted it.

The word *Allah* was most likely derived from *AL-ILAH*, which had become the generic term for whatever god was considered the highest god. The Meccan pagans used *Allah* to refer to their

own particular high god. This is why they prayed to Hubal using the name Allah. Different tribes preferred other names such as Sin or Ilqamah. Allah was NEVER called YHWH or Jesus.

The following citations reveal that there is a general consensus among Islamic scholars that Allah was a pagan deity before Islam developed in the 7th century. He was only one god among a pantheon of 360 gods worshipped by the Arabs. Even if he was at times viewed as a “high god,” this does not mean he was the one true God.

“Allah: Originally applied to the moon; he seems to be preceded by Ilmaqah, the moon god...

“Allah: the female counterpart to Allah.” *Dictionary of Non-Classical Mythology*, p. 7.

“Allah: Before the birth of Muhammad, Allah was known as a supreme, but not sole, God.”

Oxford Dictionary of World Religions, p. 48.

“Before Islam, the religion of the Arabic world involved the worship of many spirits, called jinn. Allah was but one of many gods worshiped in Mecca. But then Muhammad taught the worship of Allah as the only God, whom he identified as the same God worshiped by Christians and Jews.”

A Short History of Philosophy (Oxford University Press) p. 130.

“Historians like Vaqqidi have said Allah was actually the chief of the 360 gods being worshipped in Arabia at the time Mohammed rose to prominence. Ibn Al-Kalbi gave 27 names of pre-Islamic deities... Interestingly, not many Muslims want to accept that Allah was already being worshipped at the Ka’ba in Mecca by Arab pagans before Mohammed came. Some Muslims become angry when they are confronted with this fact. But history is not on their side. Pre-Islamic literature has proved this.”

G.J.O. Moshay, *Who Is This Allah?* (Dorchester House, Bucks, UK, 1994), pg. 138.

“Islam also owes the term ‘Allah’ to the heathen Arabs. We have evidence that it entered into numerous personal names in Northern Arabia and among the Nabateans. It occurred among the Arabs of later times, in theophorous names and on its own.”

Ibn warraq, *Why I Am Not a Muslim* (Prometheus, Amherst, 1995) p. 42.

“In any case it is an extremely important fact that Muhammad did not find it necessary to introduce an altogether novel deity, but contented himself with ridding the heathen Allah of his companions subjecting him to a kind of dogmatic purification.”

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, I:664.

“The name Allah, as the Qur’an itself is witness, was well known in pre-Islamic Arabia. Indeed, both it and its feminine form, Allat, are found not infrequently among the theophorous names in inscriptions from North Africa.”

Arthur Jeffery, ed., *Islam: Muhammad and His Religion* (New York: The Liberal Arts Press, 1958), p. 85.

“Allah is a proper name, applicable only to their [Arabs’] peculiar God.”

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, I:326.

“Allah is a pre-Islamic name...”

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, I:117.

“Allah is found ... in Arabic inscriptions prior to Islam.”
Encyclopedia Britannica, I:643.

“The Arabs, before the time of Muhammad, accepted and worshipped, after a fashion, a supreme god called Allah.”

Encyclopedia of Islam, eds. Houtsma, Arnold, Basset, Hartman (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1913), I:302.

“Allah was known to the pre-Islamic Arabs; he was one of the Meccan deities.”
Encyclopedia of Islam, ed. Gibb, I:406.

“Ilah ... appears in pre-Islamic poetry... By frequency of usage, al-ilah was contracted to allah, frequently attested to in pre-Islamic poetry.”

Encyclopedia of Islam, eds. Lewis, Menage, Pellat, Schacht (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1971), II:1093.

“The name Allah goes back before Muhammed.”

The Facts on File: Encyclopedia of World Mythology and Legend, ed. Anthony Mercatante (New York, The Facts on File, 1983), I:41.

“The source of this (Allah) goes back to pre-Muslim times. Allah is not a common name meaning ‘God’ (or a ‘god’), and the Muslim must use another word or form if he wishes to indicate any other than his own peculiar deity.”

Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, (ed. Hastings), I:326.

“Allah was already known by name to the Arabs.”

Henry Preserved Smith, *The Bible and Islam: or The Influence of the Old and New Testaments on the Religion of Mohammed* (New York: Charles Scribner’s Sons, 1897), p. 102.

“Allah: Perceived in pre-Islamic times as the creator of the earth and water, though not, at that time, considered monotheistically...”

“Allat: Astral and tutelary goddess. Pre-Islamic... One of three daughters of Allah.”
Encyclopedia of Gods, p. 11.

“Manat: Goddess. Pre-Islamic... One of the so-called daughters of Allah.”

Encyclopedia of Gods, p. 156.

“The name Allah is also evident in archeological and literary remains of pre-Islamic Arabia.”

Kenneth Cragg, *The Call of the Minaret* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 31.

