

# **Journal of Biblical Apologetics**

**Number 4, Winter 2003, Volume 7**

**Cover Art as Described by Dr. Robert a. Morey**

Cover shows the rock in the center of the Dome Mosque in Jerusalem, where supposedly Muhammad landed in his dream. Of course, he never actually stood there.

Special thanks to Sam Shamoun for his assistance in gathering together various articles that refute Islam.

## **Islam Part 3: The Qur'an**

Journal of Biblical Apologetics  
No. 4, Winter 2003, Vol. 7  
Copyright © CSP 2003 All rights reserved.

ISBN No. 1-931230-15-3

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: Who Was Muhammad?

By Dr. Robert Morey

The Message of the Qur'an: Worship of Allah Alone?

By Sam Shamoun

Ahmaddiyya in the Balance

By Sam Shamoun

The Quranic Witness to Biblical Authority

By Sam Shamoun

Muhammad, Aisha, Islam and Child Brides

By Silas

Muhammad and the Female Captives

By Silas

Slavery in Islam

By Silas

Does the Quran Teach a Local Flood?

By Sam Shamoun

## Introduction: Who Was Muhammad?

**By Dr. Robert A. Morey**

As pointed out by Ibn Warraq in his landmark work, *The Quest for the Historical Muhammad*, the “Muhammad” of faith and religion is not the Muhammad of fact and history. Modern Muslims have a legendary and mythological view of the character and life of Muhammad that is in direct contradiction with all the historical accounts.

In my debate with the Muslim apologist, Shabir Ally (to obtain a copy, call 1-800-41-TRUTH), he argued that Muhammad was a prophet because, on one occasion, he ordered his entire caravan to stop while a dog gave birth to a litter of puppies. He offered no historical evidence to back up this tender story.

I pointed out that the story, even if it were true, did not prove that Muhammad was a prophet. But, more to the point, the historical record is 100 percent clear that Muhammad ordered that all dogs be killed!

Bukhari vol. IV, no. 540: Narrated Abdullah bin Umar: Allah's Apostle ordered that the dogs should be killed.

The tender story of Muhammad holding up his caravan for a dog goes against his edict that all dogs should be killed. Even today, dogs as pets are forbidden by Islamic law. The first thing the Ayatollah did after taking over Iran was to kill all the dogs in the country!

The example above highlights the problem. The Muhammad of myth and legend has so engrained itself into the mindset of modern Muslims that, even when you quote the Qur'an or the Hadith, they will refuse to listen.

## **A Perfect and Sinless Muhammad**

One classic example is the Muslim doctrine that Muhammad was both perfect and sinless. When I stated in my lecture at the University of Texas that Muhammad was not sinless, the Muslims in the audience went crazy. (To obtain a copy of this video, call 1-800-41-TRUTH.)

Can Muslims produce any passages from the Qur'an or the Hadith that state that Muhammad was sinless? No. I have asked for such passages for over twenty years and no Muslim has been able to find one.

I have quoted passages from the Qur'an (see *Islamic Invasion*) that clearly state that Allah commanded Muhammad to repent of his sins and that Allah had forgiven him of his sins. But they ignore them. When I quoted from the Hadith (Bukhari, vol. I., nos. 19, 711, 781) where Muhammad said that he asked for forgiveness for his sins many times a day, they still would not give up their belief that Muhammad was perfect. They just believe it because, well, they just believe it! Even their own sacred books cannot open their minds to the real Muhammad.

## **The Burden of Proof**

Muslim theologians begin by assuming that their beliefs are true. Thus they assume that they do not have to prove anything. But they have it backwards. They have the burden of proof to demonstrate that Muhammad was a true prophet and not just another false prophet.

There are only four logical possibilities.

1. He was who he claimed to be: a prophet and an apostle.
2. He was a liar: he knew he was not a prophet but for money, sex and power, he claimed to be one.
3. He was mentally ill: if he were alive today he would be institutionalized as criminally insane.
4. He was a mentally ill liar: he had delusions of grandeur and he lied when it suited his purposes.

## **Where's the Beef?**

One obvious question that comes to the mind about Islam is: "Why did the seventh century Arabs accept Muhammad as a prophet?" There were no biblical or pagan prophecies that foretold his coming. He was semi-illiterate and only of average intelligence. Why did they follow him?

The natural blood lust of the seventh century Arab was no doubt stirred by Muhammad's call to kill, rape and plunder in the name of Allah. Their quest for more slaves was no doubt satisfied by Muhammad's proclaiming "open season" on all non-Muslims. Even the forced conversions at Mecca and elsewhere cannot explain everything.

## Pre-Islamic Arabia

The truth is found in pre-Islamic Arabia. The pagan Arabs, like many other barbaric peoples, believed in shamans (*kahin*) or what we call today “witch doctors” or “medicine men.” These “prophets” were revered as having magical powers over the forces of nature and over the spirits that inhabited trees, rocks, ponds and streams.

Muhammad presented himself to the pagan Arabs as a shaman. This is clear from both the Qur’an and the Hadith. As documented in my book, *Islamic Invasion*, Muhammad claimed to control the jinn, i.e., the spirits who lived in the trees, rocks, ponds and streams. In the Hadith, Muhammad is pictured as being in control of the forces of nature, and he could supposedly make it rain or cause a drought by his prayers.

### Proof No. 1: The Seal of Prophethood

The pagan Arabs looked for certain physical defects on the body as a sign of prophethood. They believed that a “seal” of prophethood would be found on the body of someone called to be a shaman or prophet. This “seal” was a large hairy mole on the back of the shaman just below the neck.

Just like a lump of wax seals a letter, the gods would place a lump of flesh on the back of someone called to be a shaman. What the pagan Arabs wanted to know was whether or not Muhammad had a large hairy mole on his back. Did he have the “seal” of prophethood?

In the Qur’an we read these words in Surah 33:40:

Muhammad is not the father of any of your men, but he is the apostle of Allah, and has the Seal of the prophets: and Allah has full knowledge of all things.

What is the identity of this “Seal of the prophets,” and what is its significance? There are two different ways of asking these questions. If you ask a modern Muslim what this “Seal” was all about, the answer would depend on whether you were talking to a Sunni or a Shi’ite Muslim.

Sunni Muslims believe that Muhammad was the last of the prophets, i.e. there will be no prophets after him. (See Yusuf Ali’s comment in his translation of the Qur’an, n. 3731, pg. 1119, as an example of how the Sunnis interpret the significance of the “seal.”)

The Shi’ites believe in a succession of prophets. This is why the Ayatollahs have so much power in Iran. The Sunnis and Shi’ites fight and kill each other over the issue of future prophets.

We are not asking about future prophets. Instead, we are asking a historical question: *What did the early Muslims believe concerning the “Seal of the prophets?”* In fact, we are asking: *“What did the most trusted and revered early Muslim historians and theologians say about this ‘Seal’ of the prophets mentioned the Qur’an?”*

The early Hadith scholars are unanimous in their interpretation of the identity and significance of the “Seal of the prophets” found in Surah 33:40. The greatest of all Hadith scholars, al-Bukhari, tells us:

Narrated As-Sa’ib bin Yazid: I stood behind him (i.e. Muhammad) and saw the seal of Prophethood between his shoulders, and it was like the “Zir-al-Hijla” (meaning the button of a small tent, but some say “egg of a partridge”) (vol. 1:189; 4:741).

The second greatest work on the Hadith is without a doubt the Sahih Muslim Hadith. It records the following:

THE FACT PERTAINING TO THE SEAL OF HIS PROPHETHOOD, ITS CHARACTERISTIC FEATURE, AND ITS LOCATION ON HIS BODY.

Jabir b. Sammura reported: I saw the seal on his back as it were a pigeon's egg. This Hadith has been narrated on the authority of Simal with the same chain of transmitters. Abdullah b. Sarjis reported: I went in after him and saw the Seal of Prophethood between his shoulders on the left side of his shoulder having spots on it like moles (vol. IV, CMLXXIX, p. 1251).

The early Muslim scholars clearly held to the same view of the seal. It was a large hairy mole on Muhammad's back that signified that he was a prophet.

A mole of an unusual size on the Prophet's back that is said to have been the divine seal which, according to the predictions of the Scriptures, marked Muhammad as the "Seal of the Prophets" (Khatimu `n-Nabiyin).

It was the size of the knob of the bridal canopy. Others say it was even the size of a closed fist (Mishkatu `I-Masabih, book III, ch. 7).

It was a piece of flesh, very brilliant in appearance, and according to some traditions it had secretly inscribed within it "Allah is one and has no associate" (Shaikh `Abdu `I-Haqq).

Muhammad said to Abu Ramsa, "Come hither and touch my back." Which he did, drawing his fingers over the prophetic seal, and behold! There was a collection of hairs upon the spot. When Abu Ramsa offered to remove it, Muhammad said, "The Physician thereof is He who placed it where it is" (Muir, new edition, p. 542).

*The Dictionary of Islam* interprets the "Seal of Prophecy" as:

This, says one, was a protuberance on the Prophets back of the size and appearance of a pigeon's egg. It is said to have been the divine seal which, according to the predictions of the Scriptures, marked Muhammad as the last of the Prophets... From the traditions it would seem to have been nothing more than a mole of unusual size (p. 389).

Ali Tabari, one of the most respected early apologists for Islam, interpreted the "seal of the Prophets" as a mole on Muhammad's back. He desperately tried to find some biblical prophecy that would predict such a physical sign. He seized upon [Isaiah 9:6](#) as a prophecy of Muhammad. He took the phrase "... and the government shall be upon his shoulders ..." and interpreted it as a prophecy concerning moles! And he said in this chapter:

"Unto us a child is born and unto us a child is given, whose government is on his shoulder" ([Isaiah 9:6](#)). He means by that "his prophecy is on his shoulder." ... In the Hebrew it is said: "The sign of prophecy is on his shoulder." This is what the Muslims call "the sign of prophecy." This is therefore a clear illusion to the portraiture (i.e. physical characteristics) of the prophet—may Allah bless and save him—and a reference to his face and his moles (N.A. Newman, *Early Christian-Muslim Dialogue* [I.B.R.I.: Hatfield, PA, 1994] p. 628).

We could go on with many more references from early Muslim theologians and historians, but these citations are sufficient to prove the "seal of prophecy" referred to in Surah 33:40 was a large hairy mole on Muhammad's back. While such physical defects are often looked upon by

pagans as a mystical sign, nowhere in the Bible are such things ever considered a sign of inspiration. Indeed, [Lev. 21:16–24](#) excludes from holy service anyone who had a physical defect!

As to [Isaiah 9:6](#), it refers to the Messiah whose title is “Mighty God.” Obviously, the word “government” does not mean a mole. I have not found a single Hebrew scholar who views [Isaiah 9:6](#) as a prophecy of Muhammad.

The pagan Arabs were looking for prophets who had a physical deformity like a large mole or tumor on his back. Muhammad had such a mole. Thus he was a pagan shaman. That is why he won over so many pagan Arabs.

## **Proof No. 2: Epileptic Seizures**

Another religious tradition among pagan Arabs was that someone who fell down and had a seizure was either possessed by the jinn (i.e. demons) or inspired by the gods or God. Once again, brain seizures, like physical deformities, are not a part of the biblical tradition.

Liberals view the suggestions that Muhammad was an epileptic and that his seizures played a major role in pagan Arabs accepting him as a prophet, as “politically incorrect.” But the historical and medical evidence is drawn from the Muslim sacred writings. *The Dictionary of Islam* (p. 393) explains:

He (i.e. Muhammad) suffered from hallucinations of his senses, and to finish his sufferings, he several times contemplated suicide by throwing down from a precipice. His friends were alarmed at his state of mind. Some considered it as eccentricities of a poetical genius; others thought that he was a *kahin*, or soothsayer; but the majority took a less charitable view (See Surah LXIX:40, XX:5), and declared that he was insane; and, as madness and melancholy are ascribed to supernatural influence in the East, they said that he was in the power of Satan and his agents, the jinn. They called in exorcists; and he himself doubted the soundness of his mind. “I hear a sound,” he said to his wife, “and I see a light. I am afraid there are jinn in me.” And on another occasion he said, “I am afraid that I am a *kahin*.”

According to unimpeachably authentic hadiths found in Bukhari, Muhammad would hear ringing in his ears; his heart would beat rapidly; his face turn red; his breathing would become labored; he would fall to the ground or lie down; he would shake; his eyes would open wide; his lips tremble; spit drool from the corners of his mouth; he would sweat profusely; he saw and heard things no one else ever saw or heard; he would sometimes make a snoring noise like that of a camel; and he would be covered with a sheet (vol. I, nos. 1, 2, 3, 4; vol. II, chapter 16 (pg. 354), 544; vol. III, nos. 17, 829; vol. IV, nos. 95, 438, 458, 461; vol. V, nos. 170, 462, 618, 659; vol. VI, nos. 447, 448, 468, 478, 481, 508).

In *McClintock and Strong’s Encyclopedia* (vol. 6, pg. 406), we read the following:

Muhammad was endowed with a nervous constitution and a lively imagination. It was not at all unnatural for him to come after a time to regard himself as actually called of God to build up his people in a new faith.