“In recent years I have become increasingly convinced that for an adequate understanding of the career of Muhammad and the sources of Islam great importance must be attached to the existence in Mecca of belief in Allah as a ‘high god.’ In a sense this is a form of paganism, but it is so different from paganism as commonly understood that it deserves separate treatment.”

William Montgomery Watt, *Muhammad’s Mecca*, p. vii.

“The use of the phrase ‘the Lord of this House’ makes it likely that those Meccans who believed in Allah as a high god-and they may have been numerous-regarded the Ka’ba as his shrine, even though there were images of other gods in it. There are stories in the Sira of pagan Meccans praying to Allah while standing beside the image of Hubal.”

William Montgomery Watt, *Muhammad’s Mecca*, p. 39.

“The customs of heathenism have left an indelible mark on Islam, notably in the rites of the pilgrimage (on which more will be said later), so that for this reason alone something ought to be said about the chief characteristics of Arabian paganism.

“The relation of this name, which in Babylonia and Assyria became a generic term simply meaning ‘god,’ to the Arabian Ilah familiar to us in the form Allah, which is compounded of al, the definite article, and Ilah by eliding the vowel ‘i,’ is not clear. Some scholars trace the name to the South Arabian Ilah, a title of the Moon god, but this is a matter of antiquarian interest ... it is clear from Nabataen and other inscriptions that Allah meant ‘the god.’

“The other gods mentioned in the Quran are all female deities: Al-Lat, al-Uzza, and Manat, which represented the Sun, the planet Venus, and Fortune, respectively; at Mecca they were regarded as the daughters of Allah... As Allah meant ‘the god,’ so Al-Lat means ‘the goddess.’ ”

Alfred Guillaume, *Islam* (Penguin, 1956) pgs. 6–7.

“As well as worshipping idols and spirits, found in animals, plants, rocks and water, the ancient Arabs believed in several major gods and goddesses whom they considered to hold supreme power over all things. The most famous of these were Al-Lat, Al-Uzza, Manat and Hubal. The first three were thought to be the daughters of Allah (God) and their intercessions on behalf of their worshippers were therefore of great significance.

“Hubal was associated with the Semitic god Ba’al and with Adonis or Tammuz, the gods of spring, fertility, agriculture and plenty... Hubal’s idol used to stand by the holy well inside the Sacred House. It was made of red sapphire but had a broken arm until the tribe of Quraysh, who considered him one of their major gods, made him a replacement in solid gold.

“In addition to the sun, moon and the star Al-Zuhara, the Arabs worshipped the planets Saturn, Mercury, and Jupiter, the stars Sirius and Canopies and the constellations of Orion, Urea Major and Minor, and the seven Pleiades.

“Some stars and planets were given human characters. According to legend, Al-Doberman, one of the stars in the Hades group, fell deeply in love with Al-Thruways, the fairest of the Pleiades stars. With the approval of the Moon, he asked for her hand in marriage.”

Chair al-Sash, *Fabled Cities, Princes & Jin From Arab Myths and Legends* (New York: Chicken, 1985), p. 28–30.

“Along with Allah, however, they worshipped a host of lesser gods and ‘daughters of Allah.’ ”

Encyclopedia of World Mythology and Legend, I:61.

“It must not be assumed that since Moslems worship one God they are very close to Christians in their faith. The important thing is not the belief that God is One, but the conception that the believers have of God’s character. Satan also believes and trembles! As Raymond Lull, the first great missionary to Moslems, pointed out long ago, the

greatest deficiency in the Moslem religion is in its conception of God... For as we know, Jehovah the God of the Bible, known both to Jews and Christians, is revealed much differently than Allah, the god of Islam.”

Howard F. Vos, Ed., *Religions in a Changing World* (Chicago, 1961), pp. 70, 71.

“Allah was the name of a god whom the Arabs worshipped many centuries before Muhammed was born.”

The World Book Encyclopedia (Chicago, 1955), Vol. 1, p. 230.

“But history establishes beyond the shadow of doubt that even the pagan Arabs, before Mohammed’s time, knew their chief god by the name of Allah and even, in a sense, proclaimed his unity... Among the pagan Arabs this term denoted the chief god of their pantheon, the Kaaba, with its three hundred and sixty idols.”

Samuel M. Zwemer, *The Moslem Doctrine of God* (New York, 1905), pp. 24–25.

“There is no corroborative evidence whatsoever for the Qur’an’s claim that the Ka’aba was initially a house of monotheist worship. Instead there certainly is evidence as far back as history can trace the sources and worship of the Ka’aba that it was thoroughly pagan and idolatrous in content and emphasis.”

John Gilchrist, *The Temple, The Ka’aba, and The Christ* (Benoni, South Africa, 1980), p. 16.