Muhammad, as we gather from the oldest and most trustworthy narratives, was an epileptic, and as such, was considered to be possessed of evil spirits. At first, he believed the sayings, but gradually he came to the conclusion, confirmed by his friends, that demons had no power over so pure and pious a man as he was, and he conceived the idea

that he was not controlled by evil spirits, but that he was visited by angels whom he, disposed to hallucinations, a vision, an audition, afflicted with the morbid state of the body and mind, saw in dreams. Or even while awake, he conceived he saw. What seemed to him good and true after such epileptic attacks, he esteemed revelation in which he, at least in the first stage of his pathetic course, firmly believed and which imparted to his pensive, variable character, the necessary courage and endurance to brave all mortifications and perils.

Whenever any scholar brings up the evidence that proves that Muhammad had the classic symptoms of mental illness, the liberals object that to say this is insensitive. But the evidence, like a granite rock, is unmoved by crying and hand wringing. This medical evidence has been gathered and explained by modern science and psychiatry.

One recent example is the book *Life Alert*, (Winepress Publishing 2002), by Dr. Dede Korkut, M.D. His analysis of the medical evidence cannot be overthrown simply because the feelings of Muslims are offended. He certifies that Muhammad suffered from two neurological deficiencies: hydrocephalus and epilepsy.

### **Conclusion**

The claim that Muhammad was a prophet like the biblical prophets falls to the ground under the weight of its own erroneous “proofs,” such as a black mole. The burden is clearly on the Muslims to produce some intellectually respectable proof that Muhammad was anything other than a mentally ill and dangerous sociopath.

## **The Message of the Quran: Worship of Allah Alone? By Sam Shamoun**

The Quaran states

“Say: ‘O People of the Book! come to common terms as between us and you: That we worship none but Allah; that we associate no partners with him; that we erect not, from among ourselves, Lords and patrons other than Allah.’ If then they turn back, say ye: ‘Bear witness that we (at least) are Muslims (bowing to Allah’s Will)’ ”S. 3:64.

“It is not (possible) that a man, to whom is given the Book, and Wisdom, and the Prophetic Office, should say to people: ‘Be ye my worshippers rather than Allah’s’: On the contrary (he would say) ‘Be ye worshippers of Him (Who is truly the Cherisher of all): For ye have taught the Book and ye have studied it earnestly.’ Nor would he instruct you to take angels and prophets for Lords and patrons. What! would he bid you to unbelief after ye have bowed your will (to Allah in Islam)?” S 3:79–80.

“The Jews call Uzair a son of Allah, and the Christians call Christ the son of Allah. That is a saying from their mouth; (in this) they but imitate what the unbelievers of old used to say. Allah’s curse be on them: how they are deluded away from the Truth! They take their priests and their anchorites to be their lords beside Allah, and (they take as their Lord) Christ the son of Mary; yet they were commanded to worship but One God: there is

no god but He. Praise and glory to Him: (Far is He) from having the partners they associate (with Him)” S. 9:30–31.

“Nor did the People of the Book make schisms, until after there came to them Clear Evidence. And they have been commanded no more than this: to worship Allah, offering Him sincere devotion, being true (in faith); to establish regular prayer; and to give Zakat; and that is the Religion Right and Straight” S. 98:4–5.

In fact, associating partners with Allah is to commit the unforgivable sin:

“Allah forgiveth not that partners should be set up with Him; but He forgiveth anything else, to whom He pleaseth; to set up partners with Allah is to devise a sin most heinous indeed” S. 4:48.

“Allah forgiveth not (the sin of) joining other gods with Him; but He forgiveth whom He pleaseth other sins than this: one who joins other gods with Allah, hath strayed far, far away (from the right)” S. 4:116.

Yet there are several instances in the Quran where men and angels are addressed as Lord and receive worship:

“There did Zakariya PRAY TO HIS LORD: ‘O MY LORD! Grant unto me from Thee a progeny that is pure: for Thou art He that heareth prayer!’ While he was standing in prayer in the chamber, THE ANGELS CALLED UNTO HIM: ‘Allah doth give thee glad tidings of Yahy—(John) witnessing the truth of a Word from Allah, and (be besides) noble, chaste, and a prophet,—of the (goodly) company of the righteous.’ HE SAID ‘O MY LORD! How shall I have a son, seeing I am very old, and my wife is barren?’ ‘Thus,’ was the answer, ‘Doth Allah accomplish what He willeth.’ HE SAID: ‘O MY LORD! Give me a Sign!’ ‘Thy Sign,’ was the answer, ‘Shall be that thou shalt speak to no man for three days but with signals. Then celebrate the praises of thy Lord again and again, and glorify Him in the evening and in the morning’ ” S. 3:38–41.

Zechariah is said to have prayed to his Lord for a child, with the angels responding to his request. Yet when asking a question Zechariah addresses the speaker(s) as his Lord!

Continuing further in the same chapter, we are told that a group of angels announced Jesus’ birth to Mary:

“Behold! THE ANGELS SAID: ‘O Mary! Allah hath chosen thee and purified thee—chosen thee above the women of all nations. O Mary! worship thy Lord devoutly: Prostrate thyself, and bow down (in prayer) with those who bow down.’ This is part of the tidings of the things unseen, which We reveal unto thee (O Messenger) by inspiration: Thou wast not with them when they cast lots with pens (or arrows), as to which of them should be charged with the care of Mary: Nor wast thou with them when they disputed (the point). Behold! THE ANGELS SAID: ‘O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honor in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah. He shall speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. And he shall be (of the company) of the righteous.’ She said: ‘O MY LORD! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?’ HE SAID: ‘Even so; Allah createth what He willeth: When He hath decreed a plan, He but saith to it, “Be,” and it is!’ ” S. 3:42–47.



This passage claims that a group of angels addressed Mary, with one specific angel (i.e., “He said”) responding to her question. In the parallel passage regarding Jesus’ birth annunciation, the One addressing Mary is said to be the Spirit of God:

“Relate in the Book (the story of) Mary, when she withdrew from her family to a place in the East. She placed a screen (to screen herself) from them; then We sent her Our Spirit (RUH), and he appeared before her as a man in all respects. She said: ‘I seek refuge from thee to (Allah) Most Gracious: (come not near) if thou dost fear Allah.’ HE SAID: ‘Nay, I AM ONLY A MESSANGER FROM THY LORD, (to announce) to thee the gift of a pure son. She said: ‘How shall I have a son, seeing that no man has touched me, and I am not unchaste?’” HE SAID: ‘So (it will be): THY LORD SAITH, “That is easy for Me: and (We wish) to appoint him as a Sign unto men and a Mercy from Us.” It is a matter (so) decreed’ ” S. 19:16–21.

Muslims claim that this Spirit was the angel Gabriel. If this is true this implies that both Zechariah and Mary committed the sin of associating partners with God since they dared to address an angel as their Lord! In fact, the phrase Our Spirit is used elsewhere in reference to One having divine qualities:

“Behold! thy Lord said to the angels: ‘I am about to create man, from sounding clay from mud molded into shape; When I have fashioned him (in due proportion) and breathed into him of My spirit, fall ye down in obeisance unto him’ ” S. 15:28–29.

“He Who created all things in the best, and He began the creation of man from clay, And made his progeny from a quintessence of despised fluid: But He fashioned him in due proportion, and breathed into him of His spirit. And He gave you (the faculties of) hearing and sight and understanding: little thanks do ye give!” S. 32:7–9.

“Behold, thy Lord said to the angels: ‘I am about to create man from clay: When I have fashioned him and breathed into him of My spirit, fall ye down in obeisance unto him’ ” S. 38:71–72.

These passages indicate that after fashioning man, God presumably gave him life by breathing his Spirit into him, echoing [Genesis 2:7](#). This implies that at least in these contexts the Spirit is God’s life-giving Agent. This being the case, how can the Spirit be Gabriel without this implying that God used a finite creature to assist him in the creation of man?

Continuing further, we are told elsewhere that Mary conceived Jesus by God’s Spirit:

“And (remember) her who guarded her chastity: We breathed into her of *Our spirit*, and We made her and her son a sign for all peoples” S. 21:91.

“And Mary the daughter of Īmrām, who guarded her chastity; and We breathed into it of *Our spirit*; and she testified to the truth of the words of her Lord and of His Revelations, and was one of the devout (servants)” S. 66:12.

According to certain Muslim commentators, the Spirit that was used to breathe into Mary was actually the angel Gabriel. Mahmoud M. Ayub mentions several Muslim commentaries regarding the preceding passages:

“... Ibn Kathir interprets the phrase ‘guarded well her generative organ’ to mean: ‘safeguarded and protected it. Guarding well IHSAN signifies chastity and high birth.’ He comments on the phrase, ‘and thus We breathed into it of our spirit’ thus ‘that is,

through the angel Gabriel.’ This is because God sent HIM TO HER, AND HE TOOK FOR HER THE FORM OF A MAN OF GOOD STATURE (S. 19:17). God commanded HIM to breathe into the breast of her chemise. HIS BREATH WENT DOWN AND PENETRATED HER GENERATIVE ORGAN, AND THUS CAUSED HER TO CONCEIVE JESUS. ...” (*Christian-Muslim Encounters*, ed. Yvonne Yazbeck Haddad & Wadi Z. Haddad [University Press of Florida, 1995], p. 67; capital emphasis ours)

And:

“Abu Ja’far al-Tusi, the jurist doctor of the Shi’i community, as well as his well known disciple al-Tabarsi, read the words, ‘We breathed INTO IT’ literally. Al-Tusi says: ‘It has been held THAT GABRIEL BREATHED INTO MARY’S GENERATIVE ORGAN then God created Christ in it’ .....” (Ibid., p. 68; capital emphasis ours).

The following is Ibn Kathir’s commentary on S. 66:12, noting that Jibril is the Arabic pronunciation of Gabriel:

“And Maryam, the daughter of ’Imran who guarded her chastity (PRIVATE PART) meaning who protected and purified her honor, by being chaste and free of immorality,

“And We breathed INTO IT (PRIVATE PART) through Our Ruh, meaning, THROUGH THE ANGEL JIBRIL. Allah sent the angel Jibril to Maryam, and he came to her in the shape of a man in every respect. Allah commanded HIM TO BLOW INTO A GAP OF HER GARMENT and that BREATH went into her womb through her private part; THIS IS HOW’ ISA WAS CONCEIVED. This is why Allah said here,

“And We breathed INTO IT through Our Ruh, and she testified to the truth of her Lord’s Kalimat, and His Kutub, meaning His decree and His legislation.” (Tafsir Ibn Kathir—Abridged, Volume 10, Surat At-Tagabun to the end of the Qur’an, abridged by a group of scholars under the supervision of Shaykh Safiur Rahman Al-Mubarakpuri [Darussalam Publishers & Distributors, Riyadh, Houston, New York, London, Lahore; September 2000], pp. 75–76; capital emphasis ours).

Finally, al-Tabari’s comments on Mary’s conception:

“... She entered the cave, and found Gabriel there—God made him appear to her as a shapely human—and he said to her, ‘O Mary, God has sent me to you to give you a boy most pure.’ At this she exclaimed, ‘I take refuge in the All Merciful from you, if you fear God!’ (She had thought that he was a man, a mortal.) But he said, ‘I am but a messenger come from your Lord.’ She then said, ‘How shall I, whom no mortal has touched, have a son; neither have I been unchaste?’ He replied, ‘Even so. The Lord has said, “Easy is that for Me, and We may appoint him a sign unto men and a mercy from Us; it is a thing decreed.”’

“That is, God has decreed that it is so. When the angel spoke thus, she submitted to the divine decree, and he breathed into HER BOSOM. Then he left her, and she filled her pitcher.

“According to Muhammad b. Sahl b. ’Askar al-Bukhari-Isma’il b. ’Abd alKarim-’Abd al-Samad b. Ma’qil, the son of the brother of Wahb-Wahb: When God sent Gabriel to Mary, he appeared to her as a shapely man. She then said, ‘I take refuge in the All Merciful from you, if you fear God!’ Then he breathed into the opening of her garment, THE BREATH REACHED HER WOMB, and she conceived Jesus...” (*The*

*History of al-Tabari, Volume IV, The Ancient Kingdoms*, trans. Moshe Perlmann [State University of New York Press, Albany, 1987], pp. 112–113; and capital emphasis ours). And:

“... ‘Then We sent unto her Our Spirit [that is, the angel Gabriel] that presented himself to her a man without fault’ ...

“She wore a gown. He held her sleeves and breathed into the opening of her garment which was split in front. The breath entered her breast, and she conceived ...” (Ibid., p. 119; bold emphasis ours).

The claim that Gabriel breathed into Mary would logically make Gabriel the speaker in S. 21:91 and 66:12. According to these passages the One speaking states that he will breathe his Spirit into Mary. Nowhere do the passages even hint to someone else being used to impregnate Mary. Seeing that Muslims claim that the Quran is the word of Allah, implying that Allah is the One speaking here, logically makes Gabriel Allah!