“In pre-Islamic days, called the Days of Ignorance, the religious background of the Arabs was pagan, and basically animistic. Through wells, stones, caves, springs, and other natural objects man could make contact with the deity... At Mekka, Allah was the chief of the gods and the special deity of the Quraish, the prophet’s tribe. Allah had three daughters: Al-Uzzah (Venus) most revered of all and pleased with human sacrifice; Manah, the goddess of destiny, and Al Lat, the goddess of vegetable life. Hubal and more than 300 others made up the pantheon. The central shrine at Mekka was the Kaaba, a cubelike stone structure which still stands though many times rebuilt. Imbedded in one corner is the black stone, probably a meteorite, the kissing of which is now an essential part of the pilgrimage.”

John Van Ess, *Meet the Arab* (New York, 1943), p. 29.

“... a people of Arabia, of the race of the Joktanites ... the Alilai living near the Red Sea in a district where gold is found; their name, children of the moon, so called from the worship of the moon, or Alilat.”

Gesenius Hebrew and Chaldee Lexicon to the Old Testament Scriptures, translated by Samuel Prideaux Tregelles (Grand Rapids, MI, 1979), p. 367.

“That Islam was conceived in idolatry is shown by the fact that many rituals performed in the name of Allah were connected with the pagan worship that existed before Islam. And today, millions of Moslems pray towards Mecca, where the famous revered black stone is located.

- Before Islam, Allah was reported to be known as:
- the supreme of a pantheon of gods.
- the name of a god whom the Arabs worshipped.
- the chief god of the pantheon.
- Ali-ilah, the god, the supreme.

- the all-powerful, all-knowing, and totally unknowable.
- the predeterminer of everyone’s life (destiny).
- the chief of the gods.
- the special deity of the Quraish.
- having three daughters: Al Uzzah (Venus), Manah and Al Lat.

... Because the rituals involved with the Islamic Pilgrimage are either identical or very close to the pre-Islamic pagan idol worship at Mecca. Because of other Arabian history which points to heathen worship of the sun, moon, and the stars, as well as other gods, of which I believe Allah was in some way connected to. This then would prove to us that Allah is not the same as the true God of the Bible whom we worship, because God never changes.”

M. J. Afshari, *Is Allah the Same God as the God of the Bible?*, pp. 6, 8, 9.

“If a Muslim says, ‘Your God and our God is the same,’ either he does not understand who Allah and Christ really are, or he intentionally glosses over the deeprooted differences.”

Adb-Al Masih, *Who Is Allah in Islam?* (Villach, Austria, Light of Life, 1985), p. 36.

“Sin. — The moon-god occupied the chief place in the astral triad. Its other two members, Shamash the sun and Ishtar the planet Venus, were his children. Thus it was, in effect, from the night that light had emerged... In his physical aspect Sin—who was venerated at Ur under the name of Nannar—was an old man with a long beard the color of lapis-lazuli. He normally wore a turban. Every evening he got into his barque—which to mortals appeared in the form of a brilliant crescent moon—and navigated the vast spaces of the nocturnal sky. Some people, however, believed that the luminous crescent was Sin’s weapon. But one day the crescent gave way to a disk, which stood out in the sky like a gleaming crown. There could be no doubt that this was the god’s own crown; and then Sin was called ‘Lord of the Diadem.’

“These successive and regular transformations lent Sin in a certain mystery. For this reason he was considered to be ‘He whose deep heart no god can penetrate’... Sin was also full of wisdom. At the end of every month the gods came to consult them and he made decisions for them... His wife was Ningal, ‘the great Lady.’ He was the father not only of Shamash and Istar but also of a son Nusku, the god of fire.”

Larousse Encyclopedia of Mythology (New York, 1960), pp. 54–56.

“Allah, the Supreme Being of the Mussulmans: Before Islam. That the Arabs, before the time of Muhammad, accepted and worshipped, after a fashion, a supreme god called Allah—‘the Ilah,’ or the god, if the form is of genuine Arabic source; if of Aramaic, from Alaha, ‘the god’—seems absolutely certain.

“Whether he was an abstraction or a development from some individual god, such as Hubal, need not here be considered... But they also recognized and tended to worship more fervently and directly other strictly subordinate gods... It is certain that they regarded particular deities (mentioned in liii. 19–20 are al-’Ussa, Manat, or Manah, al-Lat; some have interpreted vii. 179 as a reference to a perversion of Allah to Allat as daughters of Allah, vi. 100; xvi. 59; xxxvii. 149; liii. 21); they also asserted that he had sons (vi. 100)... ‘There was no god save Allah.’ This meant, for Muhammed and the Meccans, that of all the gods whom they worshipped, Allah was the only real deity. It

took no account of the nature of God in the abstract, only of the personal position of Allah ... ilah, the common noun from which Allah is probably derived..."

First Encyclopedia of Islam, E.J. Brill (New York, 1987), p. 302.

"Islam for its part ensured the survival of these pre-Islamic constituents, endowed them with a universal significance, and provided them with a context within which they have enjoyed a most remarkable longevity. Some of these significant constituents, nomadic and sedentary, the pre-Islamic roots which have formed the persistent heritage, deserve to be noted and discussed... The pre-Islamic Pilgrimage in its essential features survives, indeed is built into the very structure of Islam as one of its Five Pillars of Faith."