This also means that Gabriel has a Spirit that he uses to create and impart life. This would therefore make Gabriel the Creator, since Muslims claim that Allah was the one who created Jesus by breathing his Spirit into Mary’s womb! Otherwise the text would imply that Allah actually breathed Gabriel into both Mary and Adam since, as Muslims claim, the Spirit of Allah is actually Gabriel.

Furthermore, seeing that Muslims do not equate Gabriel with Allah inevitably leads to more than one Creator. Yet the Quran clearly states that there is no other Creator besides Allah:

“It is He Who created you from a single person, and made his mate of like nature, in order that he might dwell with her (in love). When they are united, she bears a light burden and carries it about (unnoticed). When she grows heavy, they both pray to Allah their Lord, (saying): ‘If Thou givest us a goodly child, we vow we shall (ever) be grateful.’ But when He giveth them a goodly child, they ascribe to others a share in the gift they have received: but Allah is exalted high above the partners they ascribe to Him. Do they indeed ascribe to Him as partners things that can create nothing, but are themselves created?” S. 7:189–191.

“Those whom they invoke besides Allah create nothing and are themselves created” S. 16:20.

“Yet have they taken, besides him, gods that can create nothing but are themselves created; that have no control of hurt or good to themselves; nor can they control death nor life nor resurrection” S. 25:3.

“O men! Remember the grace of Allah unto you! Is there a Creator, other than Allah, to give you sustenance from heaven or earth? There is no god but He: how then are ye perverted?” S. 35:3.

“He created you (all) from a single person: then created, of like nature, his mate; and He sent down for you eight head of cattle in pairs: He creates you, in the wombs of your mothers, in stages, one after another, in three veils of darkness. Such is Allah, your Lord and Cherisher: to Him belongs (all) dominion. There is no god but He: then how are ye turned away (from your true Lord)?” S. 39:6.

Therefore, the only plausible explanation is that the Spirit of Allah is not the angel Gabriel. Yet this view would leave us with an irreconcilable contradiction. According to S. 3:42–48 it was a group of angels that appeared to Mary, whereas in S. 19:16–21 it isn’t a group of angels but God’s Spirit that announced the Messiah’s birth.

In order to avoid attributing a contradiction to the Quran, some Muslims claim that the two passages refer to two different episodes. For example, some Muslims like Shabir Ally claim that S. 3:42–48 refers to the time when Mary was told that she would eventually conceive a child, whereas in S. 19:16–21 the Spirit was sent to inform her that the time of conception had arrived.

The only problem with this view is that it would imply that Mary disbelieved God’s ability to cause a supernatural birth on two separate occasions. Compare the following:

“Behold! The angels said: ‘O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honor in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest to Allah. He shall speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. And he shall be (of the company) of the righteous.’ ” She said: ‘O my Lord! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?’ He said: ‘Even so; Allah createth what He willeth: When He hath decreed a plan, He but saith to it, ‘Be,’ and it is!’ ” S. 3:45–47.

And:

“He said: ‘Nay, I am only a messenger from thy Lord, (to announce) to thee the gift of a pure son.’ She said: ‘How shall I have a son, seeing that no man has touched me, and I am not unchaste?’ He said: ‘So (it will be): thy Lord saith, “That is easy for Me: and (We wish) to appoint him as a Sign unto men and a Mercy from Us.” It is a matter (so) decreed’ ” S. 19:19–21.

Hence, either Muslims must accuse Mary of twice questioning the ability of Allah in causing a supernatural conception to take place without the aid of a man. This, in spite of the fact that the angels explicitly told her the first time that Allah is able to do all that he wills! Or Muslims must face up to the music and admit that the Quran contains a bona fide contradiction.

Returning to our original point regarding the problem of addressing others besides Allah as Lord, here is Mahmoud M. Ayoub’s commentary on S. 3:40. In light of what Ayoub will shortly say one readily sees the difficulty Muslims faced in trying to deal with the fact that others besides Allah are addressed as Lord:

“Two issues have concerned commentators in this verse. The first is the question of whether it is God or Gabriel whom Zechariah addresses as Lord. The second is how Zechariah, as a prophet, could have any doubt in God’s power to cause an old, barren woman to bear a child? ...

“Ibn Kathir does not raise the question of Zechariah’s doubt. He rather interprets Zechariah’s query as expressing his wonderment at God’s power. He writes, ‘When Zechariah became certain of the happy news, he began to marvel at the possibility of his having a child in such advanced age.’ Ibn Kathir assumes that Zechariah’s dialogue was with an angel, not with God ...

“Qurtubi begins by relating on the authority of al-Kalbi that the word ‘Lord’ in this verse refers to Gabriel. He says, ‘Zechariah said to Gabriel “my lord,” ’ meaning ‘my master’ ...

“Razi begins with the question of Zechariah’s dialogue and whether it was with God or with Gabriel. The question is important because it concerns the theological debate about God’s transcendence and the problem of anthropomorphism. If God hears and speaks in a manner familiar to human beings, then the question arises as to whether God has similar organs of hearing and speech. Razi argues that it is equally possible that Zechariah was addressing either God or the angel in this verse. He presents two

explanations which he attributes to the MUFASSIRUN, that is, other commentators. The first is: ‘When the angels called to Zechariah and gave him the good news, he wondered and turned to God for reassurance. Zechariah was actually addressing the angel Gabriel, and not God. The invocation ‘my lord’ is here addressed to a superior or master and not to God.’ (Ayoub, *The Qur’an and Its Interpreters, Volume II, The House of ’Imran* [State University of New York Press, Albany 1992], pp. 112, 113).

The problem with asserting that the prophet is actually addressing Allah is that instead of Allah responding, it is either the angel(s) or the Spirit that answers. When responding to the questions, both the angel(s) and the Spirit clearly make a distinction between their words and the words of Allah:

“Behold! THE ANGELS SAID: ‘O Mary! Allah giveth thee glad tidings of a Word from Him: his name will be Christ Jesus, the son of Mary, held in honor in this world and the Hereafter and of (the company of) those nearest TO ALLAH. He shall speak to the people in childhood and in maturity. And he shall be (of the company) of the righteous.’ She said: ‘O my Lord! How shall I have a son when no man hath touched me?’ HE SAID: ‘Even so; ALLAH createth what HE willeth: When HE hath decreed a plan, HE but saith to it, “Be,” and it is! And ALLAH will teach him the Book and Wisdom, the Torah and the Gospel’ ” S. 3:45–48.

“She said: ‘How shall I have a son, seeing that no man has touched me, and I am not unchaste?’ HE SAID: ‘So (it will be): THY LORD SAITH, “That is easy for Me: and (We wish) to appoint him as a Sign unto men and a Mercy from Us.” It is a matter (so) decreed’ ” S. 19:20–21.

Furthermore, the assertion that Gabriel is called Lord in the sense of being one’s master or superior does not solve the problem for the Muslim. Neither the Quran nor the Hadiths allow for even this type of respect to be given to anyone besides Allah:

“They have taken as lords beside Allah their rabbis and their monks and the Messiah son of Mary, when they were bidden to worship only One Allah. There is no Allah save Him. Be He Glorified from all that they ascribe as partner (unto Him)!” S. 9:31 Pickthall.

The only sense in which Jews and Christians would ever consider rabbis or monks as Lords would be in the sense of a superior or a master. They would have never viewed them as Lords in the same way they viewed God.

This is supported by the following Muslim tradition, a hadith quoted by Ibn Kathir regarding the meaning of S. 9:31:

“They took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allah, and the Messiah, son of Maryam” [9:31].

“Imam Ahmad, At-Tirmidhi and Ibn Jarir At-Tabari recorded a Hadith via several chains of narration, from ’Adi bin Hatim, may Allah be pleased with him, who became a Christian during the time of Jahiliyyah. When the call of the Messenger of Allah reached his area, ‘Adi ran away to Ash-Sham, and his sister and several of his people were captured. The Messenger of Allah freed his sister and gave her gifts. So she went to her brother and encouraged him to become Muslim and to go to the Messenger of Allah. ‘Adi, who was one of the chiefs of his people (the tribe of Tai’) and whose father, Hatim At-Ta’I, was known for his generosity, went to Al-Madinah. When the people announced

his arrival, ‘Adi went to the Messenger of Allah wearing a silver cross around his neck. The Messenger of Allah recited this Ayah;

“They took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allah.

“ ‘Adi commented, I said, ‘They did not worship them.’ ” The Prophet said,

“((Yes they did. They (rabbis and monks) prohibited the allowed for them (Christians and Jews) and allowed the prohibited, and they obeyed them. This is how they worshipped them.)) ...

“They took their rabbis and their monks to be their lords besides Allah....

“that the Christians and Jews obeyed their monks and rabbis in whatever they allowed or prohibited for them....” (*Tafsir Ibn Kathir, Abridged, Volume 4, Surat Al-A’raf to the end of Surah Yunus*, May 2000, pp. 409–410).

Therefore, to even address either the angel(s) or the Spirit as one’s superior or master is unacceptable within the Monotheism (TAUHID) taught by Muhammad and his Companions. In fact, addressing anyone besides Allah as one’s Lord in prayer is a violation of the three aspects of Islamic Monotheism: *Tauhid-al-Rububiyyah*, *Tauhid-al-Uluhiyyah*, and *Tauhid-al-Asma’ was-Sifat*.

Dr. Muhammad Taqi-ud-Din Al-Hilali and Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan define the meaning behind each of the three aspects:

(A) Oneness of the Lordship of Allah; *Tauhid-al-Rububiyyah*: To believe there is only one Lord for all the universe, Who is the Creator, Organizer, Planner, Sustainer, and the Giver of security, etc., and that is Allah.

(B) Oneness of the worship of Allah; TAUHID-ULUHIYYAH: To believe that none has the right to be worshiped (e.g., praying, invoking, asking for help from the unseen, swearing, offering sacrifice, giving charity, fasting, pilgrimage) but Allah.

(C) Oneness of the Names and Qualities of Allah: TAUHID AL-ASMA’ WAS-SIFAT: To believe that:

We must not name or qualify Allah with what He or His messenger ... has named or qualified Him;

None can be named or qualified with the Names and Qualifications of Allah; e.g. AL-KARIM....

(*Translation of the Meanings of The Noble Qur’an, In the English Language, A Summarized Version of At-Tabari, Al-Qurtubi and Ibn Kathir with comments from Sahih Al-Bukhari*, by Dr. Muhammad Taqi-ud-Din Al-Hilali, Ph.D. and Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan [King Fahd Complex for the Printing of The Holy Qur’an, Madinah K.S.A.], Appendix II, p. 892).

Seeing that both Zechariah and Mary addressed someone other than Allah as Lord when asking about the possibility of having a child implies that both parties violated Muhammad’s conception of Tauhid.

Another passage in which Gabriel is actually given divine status includes:

“By the Star when it goes down,—Your Companion is neither astray nor being misled. Nor does he say (ought) 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 CONVEY THE INSPIRATION TO HIS SERVANT—(conveyed) what He (meant) to convey” S. 53:1–10.

This passage clearly states that Muhammad saw someone whom Muslims claim was the Angel Gabriel. Abdullah Yusuf Ali on S. 53:5 notes:

“... This is referred by the Commentators to the angel Gabriel, through whom the inspiration came....” (Ali, *The Holy Qur’an, Translation and Commentary*, p. 1443, f. 5087).

Ibn Kathir states:

“The Trustworthy Angel brought Allah’s Revelation to the Trustworthy Messenger.

“Allah the Exalted states that the Message His servant and Messenger Muhammad brought to his people was taught to him by,

“(mighty in power), he is Jibril, peace be upon” (*Tafsir Ibn Kathir, Abridged, Volume 9, Surat Al-Jathiyah to the end of Surat Al-Munafiqun*, September 2000, p. 308).

Yet this interpretation will not work without this making Gabriel the god of Muhammad. The passage clearly states that the person that appeared to Muhammad was Muhammad’s sovereign as indicated by the last part of the sentence, “SO DID HE CONVEY THE INSPIRATION TO HIS SERVANT.” Seeing that Muslims insist that the being that appeared to Muhammad was Gabriel implies that Muhammad is a slave of Gabriel. There is simply no way of avoiding this inescapable conclusion.

Therefore, Muslims must now accept the fact that it was actually Allah who appeared to Muhammad, which would then force them to accept the idea of Allah appearing visibly. If Muslims still insist that it was Gabriel who appeared then they must also accept that Gabriel and/or Muhammad committed the sin of associating partners with Allah.

The problem that this passage presents becomes evident from Ibn Kathir’s comments:

“And was at a distance of two bow lengths or less. So (Allah) revealed to His servant whatever He revealed.

“Zirr said, ‘Abdullah narrated to us that Muhammad saw Jibril having six hundred wings.’

“SO HE REVEALED TO HIS SERVANT WHATEVER HE REVEALED means, Jibril conveyed to Allah’s servant Muhammad whatever he conveyed. OR, the meaning here could be: Allah revealed to His servant Muhammad whatever He revealed through Jibril. Both meanings are correct....” (Ibid., pp. 311–312; capital emphasis ours).