The Cambridge History of Islam, Vol. I, ed. P.M. Holt (Cambridge, 1970), p. 27.

"The Quran (22.51/I) implies that on at least one occasion 'Satan had interposed' something in the revelation Muhammad received, and this probably refers to the incident to be described. The story is that, while Muhammad was hoping for some accommodation with the great merchants, he received a revelation mentioning the goddesses al-Lat, al-Uzza, and Manat (53.19 [20, as now found]), but continuing with other two (or three) verses sanctioning intercession to these deities. At some later date Muhammad received a further revelation abrogating the latter verses, but retaining the names of the goddesses, and saying it was unfair that God should have only daughters while human beings had sons."

The Cambridge History of Islam, Vol. I, ed. P.M. Holt (Cambridge, 1970), p. 37.

"This notation at times might be very simple, as can be illustrated by such equations as the sun or winged sun for the sun-god (Sumerian, Utu; Akkadian, Shamash), a crescent moon for the Moon-god (Nanna/Sin), a star for Inanna/Ishtar (the planet Venus), seven dots or small stars for the constellation Pleiades (of which seven are readily visible, or 'Seven Sisters')..."

Civilizations of the Ancient Near East, Vol. III, ed. Jack M. Sasson, (New York), p. 1841.

"... the Ka'aba was dedicated to Allah, the High God of the pagan Arabs, despite the presiding effigy of Hubal. By the beginning of the seventh century, Al-Ilah had become more important than before in the religious life many of the Arabs. Many primitive religions develop a belief in a High God, who is sometimes called the Sky God... But they also carried on worshipping the other gods, who remained deeply important to them."

Karen Armstrong, *Muhammad* (New York: San Francisco, 1992), p. 69.

"The cult of a deity termed simply 'the god' (Al-Ilah) was known throughout southern Syria and northern Arabia in the days before Islam—Muhammad's father was named 'Abd Allah' ('Servant of Allah')—and was obviously of central importance in Mecca, where the building called the Ka'bah was indisputably his house. Indeed, the Muslims shahadah attest to precisely that point: the Quraysh, the paramount tribe of Mecca, were being called on by Muhammad to repudiate the very existence of all the other gods save this one. It seems equally certain that Allah was not merely a god in Mecca but was widely regarded as the 'high god,' the chief and head of the Meccan

pantheon, whether this was the result, as has been argued, of a natural progression toward henotheism or of the growing influence of Jews and Christians in the Arabian Peninsula... Thus Allah was neither an unknown nor an unimportant deity to the Quraysh when Muhammad began preaching his worship at Mecca.”

The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Modern Islamic World, ed. John L. Esposito, (New York, 1995), pp. 76–77.

“The religion of the Arabs, as well as their political life, was on a thoroughly primitive level... In particular the Semites regarded trees, caves, springs, and large stones as being inhabited by spirits; like the Black Stone of Islam in a corner of the Ka’bah at Mecca, in Petra and other places in Arabia stones were venerated also... Every tribe worshipped its own god, but also recognized the power of other tribal gods in their own sphere... Three goddesses in particular had elevated themselves above the circle of the inferior demons. The goddess of fate, al-Manat, corresponding to the Tyche Soteira of the Greeks, though known in Mecca, was worshipped chiefly among the neighboring Bedouin tribes of the Hudhayl. Allat ‘the Goddess,’ who is Taif, was called ar-Rabbah, ‘the Lady,’ and whom Herodotus equates with Urania—corresponded to the great mother of the gods, Astarte of the northern Semites; al-’Uzza, ‘the Mightiest,’ worshipped in the planet Venus, was merely a variant form... In addition to all these gods and goddesses the Arabs, like many other primitive peoples, believed in a God who was creator of the world, Allah, whom the Arabs did not, as has often been thought, owe to the Jews and Christians... The more the significance of the cult declined, the greater became the value of a general religious temper associated with Allah. Among the Meccans he was already coming to take the place of the old moon-god Hubal as the lord of the Ka’bah... Allah was actually the guardian of contracts, though at first they were still settled at a special ritual locality and so subordinate to the supervision of an idol. In particular he was regarded as the guardian of the alien guest, though consideration for him still lagged behind duty to one’s kinsman.”

History of the Islamic Peoples, Carl Brockelmann (New York), pp. 8–10.