The reader will notice that the word Allah is inserted in parentheses to presumably avoid the ambiguity of the text. This is despite the fact that the word does not appear in the Arabic original, as indicated by its second occurrence within Kathir’s citation! It becomes obvious why this would be done, namely to avoid the implication that Muhammad is Gabriel’s servant or that Allah appeared in visible form. The Muslims must safeguard from either interpretation if they are to maintain their belief in the absolute transcendence of Allah and/or the pure devotion that is to be given to him alone.

Islamicist FE. Peters notes:

“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 it 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 there-by prompted him and showed to him His signs, the second vision is referred to only in briefing 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)” (Peters, *Muhammad and the Origins of Islam* [State University of New York Press, Albany 1994], pp. 142–143).

Hence, no matter from what angle Muslims look at this passage they are beset with problems either way.

## **On the Worship of Others Besides Allah**

Both the Quran and Muslim sources furnish examples of others besides Allah receiving worship. The first example is Adam:

“And when We said unto the angels: Prostrate yourselves before Adam, they fell prostrate, all save Iblis. He demurred through pride, and so became a disbeliever” S. 2:34.

“And We created you, then fashioned you, then told the angels: Fall ye prostrate before Adam! And they fell prostrate, all save Iblis, who was not of those who make prostration. He said: What hindered thee that thou didst not fall prostrate when I bade thee? (Iblis) said: I am better than him. Thou createdst me of fire while him Thou didst create of mud. He said: Then go down hence! It is not for thee to show pride here, so go forth! Lo! thou art of those degraded” S. 7:11–13.

“And (remember) when thy Lord said unto the angels: Lo! I am creating a mortal out of potter’s clay of black mud altered, So, when I have made him and have breathed into



him of My Spirit, do ye fall down, prostrating yourselves unto him. So the angels fell prostrate, all of them together Save Iblis. He refused to be among the prostrate. He said: O Iblis! What aileth thee that thou art not among the prostrate? He said: I am not one to prostrate myself unto a mortal whom Thou hast created out of potter's clay of black mud altered!" S. 15:28–33.

"And when We said unto the angels: Fall down prostrate before Adam and they fell prostrate all save Iblis, he said: Shall I fall prostrate before that which Thou hast created of clay?" S. 17:61.

"And when We said unto the angels: Fall prostrate before Adam, they fell prostrate (all) save Iblis; he refused." S. 20:116.

All these verses state that it was Allah who commanded the angels to prostrate before Adam. The word signifying prostration is only used in relation to a believer prostrating before God in adoration and worship. Abdiyah Akbar Abdul Haqq comments on S. 7:12:

"The story, as a whole, involves a difficult issue. Why did God order all His angels to fall prostrate before a being inferior to them in nature? The manner of prostration is reserved for the worship of God. It was not proper, therefore, to employ it in showing respect to creatures, including Adam. Realizing the problem involved in the use of the term 'Sajda' (prostration) in the passage under discussion, Jalal al-Din made the following observation:

"The original word signifies properly, to prostrate one self till the forehead touches the ground, which is the humblest posture of adoration and strictly due to God only; but it is sometimes used to express civil worship or homage which may be paid to creatures" (W.T. Wherry, *A Comprehensive Commentary on the Quran*, Vol. I, p. 301).

"Despite Jalal al-Din's apology, strictly speaking, 'Sajda' (prostration) is due only to God. That is why the commentator did not support adequately the exception he has made to the rule, from the Koran. The 'Wahhabis,' who consider themselves strict Muslims and true Monotheists, forbid worship of any creature. God alone deserves to be worshipped, according to them. They would not allow 'Sajda' to a civil authority—the kind of prostration which is meant to be used in prayers to God.... Moreover, it is true that strictly speaking prostration before any being other than God is a practice against monotheism and spirit of the Koran, as Wahhabis would say" (Haqq, *Sharing Your Faith With a Muslim* [Bethany House Publishers, Minneapolis, MN 1980], p. 78).

In fact, not only do we find Adam receiving sajda but Joseph as well:

"Then when they entered the presence of Joseph, he provided a home for his parents with himself, and said: 'Enter ye Egypt (all) in safety if it please Allah.' And he raised his parents high on the throne, and they fell down in prostration, (all) before him (wa kharruu lahuu sujjadaa). He said: 'O my father! this is the fulfillment of my vision of old! Allah hath made it come true! He was indeed good to me when He took me out of prison and brought you (all here) out of the desert, (even) after Satan had sown enmity between me and my brothers. Verily my Lord is Gracious to whom He wills, for verily He is full of knowledge and wisdom" S. 12:99–100.

The other example is Jesus. The Quran announces the birth of John the Baptist as a messenger sent to prepare the way for Jesus Christ:

“And the angels called to him (Zechariah) while he was standing at prayer in the sanctuary, ‘God gives you glad tidings of John, confirming a word of God, a master, chaste man and a prophet, one of the righteous’ ” S. 3:39 Mahmoud’s Translation.

Islamic scholars almost unanimously hold that the Word of God here, which John came to confirm, is Jesus Christ. Mahmoud Ayoub citing Muslim Tabarsi states:

“Tabarsi argues that John was obligated *by God* to be a witness to the fact that Jesus was in truth the word of God and His Spirit” (*Ayoub, The Qur’an and Its Interpreters, Volume II*, p. 109).

Muslim exegete al-Zamakshari substantiates this by saying:

“It is related that John *was the first to believe in Jesus*. Jesus was called *Word*... because he came to being only by God’s word. It was His saying, ‘KUNN’ (be), and no other cause” (Ibid, p. 108; italic emphasis ours).

The interesting part of all of this is that Muslim commentators claim that John actually worshiped Jesus while both were still in their mothers’ wombs! For instance, Al-Qurtubi mentions Elizabeth’s visitation (called Mary’s sister) shortly after both women had conceived:

“The sister visited Mary and said, ‘O Mary, do you perceive that I am with child?’ Mary answered, ‘Do you see that I am also with child?’ Her sister went on, ‘*I feel the child in my womb bowing down to the child in your womb.*’ ”

Qurtubi continues:

“It is reported that she felt the fetus in her womb bow down with its head turned toward Mary’s womb” (*Ayoub*, p. 108).

Al-Tabari concurs:

“She [Sam-Mary] came to her sister who was then pregnant and to whom the birth of the Baptist had been announced. When the two met, the Baptist’s mother felt that her child was bowing within her in recognition of Jesus...” (*History of Al-Tabari, Volume IV*, p. 114).

And:

“... Her sister, the wife of Zechariah, came to visit her at night. When Mary opened the door for her, the sister clung to her. The wife of Zechariah said, ‘Oh Mary, do you know I am with child?’ Mary replied, ‘Do you know, that I too am with child?’ Zechariah’s wife then said, ‘I felt that the child in me was bowing to the child in you,’ as it is written, ‘confirming the Word of God’ ” (Ibid., p. 119).

Muhammad had warned his followers not to praise him as Christians praise Jesus:

“Narrated ’Umar:

“I heard the Prophet saying, ‘Do not exaggerate in praising me as the Christians praised the son of Mary, for I am only a Slave. So, call me the Slave of Allah and His Apostle’” (*Sahih Bukhari, Volume 4, Book 55, Number 654*).

In light of the preceding considerations, what will Muslims do with the fact that John not only bowed in praise to Jesus but did so while both were still in the womb? What will Muslims do with Allah commanding angels to bow down to Adam?

It will not do to say that the homage given to these individuals is not the same kind of homage one gives to God. If this is the case, then why is this practice deemed unacceptable for Muslims? Why did Muhammad forbid his followers from showing this kind of reverence to others who are worthy to receive it?

Furthermore, both Adam and Joseph received sajda, the prostration that God alone is supposed to receive. This act was in direct violation of Tauhid-al-Uluhiyyah. Yet, in the case of Adam, the one who actually commanded the angels to violate this concept was Allah himself!

### Further Examples of Plurality of Gods

As we had indicated earlier, Muslims claim that the Quran is the pure word of Allah, containing nothing but the speech of Allah alone. One will not find the words of either humans or angels mixed in with the words of Allah. Commenting on the different types of material found in the Holy Bible, Muslim polemicist Ahmad Deedat contrasts that with the Quran:

You do not have to hunt for examples of these different types of evidences in the Bible. The following quotations will make the position crystal clear:

The FIRST Type:

(a) “*I* will raise them up a prophet ... and *I* will put my words in ... and he shall speak unto them all that *I* shall command him” (Deuteronomy 18:18).

(b) “*I* even, *I* am the Lord, and beside *me* there is no saviour” (Isaiah 43:11).

(c) “Look unto *me*, and be ye saved, all the end of the earth: for *I* am God, and there is none else” (Isaiah 45:22).

Note the first person pronoun singular (highlighted in italics) in the above references, and without any difficulty you will agree that the statements seem to have the sound of being GOD’S WORD.

The SECOND Type:

(a) “*Jesus* cried with a loud voice, saying ELI, ELI, LAMA SABACHTANI? ...” (Matthew 27:46).

(b) “And *Jesus* answered him, The first of all the commandments is, *Hear, O Israel; the Lord our God is one Lord*” (Mark 12:29).

(c) “And *Jesus* said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is God” (Mark 10:18).

Even a child will be able to affirm that: Jesus “cried,” Jesus “answered” and Jesus “said” are the words of the one to whom they are attributed, i.e. the WORDS OF A PROPHET OF GOD.

The THIRD Type:

“And seeing a fig tree afar off having leaves, *he*, (JESUS) came, if haply *he* (JESUS) might find anything thereon: and when he (JESUS) came *to it*, (Jesus) found nothing but leaves...” (Mark 11:13)

The bulk of the Bible is a witnessing of this THIRD kind. These are the words of a third person. Note the italicized pronouns. They are not the Words of God or of His prophet, but the WORDS OF A HISTORIAN.

For the Muslim it is quite easy to distinguish the above types of evidence, because he also has them in his own faith. But of the followers of the different religions, *he is the most fortunate in this that his various records are contained in separate Books!*

ONE: The first kind—THE WORD OF GOD—is found in a Book called *The Holy Qur an*.

TWO: The second kind-THE WORDS OF THE PROPHET OF GOD, (Muhummed, may the peace and blessings of Allah be upon him) are recorded in the Books of Tradition called *The Hadith*.

THREE: Evidence of the third kind abounds in different volumes of Islamic history, written by some of high integrity and learning, and others of lesser trust worthiness, but the Muslim advisedly keeps his Books in separate volumes!

*The Muslim keeps the above three types of evidence jealously apart, in their proper gradations of authority. He never equates them.* On the other hand, the “Holy Bible” contains a motley type of literature, which composes the embarrassing kind, the sordid, and the obscene—all under the same cover—A Christian is forced to concede equal spiritual import and authority to all, and is thus unfortunate in this regard (Deedat, —*Is the Bible God’s Word?*, pp 4–6; see this article; italic emphasis ours).

This being the case we are forced to conclude that the Quran presents a plurality of deities. Compare the following passages with the claims made by Deedat:

“Such is Allah, your Lord. There is no God save Him, the Creator of all things, so worship Him. And He taketh care of all things. Vision comprehendeth Him not, but He comprehendeth (all) vision. He is the Subtile, the Aware. Proofs have come unto you from your Lord, so whoso seeth, it is for his own good, and whoso is blind is blind to his own hurt. And I am not a keeper over you” S. 6:102–104.

Allah claims that he is not a keeper over man, implying that someone else is. That someone must be God also. Otherwise the Quran would be committing the sin of association, attributing the work and sustaining power of the Creator to someone other than Allah. Or worse still, the Quran might be suggesting that man has no keeper at all, implying that man must sustain himself!

“Shall I seek other than Allah for judge, when He it is Who hath revealed unto you (this) Scripture, fully explained? Those unto whom We gave the Scripture (aforetime) know that it is revealed from thy Lord in truth. So be not thou of the waverers” S. 6:114.

If Deedat is correct, this means that Allah is asking whether he should seek some other judge besides Allah. Allah shifts into the first person plural indicating that he is the one that revealed all the Scriptures. This implies that the Quran reveals more than one Allah.

“Glorified be He Who carried His servant by night from the Inviolable Place of Worship to the Far distant place of worship the neighbourhood whereof We have blessed, that We might show him of Our tokens! Lo! He, only He, is the Hearer, the Seer” S. 17:1.

We have Allah praising another Being for taking Muhammad on a night journey. From there Allah reverts to the first person plural whereby he once again glorifies the One who took Muhammad on the night journey as being the Hearer and the Seer.

“I am commanded only to serve the Lord of this land which He hath hallowed, and unto Whom all things belong. And I am commanded to be of those who surrender” S. 27:1.

Again, Allah claims that he is commanded to worship the Lord of the land.

“We come not down save by commandment of thy Lord. Unto Him belongeth all that is before us and all that is behind us and all that is between those two, and thy Lord was never forgetful” S. 19:64.

We have Allah only coming down at the command of Muhammad’s Lord.

“Lo! verily, ye and that which ye worship, Ye cannot excite (anyone) against Him. Save him who is to burn in hell. There is not one of us but hath his known position. Lo! we, even we are they who set the ranks, Lo! we, even we are they who hymn His praise” S. 37:161–166.

This passage has Allah acknowledging his subjection and praise to another.

The final example includes:

“By no means! For We have created them out of the (base matter) they know! Now I do call to witness THE LORD OF ALL POINTS IN THE EAST AND THE WEST that WE can certainly Substitute for them better (men) than they; And WE are not to be defeated (in Our Plan)” S. 70:39–41.

The Creator here swears by the Lord of all the points of the East and West. There is no break in the text to indicate that someone else is interspersing his comments with the words of the Creator. This means that there is more than one Lord and that Allah actually swears by this other Lord!

In light of the preceding examples we really do not see how Muslims can evade being accused of idolatry or polytheism. Either they will have to change their position regarding the nature of the Quran and admit that it contains more than just the words of Allah. Or they will have to settle for the fact that the Quran teaches that there are several Lords, Allahs, and Creators.

In the service of our risen Lord and eternal Savior, Jesus Christ, for ever and ever. Amen. Come Lord Jesus. We will always love you, for you are our Eternal Lord forever.

For further articles by Sam Shamoun, see the Answering Islam home page at [www.answeringislam.org](http://www.answeringislam.org)

## **Ahmaddiyya In the Balance By Sam Shamoun**

The Ahmaddiyya sect of Islam was founded in 1882 by Mirza Ghulam Ahmad of India. At first, Ghulam had no intention of starting a new religious sect, but focused instead on refuting Christianity and Christian missionaries throughout India. From there, Ghulam wrote a book in 1879/80 titled *Baraheen Ahmadiyya*. In this two-volume work, Mirza promoted the Orthodox Islamic conception of Christ, Muhammad, Prophets, revelation, etc., while attempting to present a case against Christianity.

By the time his third volume was published in 1882, he claimed to have received revelations from God, eventually proclaiming himself to be God's reformer and chosen Messiah for this age. This caused an uproar amongst the Orthodox Muslims, since it is an article of faith for all Muslims to believe that Muhammad was the last messenger of God and the seal of revelation (S. 33:40).

Thus, for Mirza to make such claims was apostasy. Ghulam eventually died in 1908, leaving behind a group of dedicated followers who have since that time increased dramatically.

After his death, Mirza's first disciples Hakim Noor-ud-din led the movement until the latter's demise in 1914.

The group eventually split into two with the newly formed sect settling in Lahore, calling itself Anjuman Ishaate Islam (also known as the Lahori Party). This group tried to play down Mirza's self-styled prophetic claims, stating that Ghulam was nothing more than a reformer. The other group, calling itself Qadiani, continued to emphasize Ghulam's prophethood.

Unfortunately for both groups, they have been labeled heretics by conservative Muslims such as Sunnis and Shiites.

This has led to their persecution and to a denial of the Ahmaddiyyas' rights in Pakistan and in Islamic countries such as Saudi Arabia. For instance, Ahmaddiyyas are not allowed to enter Mecca to make Hajj, a required tenet of Islam. Further, in 1974 the National Assembly of Pakistan declared them non-Muslims.

In spite of all this, many Muslims have adopted their approach and polemics in defending Islam from Christianization and evangelization.

It will be our intention to contrast some of the Ahmaddiyya claims and teachings with that of the Bible and even the Quran in order to see for ourselves whether Mirza Ghulam Ahmad was indeed the Messiah of this age, or simply one of many false Christs that were prophesied to come before the great and terrible day of the Lord.

## **Mirza Ghulam Ahmad's Claims**

### **A. Prophet**

Mirza claimed to be a Muhaddith, a kind of prophet. Although a Muhaddith is, in the words of Ghulam, a partial prophet, this nonetheless contradicts the Quran (S. 33:40) (*Tawzih Maram*, p. 18; Trans. "Explanation of Objectives," p. 11).

His claims outraged many, branding him a heretic. To avoid controversy he publicly denied prophethood, suggesting that his usage of the title "Prophet" was for the sake of simplicity (*Tabligh-i-Risalat*, Vol. II, p. 95).

Yet, shortly afterward he would go on to say that he had been given the names and attributes of all the prophets:

"No prophets came into this world whose name was not given to me. In Burahin-i-Ahmadiya God has affirmed me as Adam, Noah, Ibrahim, Ishaque, Yaqub, Ismail, Moses, Dawud, Isa, son of Mary, and Muhammad (Peace and blessings of Allah be upon him). I am the incarnation of all those prophets (Maududi, *The Qadiani Problem*, p. 119). He later declared:

"Wherever I have denied being a prophet (Nubuwat), I have denied it in the sense that I am no independent bearer of a Law or Shariah nor am I an independent prophet in my

own right... I am a Rasul (apostle, messenger) and Nabi (prophet) without a new Shariah” (Ek Ghalati Ka Tzala, *A Misunderstanding Removed*, pp. 11–12).

Thus in one sense, Mirza denies prophethood and in another affirms it.

## **B. Krishna of Hinduism**

Mirza believed that he was Krishna as recorded in the Haqiqat-ul-Wahi:

“I am Krishna whose advent the Aryans are waiting for in these days. I do not make this claim on my own. God Almighty has conveyed to me repeatedly that I am Krishna, King of the Aryans, who was to appear in the latter days” (Appendix, p. 85).

## **C. God and Son of God**

Mirza claimed to have a vision in which God is supposed to have told him:

“You are to me in the position of offspring. You have a relation with me which the world does not know...”<sup>1</sup> “You are to me like my unity and uniqueness...”<sup>2</sup> “To me you are like my son...”<sup>3</sup>

“God addressed me with these words: ‘Listen! O my Son.’”<sup>4</sup> “In a vision I saw that I was God and believed myself to be such... Divinity coursed through my veins and muscles... I then created the heavens and the earth... then I said: ‘We shall now create man.’”<sup>5</sup>

## **D. Mirza is both Mary and Jesus**

“In the third volume of *Baraheen Ahmadiyya* he (God) named me as Mariam. Then, as is evident from *Baraheen*... I was reared in the image of Mary for two years... Then I was filled with the soul of Christ and I became pregnant in a metaphorical sense. At last after a period of many months—I was delivered from Mary into the form of Christ... Hence in this way I became the Son of Mary” (*Kashti—Noh*, pp. 46–47).

Mirza stated that God told him, “I created you from the same essence as Jesus was” (*Hamamit-il—Bushra*, p. 14).

Some other incredible claims either made by Mirza or his followers include the following:

- “Heaven and earth can move away but it is not possible that his (Ghulam’s) promise may not be fulfilled” (Zafrulla Khan, *Ah-madiyyat: The Renaissance of Islam*, p. 38).
- “I am the water that has descended from heaven at its due time. I am the divine light that has illuminated the day” (Ahmad, *Baraheen Ahmadiyya*, Vol. 5, p. 115).

---

<sup>1</sup> *Fountain of Christianity*, 9.63.

<sup>2</sup> *Baraheen Ahmadiyya*, Vol. IV, p. 489 (footnote).

<sup>3</sup> *Haqiqat-ul-Wahi*, p. 86.

<sup>4</sup> *Al-Bushra*, Vol. 1, p. 49.

<sup>5</sup> *Kitab al-Bariyah*, pp. 85–87.

- “He who does not accept me, does not disobey me, but disobeys him who has prophesied my coming” (Ahmad, *Haqiqat-ul-Wahi*, p. 178).
- “We gave thee glad tiding of a gentle son, a manifestation of the true and high as if Allah had descended from heaven. His name is Emmanuel. A son will be born to thee and grace will come close to thee” (Ahmad, *Anjam Athem*, p. 62).

The claims of Ahmad and his followers leave little imagination as for the reason why Muslims consider the Ahmaddiyyas heretics.

## **A Denial of the Miraculous**

Ahmaddiyya’s founder denied the miracles of Jesus and the prophets. His reason for denying the miraculous nature of the prophets’ lives becomes obvious from his own words:

“A matter which is not possible for the Holy prophet [Muhammad]—the best of prophets... how can it be so for the Messiah! [Jesus]? It would be so derogatory to the Holy Prophet to think that what is impossible for him to attain, is possible for the Messiah” (*Tawzih Miram*, English translation, pp. 6–77).

Thus, Mirza denies both the Biblical and the Quranic evidence for Jesus’ miracles (cf. S. 5:110, 3:50; [John 10:25, 32](#); [Matthew 11:20–24](#)).

## **Denial of Jesus’ Death, Resurrection and Ascension**

Although the Bible and Quran disagree on the crucifixion of Christ, both books confirm the bodily ascension of Christ into heaven (cf. [Acts 1:9–11](#); S. 3:55).

The Bible states that Christ was crucified and killed for our sins and that he arose on the third day, never to die again (cf. [Luke 24:36–48](#); [Rev. 1:17–18](#)). The Quran, however, declares that Christ was neither crucified nor killed but it so appeared to his enemies (S. 4:157–158).

Ahmaddiyyas on the other hand accept Jesus’ crucifixion on the cross, but deny he ever died. Instead, Christ swooned, only to resuscitate three days later. From there he went to India where he lived to a ripe old age and died in Kashmir.

There is a difference of opinion as to when Jesus actually died. According to Mirza, Muhammad said: “Jesus was 125 years of age when he died” (Ahmad, *Jesus in India*, p. 53).

Yet Shams, Mirza’s follower, states that Muhammad claimed that “Jesus died at the age of one hundred twenty years” (Shams, *Where Did Jesus Die?*, p. 153).

This is further complicated by the fact that in one of Mirza’s earlier writings, AZALA AUHAM, Ghulam stated that Jesus died in Galilee shortly after escaping death on the cross at the age of sixty or seventy (pp. 473–474, 623–625).

Mirza confuses his readers even more by stating in *Atman-ul-Hujjat* that Imam Malik (one of the founders of Islamic jurisprudence) believed that Jesus died at the age of 33, alleging that Jesus was buried in Syria sometime later (pp. 17–19).

To make matters worse than what they already are, Mirza abandons the early age and Galilean death theory for Kashmir India (*Jesus in India*, pp. 15–16).

The reader might be wondering as to the reason for such confusion and contradiction surrounding the Ahmaddiyyas’ theory on Jesus’ final days on earth. The answer is simple:



Ahmaddiyyas are committed to disproving Jesus' bodily resurrection and ascension since this would destroy their faith and position:

“It is impossible for us to think that Jesus the Messiah, is alive in Heaven, while Muhammad, our Holy Prophet, lies buried in the earth. We cannot think so... If it is true that Jesus is alive in Heaven, we cannot feel more dead. We cannot tolerate the thought that our Master is dead and buried, while Jesus is alive and in Heaven. We feel humiliated before Christians” (Bashir-ud-din, *Invitation to Ahmadiyyat*, p. 15).

“Prove to Christians that Christ in reality is forever dead. Through the victory to be gained by this argument you will be able to wipe the Christian religion off the face of the earth... Do not entangle with other ideas to talk about with Christians. Just concentrate upon the arguments regarding the death of Jesus Christ, and by the use of powerful arguments put the Christians to silence. The day you will imprint this fact on the minds of Christians, you will know that the Christian religion has made its exit from the world” (Ghulam, *Azala Auham*, pp. 560–61).

### **The Return of Christ**

Another point where Christians and Muslims agree upon is on the return of Jesus Christ to the earth as Judge and Executioner. This fact is documented in nearly every book of the New Testament and alluded to in the Quran (cf. [Matthew 25:31–45](#); [Mark 13:26–27](#); [Acts 1:10–11](#); S. 43:54, 61). This is further elaborated in the authentic Traditions of Muhammad:

“Abu Huraira reported God's messenger as saying: ‘By him in whose hand my soul is, the son of Mary will soon descend among you as a just judge. He will break crosses, kill swine and abolish the jizya (poll tax), and wealth will pour forth to such an extent that no one will accept it’ ” (*Sahi Muslim*, Vol. 1, p. 92).

After his descension, the Muslims believe that Christ will marry, have children, die and be buried next to Muhammad in between Abu Bakr and Umar b. Al-Kattab, the first two caliphs.

Since Ahmaddiyyas do not believe in Jesus' ascension, it comes as no surprise that they also deny his Second Coming. They believe that Mirza Ghulam Ahmad has replaced Jesus as the Messiah and that all must turn to this Indian Messiah for hope. Claiming to be the answer to the anti-Islamic attacks he states:

“No wonder, therefore, God Almighty has chosen from amongst the true Muslims of our time this humble one, and blessed him with his revealed word and with other divine favors that this vicious magic may be undone” (Ahmad, *Victory of Islam*, p. 4).

Addressing the West, Mirza declared:

“Ye Christians of Europe and America, and ye seekers after truth know for certain that the Messiah who was to come has come and it is he who is speaking to you at this moment” (Ahmad, *A Review of Christianity*, pp. 40–41).