“The Romans and Abyssinians were identified with Christianity. Whole tribes and districts held up the banner of Judaism and waged war in its propagation. The Persian power was the exponent of the fire-worship; and the Arabs in general were devoted to that native idolatry which had its center in the national sanctuary of the Kaaba... The religion most widely prevalent in Arabia, when Mohammed began his life, was a species of heathenism of idol-worship, which had its local center in Mecca and its temple... According to a theory held by many, this temple had been sourceally connected with the ancient worship of the sun, moon and stars, and its circumambulation by the worshippers had a symbolical reference to the rotation of the heavenly bodies. Within its precincts and in its neighborhood there were found many idols, such as Hobal, Lat, Ozza, Manah, Wadd, Sawa, Yaghut, Nasr, Isaf, Naila, etc. A black stone in the temple was regarded with superstitious awe as eminently sacred... The attempt of the Mussulmans to derive it direct from a stone altar or pillar, erected by Abraham and his son Ishmael, in that identical locality, is altogether unsupported by history, and, in fact, flagrantly contrary to the Biblical record of the life of Abraham and his son. The pagan character of the temple is sufficiently marked by the statement of Mohammedan writers that before its purification by their Prophet, it contained no less than 360 idols, as many as there were

days of the year; and that on its walls were painted the figures of angels, prophets, saints, including those of Abraham and Ishmael, and even of the Virgin Mary with her infant Son... Mohammed, with great practical insight and shrewdness, seized on this advantage and retained the heathen shrine of his native city as the local center of Islam. He sanctioned it by his own example as a place of religious pilgrimage for all his followers.”
Mohammed and Mohammedanism, S. W. Koelle (London, 1889), p. 17–19.

“According to D. Nielsen, the starting point of the religion of the Semitic nomads was marked by the astral triad, Sun-Moon-Venus, the moon being more important for the nomads and the sun more important for the settled tribes.”
Studies on Islam, trans., ed. Merlin L. Swartz (New York, Oxford, 1981), p. 7.

“One detail which already impressed the Greek authors was the role played by sacred stones... The material object is not venerated for itself but rather as the dwelling of either a person, being (god, spirit) or a force.”
Studies on Islam, *ibid.*, p. 8.

“The final divinity to be considered is Allah who was recognized before Islam as god, and if not as the only god at least as a supreme god. The Quran makes it quite clear that he was recognized at Mecca, though belief in him was certainly more widespread... How is this to be explained? Earlier scholars attributed the diffusion of this belief solely to Christian and Judaic influences. But now a growing number of authors maintain that this idea had older roots in Arabia... If, therefore, Allah is indigenous to Arabia, one must ask further: Are there indications of a nomadic source? I think there are, based on a comparison of the beliefs of the nomads in central and northern Asia with those of northeastern Africa. Like the supreme being of many other nomads, Allah is a god of the sky and dispenser of rain.”*Studies on Islam*, *ibid.*, p. 12.

“The ibex (wa'al) still inhabits South Arabia and in Sabeian times represented the moon god. Dr. Albert Jamme believes it was of religious significance to the ancient Sabeians that the curved ibex horn held sideways resembled the first quarter of the moon.”
Qataban and Sheba: Exploring the Ancient Kingdoms on the Biblical Spice Routes of Arabia, Wendell Phillips (New York, 1955), p. 64.

“The first pre-Islamic inscription discovered in Dhofar Province, Oman, this bronze plaque, deciphered by Dr. Albert Jamme, dates from about the second century A.D. and gives the name of the Hadramaut moon god Sin and the name Sumhuram, a long-lost city... The moon was the chief deity of all the early South Arabian kingdoms—particularly fitting in that region where the soft light of the moon brought the rest and cool winds of night as a relief from the blinding sun and scorching heat of day.

In contrast to most of the old religions with which we are familiar, the moon god is male, while the sun god is his consort, a female. The third god of importance is their child, the male morning star, which we know as the planet Venus...

The spice route riches brought them a standard of luxurious living inconceivable to the poverty-stricken South Arabian Bedouins of today. Like nearly all Semitic peoples they worshipped the moon, the sun, and the morning star. The chief god, the moon, was a male deity symbolized by the bull, and we found many carved bulls' heads, with drains for the blood of sacrificed animals.”

Qataban and Sheba: Exploring the Ancient Kingdoms on the Biblical Spice Routes of Arabia, *ibid.*, p. 227.

“Arabia in Muhammad’s time was polytheistic in its conception of the cosmos and tribal in its social structure. Each tribe had its own god(s) and goddess(es), which were manifest in the forms of idols, stones, trees, or stars in the sky.”

Islamic Studies, A History of Religions Approach, 2nd Ed., Richard C. Martin (New Jersey), p. 96.

II. The Religion of the Pre-Islamic Arabs

“The life of the pre-Islamic Arabs, especially in the Hijaz, depended on trade and they made a trade of their religion as well. About four hundred years before the birth of Muhammad one Amr bin Lahyo bin Harath bin Amr ul-Qais bin Thalaba bin Azd bin Khalan bin Babalyun bin Saba, a descendant of Qahtan and king of Hijaz, had put an idol called Habal on the roof of the Kaba. This was one of the chief deities of the Quraish before Islam. It is said that there were altogether three hundred and sixty idols in and about the Kaba and that each tribe had its own deity... The shapes and figures of the idols were also made according to the fancy of the worshippers. Thus Wadd was shaped like a man, Naila like a woman, so was Suwa. Yaghuth was made in the shape of a lion, Yauq like a horse and Nasr like a vulture... Besides Hodal, there was another idol called Shams placed on the roof of the Kaba... The blood of the sacrificial animals brought by the pilgrims was offered to the deities in the Kaba and sometimes even human beings were sacrificed and offered to the god... Besides idol-worship, they also worshipped the stars, the sun and the moon.”

Muhammad the Holy Prophet, Hafiz Ghulam Sarwar (Pakistan), p. 18–19.

“The Bedouin do not seem to have had much time for religion. They were realists, without a great deal of imagination. They believed the land was peopled by spirits, the jinns, who were often invisible but appeared also in animal form. The dead were thought to live on in a dim and ghostly state. Offerings were made to them and steales and cairns of stones erected on their graves. Certain trees and stones (especially meteorites and those shaped to resemble human forms) housed spirits and divinities. Divinities dwelt in the sky and some were actually stars. Some were thought to be ancient sages made divine. The list of these divine beings, and above all the importance with which each was regarded, varied from one tribe to the next; but the chief of them were to be found all over the peninsula. This was especially true of Allah, ‘the God, the Divinity,’ the personification of the divine world in its highest form, creator of the universe and keeper of sworn oaths. In the Hejaz three goddesses had pride of place as the ‘daughters of Allah.’ The first of these was Allat, mentioned by Herodotus under the name of Alilat. Her name means simply ‘the goddess,’ and she may have stood for one aspect of Venus, the morning star, although Hellenized Arabs identified her with Athena. Next came Uzza, ‘the allpowerful’; whom other sources identify with Venus. The third was Manat, the goddess of fate, who held the shears which cut the thread of life and who was worshipped in a shrine on the sea-shore. The great god of Mecca was Hubal, an idol made of red cornelian... Homage was paid to the divinity with offerings and the sacrifice of animals

and perhaps, occasionally, of human beings. Certain sanctuaries were the object of pilgrimage (hajj) at which a variety of rituals were performed, consisting notably of ceremonial processions around the sacred object. Certain prohibitions had to be observed during these rituals, such as in many cases abstention from sexual relations. Magic was common. People feared the evil eye and protected themselves with amulets.”

Mohammed, Maxine Robinson (New York), pp. 16–17.

“These and many other verses show clearly that the existence of a god called Allah and even his highest position among the divinities was known and acknowledged in Jahiliyyah, but He was, after all, but one of the gods... Was the Koranic concept of Allah a continuation of the pre-Islamic one, or did the former represent a complete break with the latter? Were there some essential—not accidental—ties between the two concepts signified by one and the same name? Or was it a simple matter of a common word used for two different objects?

“In order to be able to give a satisfactory answer to these initial questions, we will do well to remember the fact that, when the Koran began to use this name, there immediately arose serious debates among the Arabs of Mecca. The Koranic usage of the word provoked stormy discussions over the nature of this God between the Muslims and the Kafirs, as is most eloquently attested by the Koran itself.

“What does this mean from the semantical point of view? What are the implications of the fact that the name of Allah was not only known to both parties but was actually used by both parties in their discussion with each other? The very fact that the name of Allah was common to both the pagan Arabs and the Muslims, particularly the fact that it gave rise to much heated discussion about the concept of God, would seem to suggest conclusively that there was some common ground of understanding between the two parties. Otherwise there could have been neither debate nor discussion at all. And when the Prophet addressed his adversaries in the name of Allah, he did so simply and solely because he knew that this name meant something—and something important—to their minds too. If this were not so, his activity would have been quite pointless in this respect.

“As regards the ‘basic’ meaning of Allah, In pre-Islamic times each tribe, as a rule, had its own local god or divinity known by a proper name. So, at first, each tribe may have meant its own local divinity when it used an expression equivalent in meaning to ‘the God’; this is quite probable. But the very fact that people began to designate their own local divinity by the abstract form of ‘the God’ must have paved the way for the growth of an abstract notion of God without any localizing qualification and then, following this, for a belief in the supreme God common to all the tribes. We meet with similar instances all over the world.

“Before the name [Allah] came into Islam, it had already long been part of the pre-Islamic system, and a considerably important part, too... the pagan concept of Allah, which is purely Arabian—the case in which we see the pre-Islamic Arabs themselves talking about ‘Allah’ as they understood the word in their own peculiar way.”

God and Man in the Koran, Toshihiko Izutsu (Tokyo, 1964), pp. 95–99, 103–104.

One must ask why Shabir did not deal with all the citations I have given to prove my point? Could it be they are too clearly on my side?

Shabir and Logic

During our debate, I constantly pointed out the logical fallacies committed by Shabir. This must have irritated him greatly as he desperately tries to find a logical fallacy in my arguments.

First, I have argued that the word “Allah” existed before Muhammad was born.