### **False Prophecies**

Believing himself to be Al-Masih Mawud (*The Promised Messiah*) and a prophet, it is not surprising to find Mirza attempting to prophesy future events. Unfortunately, none of these prophecies came to pass, exposing him as a false prophet. Embarrassed by this fact,

Ahmaddiyyas have tried desperately to explain away these false predictions but to no avail as the following examples prove:

### **Maulvi Sana-Ullah**

Fierce opposition broke out between Ghulam and one Maulvi Sana-Ullah over Mirza's claim. In 1907 Mirza advertised a prayer he made against the Maulvi:

“O, my beloved Master!... If my claim to being the Christ is my own innovation then I am a liar... I pray to thee to kill me in Maulvi Sana-Ullah's lifetime and ... if Sana-Ullah is not truthful in his allegations against me then I pray to annihilate him in my lifetime... not through human hands but through bubonic plague and cholera...”  
(advertisement, April 15, 1907, *Majmua Ishtiharat*, Vol. 3, p. 579).

Exactly one year and twenty-one days later, Ghulam died, whereas Sana-Ullah lived on for an additional forty years.

## **A Former Disciple**

Dr. Abdul Hakim had been Mirza's pupil for nearly twenty years when he soon thereafter rebelled against his mentor, writing two books, *Al-Masih Ad Dajjal* and *Kana Masih*. On July 12, 1906, Hakim published an advertisement stating that Ghulam would die within three years. Mirza retaliated by warning Hakim that calamity would soon befall and that the angels were ready to take his life with swords (advertisement, August 16, 1906, *Majmua Ishtiharat*, Vol. 3, p. 559).

Intending to put fear into Ghulam's heart, Abdul predicted that Mirza would die by August 4, 1908. In response to this, Ghulam predicted that God would increase his age while decreasing the age of his enemy (*Chashma Marifat*, p. 321 ff.).

Yet in May 1908 Mirza died unexpectedly, unlike Hakim, who continued to live on for several more years after that.

## **Marriage Made in Heaven**

Mirza prophesied that he was going to marry a young Muslim woman named Muhammadi Begum. Although the father refused, Ghulam claimed that like Muhammad's marriage to Zainab, Muhammadi was given to him in wedlock by God Almighty Himself:

“God Almighty will bring Muhammadi Begum to you as a virgin or a widow... He will certainly fulfill this and no one can stop him” (*Azala Auham*, p. 396).

After discovering that Begum was to marry someone else, another revelation from the Lord was given to warn the girl's father:

“Tell him to establish a relationship with you by giving his elder daughter in marriage to you and thus obtain light from light... Tell him that if he persists in carrying out any different design, his household will become subject to some serious misfortunes, the last of which would be his death within three years of the marriage of his daughter to someone else... the husband of his daughter will also die within two years and a half. This is a divine decree” (*Ayenuh Kamalat Islam*, pp. 572–573).

In spite of all these threats, the marriage never materialized and the father did not die as stated in the prediction, nor did the husband suffer any harm.

## The Great Debate

In 1893, Mirza Ghulam Ahmad engaged in a series of debates with a Muslim convert to Christianity named Abdullah Atham lasting several weeks.

“On the last day of the debate, Ghulam prophesied that whichever debater was lying would die within fifteen months unless that individual were to recant and accept the truth” (advertisement June 5, 1893, *Majmua Ishtiharat*, Vol. 1, p. 434).

Keeping in mind that Atham was an elderly man of sixty-five years and in poor health, the probabilities of him dying within fifteen months was surely high. Yet, fifteen months passed and nothing ever happened to Atham.

This embarrassment led Mirza to state that although appearing alive, Abdullah was in fact spiritually dead, being afflicted with inner fear and guilt (*Anjam Atham*, pp. 10–11).

Ghulam’s son, Bashir-ud-din, boldly claimed that Atham “stopped all his work in support of Christianity. He started doubting Jesus’ divinity and began to realize the truth of Islam, thus escaping death” (*Invitation to Ahmaddiyat*, pp. 249–251).

Yet these statements were simply untrue, since within those fifteen months Atham completed his book, *Khulasa Mubahisa*, in which he presented solid evidence for the doctrine of the Trinity and for Jesus’ divinity. In a letter that Atham wrote to a local newspaper, he publicly stated that he was still a Christian and praising God for it (Prof. M.E. Burney, *Qadiani Madhab ka Elmi Muhasabah*, Ed. 9th, p. 325).

Hence, in briefly examining Ghulam’s predictions one thing is certain: Mirza is not the Messiah nor a divine-sanctioned prophet of the true God, since God would never allow any of his prophets to make false predictions. ([Deuteronomy 18:20–23](#)).

## Conclusion

After reviewing the claims made by Ahmaddiyyas in regard to their founder, and reading Ghulam’s own writings, we are reminded of the Lord Jesus’ warning to his disciples:

“And Jesus answered them, ‘Take heed that no one leads you astray. For many will come in my name, saying, “I am the Christ”: and they will lead many astray... and many false prophets will arise and lead many astray... Then if anyone says to you, “Lo, here is the Christ!” or “There he is!” Do not believe it. For false Christs and false prophets will arise and show great signs and wonders, so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect. Lo, I have told you beforehand... So, if they say, “Lo, he is in the wilderness,” do not go out; if they say, “Lo, he is in the inner rooms,” do not believe it. For as the lightning comes from the east and shines as far as the west, so will the coming of the Son of Man be. Wherever the body is, there the eagles will be gathered together’ ” ([Matthew 24:5, 11, 23–28](#)).

We submit in love that Mirza was not another Messiah, but one of the many pretenders that our Lord Jesus foretold who were coming into the world. The Bible and the Quran know of only one Messiah, Jesus the Lord (cf. [Matthew 16:16](#); S. 3:45). There shall be none after him, for

“there is salvation in no one else, for there is no other name under heaven given among men by which we must be saved” (Acts 4:12). That name being Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory, King of kings.

## **The Quranic Witness To Biblical Authority**

**By Sam Shamoun**

A common accusation leveled by Muslims against Christians is the belief that the Holy Bible in our possession today, has been corrupted and no longer represents the original teachings of God’s messengers. Hence, Muslims believe that God sent down the Quran as a criterion to judge and correct the Bible, exposing the corruption made to it. Accordingly, anything contained within the Holy Bible that is confirmed by the Quran can be trusted and is acceptable to Muslims. At the same time, the passages of the Bible that disagree with the Quran are rejected as interpolations added on later by the community of believers expressing their personal beliefs and experiences.

Doctrines such as Original Sin, the Trinity, the divinity of Jesus, His vicarious death and atonement, are ideas foreign to the original, pristine teaching of Jesus and His first followers, whom the Quran agrees, were Muslims submitted to the exclusive worship of the One True God. Since the Bible teaches the above-mentioned doctrines, it could not have possibly been preserved from deliberate textual corruption, since it would have agreed with the Quran in every detail.

This assumption is fallacious for the following reasons:

- There are nearly 25,000 whole or fragmentary copies of the individual books of the Bible in our possession today, with some dating back four, six, and even eight centuries before the compilation of the Quran. Due to the fact that everything was hand-copied, thousands of variants arose. Yet, textual critics who are not necessarily Christians, have carefully examined these variants and have concluded that we have 98.33 percent of the original reading, with the 1.77 percent still remaining intact within the variants. Hence, we have virtually 100 percent of the original reading faithfully preserved via the manuscript copies. Further, the critics have also established the fact that none of these variants affect any major doctrine, since most of them are nothing more than misspellings, numerical discrepancies, and scribal notes which were assumed to be part of the text by later scribes.

An example of a variant is given here for further clarification:

Y\*u hav on a illion llars  
Yo ave w\*n mill dollars  
You have won a \* dollars  
You \* million ars

A careful examination of these variants would lead us to the conclusion that the original document read, “You have won a million dollars.” This exemplifies the majority of the variants found in the Bible, and clearly demonstrates that these in no way affect any tenet of faith whatsoever.

● The Quran itself bears witness to the fact that the Bible we have today is the uncorrupted Word of God. Before proceeding to the evidence for this claim, we will quote the common assumptions made by Muslims and respond to them:

**1. The Quran confirms the *Torah* of Moses and the *INJIL* (Gospel) given to Jesus. It never mentions the Gospels (plural) or the Pentateuch (the first five books of the Old Testament).**

**Response:**

The Quran affirms the Torah that was available at the time of Muhammad, and the Gospel in usage at that time:

Sura 7:156–157

“And I will write down (my mercy) for those who are righteous and give alms and who believe in our signs; who follow the apostle, the unlettered prophet, whom they find written in the *Torah and the Gospel* THAT IS WITH THEM.”

**Remark:** This verse states that there is a prophecy of Muhammad to be found in the Gospel [singular] available during that time. This destroys the Muslim contention that the Quran mentions the Gospel given to Jesus, not the gospels written about him, since the only Gospel in usage at the time of Muhammad were the same four-fold Gospel accounts contained within our modern-day New Testaments.

Sura 53:36

“Nay is he not acquainted with what is IN THE BOOKS OF MOSES.”

Sura 5:46:

“But why do they (the Jews) come to thee for decision, when they have the Torah in which IS the command of God.”

Sura 5:50:

“And let the People of the Gospel judge by what God has revealed in it. If any fail to judge by what God has revealed, they are licentious.”

Sura 5:71:

“Say, O People of the Book! You are not (founded) on anything UNTIL you PERFORM the TORAH and the GOSPEL, and what was revealed to you from your Lord.”

Sura 3:93–94:

“All food was lawful to the children of Israel except what Israel made unlawful for itself before the Torah was revealed. Say, ‘BRING the TORAH and READ it, if you are men of truth.’ If any, after this, invent a lie and attribute it to God, they are indeed transgressors.”

Sura 28:48–49:

“But when the truth has come to them from Us, they say: ‘why is he not given the like of what was given to Moses?’ Did they not disbelieve in that which was given to Moses before? They say: ‘Two kinds of magic (the Torah and the Quran) each helping the other!’ And they say: ‘Verily! In both we are disbelievers.’ Say (to them, O Muhammad): ‘Then bring a Book from Allah, which is a better guide than these TWO (the Torah and the Quran), that I may follow it, if you are truthful.’ ”

**Remark:** Notice how Muhammad is commanded to defend both the Quran and the Torah of Moses that was available to him as a guidance from God. No mention of textual corruption whatsoever.

Sura 32:23:

“We did indeed aforetime give the Book to Moses: Be not then in doubt of its REACHING (THEE): And we made it a guide to the Children of Israel.”

These verses presuppose that an uncorrupted Torah and Gospel exist which both Jews and Christians are commanded to study and adhere to.

The only Torah the Jews have ever known, and Gospel that Christians have possessed are that which make up the five books of Moses and the four gospel accounts\* found in our modern Bibles today.

[\*The Gospel of Jesus is not a book, but the Good News that God sent His Son into the world to atone for sin and make reconciliation between God and man. Hence, Jesus is the living Gospel sent to the world. Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John are not four different gospels, but four different perspectives on the one Gospel of God revealed in the person of Christ. The authors, writing under inspiration, give mutually complementary, not contradictory, material on the life and passion of Christ. This multiple attestation serves the purpose of fulfilling the requirement of the Mosaic Law that, “by the mouth of two or three witnesses the matter shall be established” [Deuteronomy 19:15.](#)]

In fact, God personally states to Muhammad in 32:23 that he should have no doubt that the Torah of his time is the very same Torah of Moses.

This is solidified by the fact that we have copies of these books that are both prior to and contemporary with the time of Muhammad, and are identical to what we have today. It is purely wishful thinking to suppose that the Torah and Gospel referred to at the time of Muhammad were something totally different in content from what we have in our possession.

## **2. The Quran never alludes to the Bible, only the revelation originally given to the Prophets, i.e. Moses, David, Jesus, etc.**

**Response:** This is another unsubstantiated assumption. It is presumed that since the word “Bible” does not appear in the Quran, then what the Judeo-Christian communities commonly refer to as God’s Word is not acceptable to the Muslims.

Yet, if one were to trace the word *Bible* back to the Greek, one would discover that the word itself comes from the term *BIBLIA*, meaning “books.” Hence, in time the collection became classified as *the Book* due to the fact that although the Bible consisted of 66 individual writings, the author was one, the Holy Spirit, having one unifying theme: the advent of God’s Messiah-Deliverer.

Not surprisingly, we find the Quran mentioning the Book (Arabic—al-Kitab) of the Jews and Christians:

Sura 2:113:

“The Jews say, ‘The Christians are not (founded) upon anything.’ And the Christians say, ‘The Jews are not (founded) upon anything.’ And yet THEY READ THE BOOK.”

Sura 3:79:

“It is not for a man to whom is given the Book and wisdom and prophecy that he should then say to people, ‘Be worshipers of me in place of God.’ But rather, ‘Be true

teachers (rabbániyín), since you TEACH the BOOK and you STUDY IT EARNESTLY.’  
”

The Muslim scripture again presumes the existence of an uncorrupted Book which both Jews and Christians study. The only Book in the hands of the Judeo-Christian community at the time was the Bible as it exists in its present form. Furthermore, the Arabic term used for the Bible is the very same used in the Quran, *al-Kitab al-Muqaddas*, the Holy *Book*. Hence, the *Kitab* referred to in the Quran is the very *Kitab* used by Arab Christians during and after the time of Muhammad.