To prove this point I pointed out that Muhammad’s father and uncle both had “Allah” as part of their names. This is a historical argument that deals with the chronological reality that a father pre-exists his son. It would look like this.

If x exists before y,

Then: the father of Muhammad (x) existed before Muhammad (y).

If the name of x exists before the birth of y

Then the name abd-Allah existed before the birth of Muhammad

Then the word “Allah” existed before Muhammad.

I also build on this argument:

If x lived and died before y was born,

Then, the meaning of x’s name will be pre-y.

If the meaning of x’s name is pre-y,

And x was a pagan,

Then the pre-y meaning of the name of x is pagan.

If “Allah” was part of x’s name,

Then “Allah” is pre-y.

If the pre-y meaning of “Allah” was a pagan deity,

Then the name of x referred to a pagan deity.

If “Allah” came from Il or Ilah in pre-y times,

And Il or Ilah was originally the Moon-god,

Then Allah originally referred to the Moon-god.

In logic this last syllogism would be as follows:

a>b

b>c

a>c

Shabir needs someone who teaches logic to tell him that the syllogism above is valid. He needs someone to tell him that logic deals with the validity of the form of an argument and not with whether the premise is true or false. Shabir does not understand this point. He assumes that because he denies the truth of my premise, this means my conclusion is invalid.

This is the fatal flaw of Shabir’s entire booklet.

He assumes a post-Islamic meaning of the word “Allah” as a reference to the one true deity of Islam. Thus he resists any attempt to find a pagan pre-Islamic meaning of the word. He assumes Islam is true and then judges everything pre-Islamic by Islam.

Concerning the archeological evidence I set forth, Shabir cannot make up his mind. Sometimes he seems to deny it all and, then in other places, he seems to admit that I was right. He contradicts himself on this point.

Shabir’s main objection is a question of relevance and not fact. In some places he admits that I am right on the archeological facts but then turns around and claims that these facts are irrelevant. Thus it does not matter to him that Moon-god religion was dominant in the Fertile Crescent. But the cultural and religious context of the pre-Islamic world in general is relevant because I am discussing that time period!

The fact is Moon-god worship was the dominant religion in the ancient world. I surveyed the archeological evidence from Babylon to Egypt to prove this point. But Shabir complains:

“He should get to the point of proving that Moon-worship existed in Arabia.”

Notice he says “Arabia” in general and not just Southern Arabia. He later condemns me for referring to Arabia in general. He thus does here what he condemns me for doing later.

After I pointed out that Moon-god temples have been found in Arabia and quoted from scholars to prove this point, does he deny that I am correct on this point? No.

How does Shabir try to wiggle out of the evidence I give? He commits the logical fallacy of arguing from silence. He asks, “But where is the evidence concerning North Arabia?” Since he can’t deny the evidence that I submit, he just keeps asking for more evidence!

I set forth the hard evidence that moon worship was common among pre-Islamic pagans in Arabia. He admits that this is true for Southern Arabia. But he waves this evidence away because archeologists have not been to Northern Arabia. But modern archeologists are not allowed by the Saudis to dig in Northern Arabia. I am sure that such evidence would come to light if they were allowed to investigate the area.

The bulk of Shabir’s booklet commits the same logical fallacies over and over again. When I quoted from Segall or other scholars that moon religion was dominant in Arabia, he complains that the evidence only proves this for Southern Arabia. But he waves aside this evidence by complaining the evidence has not been found in Northern Arabia.

He points to Minoan inscriptions that list names for the Moon-god and concludes that since Allah is not mentioned, this means it was not a name for the Moon-god. Of course, he is arguing from silence once again. It is logically irrelevant if a Minoan inscription does not mention the Arabic word Allah.

The depth to which Shabir now sinks is amazing. While every Islamic reference work defines Al-Lat, Al-Uzza and Manat as three pagan goddesses who were called the “daughters of Allah” by pagan Arabs in pre-Islamic times, Shabir claims that I “invented” the idea that they were thus the daughters of the “Moon-god.”

My conclusion that Al-Lat, Al-Uzza and Manat were viewed as the daughters of the Moon-god, is a valid deduction given the fact that Allah was originally the Moon-god in pre-Islamic times. The connection between Allah and the Moon-god has been pointed out by various scholars long before I came along. For example, *The Dictionary of Non-Classical Mythology*, states, “Allah: Originally applied to the moon...” (p. 7).

Now, did I invent the statement above? No. Does Shabir set forth any citations to back up his denial of *The Dictionary of Non-Classical Mythology*? No.

I refer to “amazing discoveries” revealed by G. Caton Thompson in her 1944 book *The Tombs and Moon Temple of Hureidha*. What did she reveal? She uncovered a temple to the Moon-god in Southern Arabia. This is sufficient to prove that some Arabs were worshipping the Moon-god in pre-Islamic times.