Furthermore, it is not true either that the term *Torah* only referred to the five books of Moses. In both the Holy Bible and the Hadith the word is used in a generic sense to refer to the Old Testament as a whole.

For instance, the *Mishkat al-Masabih* cites several traditions (Book XXVI, Ch. XVIII, pp. 1232, 1233 and ch. 19, p. 1244) which indicate that the Torah prophesies the coming of Muhammad:

“Ata b. Yasar told that he met ‘Abdal-lah b. ‘Amr b. al-As and asked him to inform him of the description of God’s messenger given in the Torah. He agreed, swearing by God that he was certainly described in the Torah by part of the description of him given in the Qur’an when it says,

“ ‘O prophet, We have sent you as a witness, a bearer of good tidings, and a warner, and a guard for the common people’ (From Al-Ahzab 33:45 up to here. The following is from the Torah—Old Testament, [Isaiah 42:1–3, 6–7](#).) ‘ You are my servant and my messenger; I have called you the one who trusts, not harsh or rough, nor loud-voiced in the streets. He will not repulse evil with evil, but will pardon and forgive, and God will not take him till He uses him to straighten the crooked creed so that people may say there is no god but God, and he opens thereby blind eyes, deaf ears and hardened hearts. Bukhari transmitted it, and Darimi also gives something to the same effect on the authority of ‘Ata who gave as his authority Ibn Salam.’ ”

The citation from the Torah is actually found in [Isaiah 42:1–3, 6–7](#). You will not find a single reference in the Torah of Moses matching the above citation. This proves that at least in this Hadith the word “Torah” referred to more than the first five books of Moses.

Commenting on the preceding hadith, Ibn Kathir writes:

“ ... Al-Bukhari recorded it from ‘Ab-dullah bin ‘Amr. It was also recorded by Al-Bukhari [up to the word] forgoes. And he mentioned the narration of ‘Abdullah bin ‘Amr then he said: ‘It was COMMON in the speech of our Salaf that they describe the Books of the People of the Two Scriptures AS THE TAWRAH, as some Hadiths concur. Allah knows best’ ” (*Tafsir An Kathir (Abridged), Volume 4, (Surat AlAraf to the end of Surah Yunus)*, abridged by a group of scholars under the supervision of Shaykh Safiur-Rahman Al-Mubarakpuri [Darussalam Publishers & Distributors, Riyadh, Houston, New York, Lahore; First Edition: May 2000], p. 179”; capital emphasis ours).

“Jesus answered them, ‘Has it not been written in your LAW, I said you are gods?’ ”  
[John 10:34](#).

Jesus includes [Psalm 82:6](#) as part of the Law (i.e. Torah).

“The crowd spoke up, ‘We have heard from the LAW that the Christ will remain forever, so how can you say, “The Son of Man must be lifted up?” Who is this Son of Man?’ ” [John 12:34](#).

There is no reference in the books of Moses that indicates Christ will remain forever. The only places you’ll find such statements are [Psalm 110:1, 4](#) and [Daniel 7:13–14](#). Hence, the Jews used the term “Law” (Torah) as a reference for the whole of the Hebrew Bible.

“But this is to fulfill what is written in their LAW ‘They hated me without reason’ ” [John 15:25](#).

Jesus alludes to [Psalms 35:19](#) and [69:4](#) as part of the Law.

In [Romans 3:10–19](#) Paul alludes to [Psalms 5:9, 10:7, 36:1, 14:1–3, 51:4, 53:1–3, 59:7–8, 140:3](#) and [Ecclesiastes 7:20](#) as “the Law.”

“In the LAW it is written: ‘Through men of strange tongues and through the lips of foreigners I will speak to this people, but even then they will not listen to me,’ says the Lord” [1 Corinthians 14:21](#).

Paul includes [Isaiah 28:11–12](#) as part of the Law. This should sufficiently demonstrate that the term Torah or Law came to be used in a broader sense referring to the entire Hebrew Bible. This is precisely what we find in the Hadith as well.

Finally, by the start of the second century the term “Gospel” was used by the early church to refer to the fourfold Gospel accounts of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Noted scholar, F. F. Bruce explains:

“At a very early date it appears that the four Gospels were united in one collection. They must have been brought together very soon after the writing of the Gospel according to John. This fourfold collection was known originally as ‘The Gospel’ singular, not ‘The Gospels’ in the plural; there was only one Gospel, narrated in four records, distinguished as ‘according to Matthew’, ‘according to Mark’, and so on. About A.D. 115 Ignatius, bishop, of Antioch, refers to ‘The Gospel’ as an authoritative writing, and as he knew more than one of the four ‘Gospels’ it may well be that by ‘The Gospel’ *sans phrase* he means the fourfold collection which went by that name” (Bruce, *The New Testament Documents: Are They Reliable?* [InterVarsity Press: Downers Grove, IL., rpt. 1992], p. 23).

Bruce goes on to cite another church father:

“By the time of Irenaeus, who, though, a native of Asia Minor, was bishop of Lyons in Gaul about A.D. 180, the idea of a fourfold Gospel had become so axiomatic in the Church at large that he can refer to it as an established and recognized fact as obvious as the four cardinal points or the four winds: ‘For as there are four quarters of the world in which we live, and four universal winds, and as the Church is dispersed over all the earth, and the gospel is the pillar and base of the Church and the breath of life, so it is natural that it should have four pillars, breathing immortality from every quarter and kindling the life of men anew. Whence it is manifest that the Word, the architect of all things, who sits upon the cherubim and holds all things together, having been made manifested to men, have given us the gospel in fourfold form, but held together by one Spirit’ ” (Ibid., p. 24).



Hence, to a Christian living at the time of Muhammad the term “Gospel” meant the fourfold collection found in our present day Bibles.

**3. The Quran is sent down as the Criterion (AL-FURQAN) and a guardian over previous Scripture (MUHAIMINAN 'ALAIHI), indicating that its function is to expose the corruption of the former text.**

**Response:**The term, AL-FURQAN, is used also for the revelation given to Moses:

Sura 2:53:

“And remember We gave Moses the Scripture and *the Criterion* (between right and wrong): there was a chance for you to be guided aright”—Y. Ali.

Sura 21:48:

“In the past We granted to Moses and Aaron *the Criterion* (for judgement) and a light and a Message for those who would do right...”—Y. Ali.

This is a strong indication that the term *Criterion* does not suggest that a scripture called by this term corrects and exposes corruption to previous revelation, since there were no scriptures prior to the one given to Moses.

The term Furqan also appears in Suras 2:185; 8:29, 41 and 25:1:

“The month of Ramadan is that in which the Quran was revealed a guidance to men and clear proofs of the guidance and the *Criterion* (Furqan)...” [2:185—Maulana Muhammad Ali; F.E. Peters trans.].

The Quran is stated to be the clear proof of the guidance and of the FURQAN, implying that the FURQAN is something other than the Quran, at least in this reference.

“O you who believe, if you keep your duty to Allah, He will grant you a *distinction* (Furgan) and do away with your evils and protect you. And Allah is the Lord of mighty grace” [8:29—M. Muhammad Ali].

This passage promises Muslims that if they believe and keep duty, Allah would grant them a FURQAN. This could not be the Quran since it was already being given piecemeal to the community through their prophet Muhammad.

“And know that whatever you acquire in war, a fifth of it is for Allah and for the Messenger and for the near of kin and the orphans and the needy and the wayfarer, if you believe in Allah and in that which We revealed to Our servant, on the day of *Discrimination* (Furgan), the day on which *the two parties met...*” [8:41—M.M. Ali].

This verse was revealed in connection to the battle of Badr, where the Muslims met the other party in war on the day of FURQAN. Based on the context itself, FURQAN can only mean victory, i.e. that Allah granted the Muslims victory over the much larger opposition. This suggests that the term can and often does mean more than simply a criterion used in relation to judging right and wrong. In fact, the term is used to refer to things other than the Quran, and is therefore not something unique to Islam.

“Blessed is He Who sent down the *Discrimination* (Furgan) upon His servant that he might be a warner to the nations” [25:1—M. M. Ali].

The revelation that Muhammad received is the FURQAN that is to be used to warn the nations. Yet, in Sura 3:3 all the books of God were sent as a FURQAN:

“He has revealed to thee the Book with truth, confirming that which is before it, and He revealed the Torah and the Gospel aforetime, *a guidance for the people, and He sent the Criterion (al-Furqan)...*”

This passage makes it clear that *the Furqan* cannot be referring to the Quran alone, since the two are seen as being distinct. It is precisely this distinction which has led Muslim scholars to differ on the identity of *the Furqan* itself, whether it is the Quran or all the revealed books of God. Muslim scholar Mahmoud M. Ayoub writes:

“The issue that has concerned commentators in connection with this verse is the mention of the *Furqan* (criterion) after that of the Qur’an and the Torah and the Gospel. The word *Furqan* is generally used as one of the names of the Qur’an... Since the Qur’an is mentioned in the previous verse as a revelation preceded by the Torah and the Gospel, what is the wisdom in mentioning it again? Commentators have offered *various answers to this problem*” [Ayoub, *The Quran and Its Interpreters, vol. II-The House of Imran*; Albany, N.Y: State University of New York Press, 1992, p. 15].

Some commentators like al-Zamakhshari, believe it to be the entire collection of revealed books, or quite possibly the Psalms of David or the Quran itself:

“If you ask what is here intended by the word *Furqan*, I answer, It is the entire genre of heavenly books *because they are all a Criterion (Furgan) distinguishing truth from falsehood*. It may also mean all the Scriptures mentioned here. It is as though God said after mentioning the three Scriptures, ‘and He sent down that by means of which truth may be distinguished from error,’ meaning either all His Scriptures, or these three Books in particular. It may also be that God here intended a Fourth Scripture, which is the Psalms (ZABUR), as He says, ‘and We gave David the Psalms’ (Q. 17:55). It may also be that God here repeated mention of the Quran, denoting its special characteristic of being a criterion distinguishing between truth and error. This He did after mentioning it by its generic name, by way of emphasizing its greatness and manifesting its special excellence” [Ibid., p. 16].

The view that *Furqan* refers to all three Scriptures is, according to Razi, “the view of most *tafsir* masters,” since they “are not only a source of divine guidance, they are also divine criteria distinguishing between lawful and unlawful acts and precepts in addition to other sacred laws” [Ibid., p. 17].

Ar-Razi, believes differently, arguing:

“As for identifying the Psalms as the *Furqan*, it is unlikely because the Psalms contain no laws or precepts, but only exhortations. Thus to characterize the Torah and Gospel as *Furqan is more probable than the Psalms* because they do contain clear evidence of this in their precepts and laws. As for the second view which identifies the Quran as the *Furqan* in this instance, *it is also unlikely* because God saying ‘and He sent

down the Criterion' is conjoined to what is before it [that is 'He sent down the Book to you']. Moreover, that which is conjoined to a thing *must be different from the thing which it is conjoined*, which is in this case the Qur'an, but which was already mentioned. This means, therefore, that *the Furqan must be other than the Qur'an...*" [Ibid., p. 17].

Razi believes that *Furqan* refers to "the miracles which God linked to the revelation of these Scriptures" [Op. cit.].

Ayoub goes on to list the different ways the verse has been interpreted such as the fact that some say *Furqan* refers to both the Quran and Muhammad (Nisaburi), to the faith in the divine oneness in relation to the universal mind (Ibn Arabi), to every clear and unambiguous verse (Imam Ja'far al-Sadiq), or even to "all the fundamental and ancillary [religious] sciences which God sent down to His prophets through revelation" (Tabataba'i) (Ibid., pp. 17–20).

Thus, due to the text's ambiguity Muslim apologists cannot convincingly demonstrate that *Furqan* is used for the Quran as a criteria over previous Scriptures. In fact, a case can and has already been made by Muslims themselves to prove that all Scripture is *al-Furqan*.

The other term used in relation to the Quran is found in Sura 5:48:

"To you (Muhammad) We revealed the book in truth, attesting to (the truth of) that which IS between his (its) hands from the scripture (the Torah and Gospel), and guarding it (WA MUHAIMINAN ALAIHI)."

It is presumed that the Arabic phrase, "guarding it in safety," refers to the Quran's role as a quality control agent, affirming that which remains intact and exposing any tampering to the biblical text. Muslims often accuse Christians of misquoting the Quran, reading verses out of their intended context. Amazingly, Muslims are guilty of the very same thing and against their own scripture!

When the verse is read in conjunction with the previous passages and within the verse itself, the Quran is seen as protecting and guarding uncorrupted scriptures; it says absolutely nothing about exposing textual corruption whatsoever (cf. Sura 5:43–47, 68-Ali).

In fact, the Quran came as an Arabic verification of the Bible to the Arabs who were ignorant of the contents of the Judeo-Christian Scripture:

Sura 35:31:

"That which We have revealed to you of the Book is the truth, attesting to (the truth of) that which IS between his (its) hands (the Torah and Gospel)..."

Sura 10:37:

"This Quran is not such as can be produced by other than God; but it is a verification of that (the Torah and Gospel) which IS between his (its) hands, and the explanation of the Book, WHEREIN THERE IS NO DOUBT, from the Lord of the worlds."