But Shabir cannot rest with this reality. He must drag a red herring across the trail to divert attention from the crucial point. He argues over whether some minor artifacts are Moon-god idols. The question of whether they were idols or not has no logical bearing on my point that an Arabian temple to the Moon-god was dug up by Thompson. The arguments over whether this or that broken statue is an idol does not logically affect this reality. Shabir does not refute or even deny Thompson’s claim that she discovered a Moon-god temple in Arabia.

Shabir complains about my citations from such books as *The Ancient Near East: A New Anthology of Texts and Pictures*, *The Bible As History in Pictures*, and *Archaeology of the Bible*. I use them as illustrations of the vast scope of astral worship in the ancient world. Why does he whine about these citations?

Shabir shows his true ignorance by not understanding that Baal and other ancient deities were astral deities of the moon, sun and stars. He does not understand that the gender of the Moon-God and the Sun-God flipped from male to female at times. For the majority of time, the Moon-god was viewed as a male deity. But sometimes the Moon was viewed as female. The name of the Moon-god changed from culture to culture. The Moon-god could be described as a storm god in some cultures. Thus his argument falls to the ground because Baal was an astral deity connected to the worship of the moon and the sun, depending on by whom, when, and where he was worshipped.

I have successfully documented that the Moon-god had many different names such as Nana, Hubal, Sin, etc. I also showed that he was also called Il or Ilah, which according to Coon and others became Allah.

I must also point out that some scholars refer to Allah as a “name,” while others use the word “title.” The fact that pagan deities were given the title “daughters of Allah” and yet had personal names such as Al-Lat, Al-Uzza and Manat, is not a contradiction.

Why am I bringing this up? Shabir spends much time on the issue of whether I said that Allah was a “name” or a “title.” Why did he waste time on such an irrelevant issue? It was another red herring! Whether or not I used “name” or “title” has no logical bearing on what I am saying about the history of Allah.

Even Shabir must acknowledge that every title is a name!

Another fallacy practiced by Shabir is arguing in a circle. For example, there is a pre-Islamic inscription where Sin had a father. Shabir rejects this as a reference to Allah because, according to Post-Islamic theology, Allah has no father. But he is begging the question at this point.

Shabir goes on to claim that since the Moon-god Sin is said to have a father, this refutes “my” idea that Allah was viewed as the “high” god by pagan Arabs. He then announces, “This again disproves Morey.”

Several comments are in order.

1. Why does he assume that Allah in pre-Islamic times was not viewed as having a father by the pagans? On what grounds does he constantly read Post-Islamic ideas into pre-Islamic inscriptions? If pagan Arabs thought that Allah had a wife and daughters, why wouldn't they think he had a father and a mother as well?

2. That Allah was viewed as a high god or even as the highest god by the Meccan pagans is not “my” idea. This is an observation made by many scholars long before I studied Islam. Shabir's fight is not with me but with the many scholars who hold to that position.

3. That the “high god” had a father does not logically imply that he was not viewed as the high god. Gods and goddesses come and go in ancient mythology.

Another problem in Shabir's booklet is that he argues that since Allah is not listed in some inscriptions along with other names for the Moon-god, this means Allah is not a name for the Moon-god. He concludes, “These inscriptions show that the Moon-god was not Allah.” But he is arguing from silence once again. It is logically irrelevant whether the Arabic word Allah appears or does not appear in some non-Arabic inscription.

In the end, Shabir admits:

“Morey was successful in proving that moon worship was prevalent in South Arabia before Islam.”

Read his words several times. Did you see what he says? After calling me “deceptive” and “dishonest,” in the end he admits that I was right!!!

He also commits the “Tit for Tat” fallacy of arguing that if Islam falls because Allah was originally the Moon-god, then Judaism goes down with it as some liberal scholars feel that Elohim started out as an astral deity. But the issue of whether Elohim started out as the Moon-god has no *logical* bearing on whether Allah began as the Moon-god. He is using Elohim as a red herring to divert attention from Allah.

At the end of his booklet, Shabir reveals his main error:

“Even if he [Morey] was able to show that the North Arabs in Mecca worshipped the Moon-god, and even if he was able to show that they used to call this Moon-god Allah, this still does not prove that Allah in Islam is a Moon-god. To prove or disprove this he needs to show what the Qur’ân teaches about moon worship.

““The Qur’ân, however, clearly refutes moon-worship. The Qur’ân says: Adore not the sun and the moon, but adore Allah who created them...” (Qur’ân 41:37).

This statement reveals that Shabir’s entire booklet is based on a straw man of his own imagination. I have never said that Muslims today consciously worship the Moon. I have refuted this straw man in my booklet, *The Logical Fallacies Made by Muslim Apologists*. Since Shabir is fighting a figment of his imagination, his booklet is thus an exercise in futility.

Conclusion

While I am honored that Shabir has spent so much time attacking me personally, his character assassination is a failure due to his many logical fallacies. We pray for Shabir that he will turn from his false god, false prophet, and false revelation to the one true God, true Prophet, and true revelation. To the Holy Trinity be all the Glory! Amen!