Sura 6:154–157:

"Then We gave *Moses the Book*, complete as to whatever is excellent, and explaining all things in detail, *and a guide and a mercy*, that they might believe in the meeting with their Lord. And this (the Quran) is a Book which We have revealed, blessed: so follow it and be righteous, that you may receive mercy: lest you should say, '*The Book was sent down to two peoples before us, and for our part, we remained unacquainted with all that they learned by assiduous study*'; or lest you should say: '*If the Book (the Torah and Gospel) had only been sent down to us, we should have followed its guidance better than they*' "

Sura 46:12:

“And before this was the Book of Moses as *a guide and a mercy*: and this Book is a verification (of it) *in the Arabic tongue* to warn those who transgress and as glad tidings to the righteous.”

Sura 26:192–197:

And lo! It is a revelation of the Lord of the Worlds, which the True Spirit hath brought down upon thy heart, that thou mayest be (one) of the warners, *In Plain Arabic Speech. And lo! It is in the Scriptures of the men of old*. Is it not a token for them that the doctors of the children of Israel know it?”

In the preceding passages the Quran is sent as a confirmation of the Book “in which there is no doubt.” Not once do these verses state that the Book at the time of Muhammad had been corrupted and needed to be corrected in any way. Furthermore, it is the Quran, not the Bible, that needs to be viewed in light of previous Scripture for verification purposes:

“And if thou (Muhammad) art in doubt concerning that which We reveal unto thee, *then question those who read the Scripture (that was) before thee*. Verily the Truth from thy Lord hath come unto thee. So be not thou of the waverers” [S. 10:94].

Furthermore, this commits an etymological fallacy. The meaning of the word is not derived from its root but in the manner and the context in which it is used within a sentence. For instance, one of the 99 names of God in the Quran is *almuhaimin*:

“He is Allah, besides Whom there is no God; the King, the Holy, the Author of Peace, the Grantor of Security, *Guardian* (MUHAIMIN) over all, the Mighty, the Supreme, the Possessor of greatness. Glory be to Allah from that which they set up (with Him)!” [S. 59:23].

Are we to presume that Allah confirms that which remains intact in creation and exposes corruption to it since he is called MUHAIMIN? Obviously not, which indicates that the word does not have just one meaning as some modern Muslim apologists seem to suggest. It simply implies that the Quran guards, not corrects, the Holy Bible. In fact, this is precisely how one Muslim commentator, al-Baidawi, understood the term:

“A keeper over the whole sacred books, such as shall preserve them from change, and witness to their truth and authority” (Abdiyah Akbar Abdul-Haqq, *Sharing Your Faith With a Muslim* [Bethany House Publishers, 6820 Auto Road, Minneapolis, MN, 55438, 1980], p. 39 citing W. Muir, CORAN, p. 205).

Muslim commentator Ahmad b. Mahmud al-Nasafi concurs:

“[The phrase] ‘confirming the Book that was before it’ means that the Quran confirms what the Torah says and offers. ‘Assuring it’ means bearing witness to it. The Quran did not say, ‘Believe what I have believed and disbelieve what I have disbelieved and what I keep silent on, neither believe it nor disbelieve it,’ but it says, ‘who so judges not according to what Allah has sent down.’ Muhammad also said: ‘I am the first who fulfills Allah’s command and his Book (i.e., The Torah and the Gospel).’ (See al-Nasafi’s commentary on Sura al-Maida 5:43–48).” (*True Guidance* [Light of Life, P.O. Box 13,

A-9503 Villach, Austria, 1994], pp. 96–97, citing *Tafsir al-Nasafi* vol. 1–4, Cairo, Egypt, 1961).

Finally, the Quran itself states that God would make sure that the Bible would be protected from corruption:

“We have, without doubt *sent down THE MESSAGE (Zhikra)*; And We will assuredly guard it (from corruption)” [S. 15:9—Y Ali].

That this includes the Holy Bible is made clear in the following citations:

“And before thee We sent none but men, to whom We granted inspiration: If ye realise this not, ask of those *who possess THE MESSAGE (Zhikri)*” [S. 16:43—Y Ali].

“Before thee, also, the messengers We sent were but men, to whom We granted inspiration: if ye know this not, ask of those *who possess THE MESSAGE (Zhikri)*” [S. 21:7—Y Ali].

“In the past We granted to Moses and Aaron *the Criterion (al-Furqana)* (for judgment), *And a Light and a Message (Zikra)* for those who would do right” [S. 21:48].

“Before this, We wrote in the Psalms, after *THE REMINDER (Zhikri)*: ‘My servants, the righteous, shall inherit the earth’ ” [S. 21:105].

“We did aforetime give Moses the Guidance, and We gave the Book in inheritance to the Children of Israel—*A Guide and A REMINDER (Zhikraa)* to men of understanding” [S. 40:53–54—Y Ali].

These passages establish that the revelation given to Moses, David and the Book which Jews and Christians possessed at the time of Muhammad is also part of *that Reminder* which God sent down and promised to preserve. Hence, for Muslims to state that the Bible is corrupt basically means that God failed to guard his message from corruption, breaking his promise of insuring its preservation.

#### **4. The Quran clearly indicates that the Bible has been falsified in Sura 2:79:**

“Therefore woe be unto those who write Scripture with their hands and then say, ‘This is from Allah,’ that they may purchase a small gain therewith. Woe unto them for that their hands have written, and woe unto them for that they earn thereby.”

##### **Response:**

It cannot be overstated that the context of any scripture quoted is very important in understanding the passage presented. Hence, when one reads the verse before it, the meaning of the verse cited above takes on a whole new dimension:

“Among them are unlettered folk who know the Scripture not except from hearsay. **THEY BUT GUESS**” [S. 2:78].

It becomes obvious that this passage is referring to certain Jews during Muhammad’s time who knew nothing of their respective Scriptures, falsifying revelation for gain. Yet, the passages that we examined before it affirm that there were Jews and Christians who knew the Book, studying it in truth.

In fact, Sura 3:199 clearly states that there were many who would not falsify revelation for profit:

*“And there are, certainly, among the People of the Book, those who believe in God, and that which has been revealed to you, in that which has been revealed to them, bowing in humility to God. They will not sell the signs of God for miserable gain. For them is a reward with their Lord, and God is swift in account.”*

Sura 3:113–114:

*“Not all of them are alike. Some of the People of the Book are an upright people. They recite the signs (or verses) of God in the night season and they bow down worshipping. They believe in God and the last day. They command what is just, and forbid what is wrong and they hasten in good works, and they are of the righteous.”*

Further, the Quran accuses a certain number of the Jewish faction of perverting the text with their tongues, reading it out of context. It never accuses them of perverting the text itself:

Sura 3:78:

*“There is among them a party (fariq) who (in reading) twist their tongues with the Book so that you will count it from the Book and it is not from the Book. And they say it is from God and it is not from God. And they say a lie against God and they know (it).”*

Sura 5:12–13:

*“God formerly took a covenant from the Children of Israel, and We appointed twelve captains among them ... and because of their (Jews’) breach of their covenant, We cursed them, and made their hearts grow hard. They change the words from their (right) places and they forgot a part of that whereby they were admonished. You will not cease to find deceit in them, excepting a few of them, but pardon them, and forgive, for God loves those who are kind.”*

Finally, Jews did they very same thing when hearing the Quran:

*“Can you (O men of faith) still earnestly desire that they (the Jews) will believe in you? And verily a party (FARIQ) among them hear the Word of God, then they pervert it knowingly after they have understood it. And when they meet the believers they say, ‘We believe,’ but when they meet each other in private they say, ‘Why do you tell them what God has revealed to you (in the Torah), that they may engage you in argument about it before their God? What do you not understand?’ Do they not know that God knows what they conceal and what they make public?” (S. 2:75–77, c.f. S. 4:44–47).*

No Muslim would dare say that the Quranic text had been corrupted by these Jews who were perverting Muhammad’s words to them. Hence, perversion refers to misinterpreting the meaning of, never to corruption of, the text of Scripture.

In concluding this study, we would like to address one final Muslim attempt to prove that the Islamic Scripture denies the authority of our present Bible by referring to the following traditions:

*“Abu Huraira reported God’s Messenger as saying:*

*“ ‘In the last days there will be lying dajjals who will bring you traditions of which neither you nor your fathers have heard, so beware of them. They will neither lead you astray nor seduce you.’ Muslim transmitted it. He also said that the People of the Book*

used to read the Torah in *Hebrew and expound it in Arabic to the Muslims*, so God's messenger said, 'Neither believe nor disbelieve the People of the Book, but say, Say (O Muslims): We believe in Allah and that which is revealed unto Abraham, and Ishmael, and Isaac, and Jacob, and the tribes, and that which Moses and Jesus received, and that which the Prophets received from their Lord. We make no distinction between any of them, and unto Him we have surrendered' (S. 2:136) Bukhari transmitted it" (*Mishkat ul-Masabih, Bk. 1, Ch. VI, p. 42* [tr. James Robson, Ashraf, Lahore, 1963]).

It is suggested that Muhammad is commanding Muslims to neither accept nor reject the Bible, using the Quran as the Criteria instead.

Unfortunately for the Muslim line of argument, this Hadith does not reject the Holy Bible itself, but its Arabic interpretation. The Jews were reading the Torah in Hebrew, a language foreign to Muhammad and his followers, and proceeded to interpret its meaning in Arabic; and believing that the Jews were not honest in their dealings with Muslims, Muhammad could not be certain of their honesty in correctly conveying the meaning of their Scripture.

"In his commentary on Bukhari, Ayni affirms this when he states that the Muslims were unable to know whether or not the interpretations given by the People of the Book accorded with the Torah, suggesting that to confirm a lie or to deny the truth provokes the wrath of God" (Ernest Hahn, *The Integrity of the Bible According to the Qur'an and the Hadith*, p. 30).

That Muhammad believed that the text of Torah had not been corrupted is solidified by this Hadith from *Sunan Abu Dawud*, Book 38 (*Kitab al-Hudud*, i.e., Prescribed Punishments), No. 4434:

"Narrated Abdullah Ibn Umar:

"A group of Jews came and invited the Apostle of Allah (peace-be-upon-him) to Quff. So he visited them in their school. They said: Abul Qasim, one of our men has committed fornication with a woman; so pronounce judgement upon them. They placed a cushion for the Apostle of Allah (peace-be-upon-him) who sat on it and said: *Bring the Torah*. It was then brought. He then withdrew the cushion from beneath him *and placed the Torah on it saying: I believed in thee and in Him who revealed thee*. He then said: Bring me one who is learned among you. Then a young man was brought. The transmitter then mentioned the rest of the tradition of stoning similar to the one transmitted by Malik from Nafi' " (see also No. 4431).

Hence, Muhammad not only believes in the integrity of the Jewish Scripture, but respects it enough to place it on a cushion! This in effect proves that corruption refers to misinterpretation, not to textual tampering.

This following story is taken from Ibn Ishaq's *Sira Rasulullah*:

"Raft b. Haritha and Sallam b. Mishkam and Malik b. al-Sayf and Rafi b. Huraymila came to him and said: 'Do you not allege that you follow the religion of Abraham AND BELIEVE IN THE TORAH WHICH WE HAVE AND TESTIFY THAT IT IS THE TRUTH FROM GOD?' He replied, 'CERTAINLY, but you have sinned and broken the covenant contained therein and concealed what you were ordered to make plain to man, and I disassociate myself from your sin.' They said, 'We hold by what we have. We live according to the guidance and the truth and we do not believe in you and we will not

follow you.’ So God sent down concerning them: ‘Say O Scripture folk, you have no standing until you observe the Torah and the Gospel and what has been sent down to you from your Lord. What has been sent down to thee from thy Lord will assuredly increase many of them in error and unbelief. But be not sad because of the unbelieving people’ ” (Alfred Guillaume, *The Life of Muhammad*, p. 268).

Muhammad believes in the Torah available in his day as the truth from God. His skepticism was not directed towards the purity of the text itself, but the Jewish misinterpretation of God’s holy Book. Hence, there is no evidence that Muhammad believed that the Holy Bible had been tampered with.

Muslims, both of the past and present, who agree with this, include Ibn Abbas, Ali at-Tabari, al-Baidhawi, ar-Razi, al-Ghazzali, Ibn Taymiyya, Muhammad Abduh, Maulawi Muhammad Sa’id, Sayyid Ahmad Husayn Shawkat Mirthi, Maulawi Chiragud-Din, Mahmoud Ayoub, Ibn Khaldun, and Adil Ozdemir. All these scholars affirm that the Quran in no way assumes the corruption of the Biblical text, but rather, the People of the Book’s deliberate misinterpretation of it (cf. E. Hahn, op. cit., Appendix III; Gerhard Nehls, *Dear Abdallah*, p. 9).

For instance, Muhammad Abduh Sayyid Ahmad Khan, a religious and social reformer of modern times (died 1905), states:

“As far as the text of the Bible is concerned. it has not been altered... No attempt was made to present a diverging text as the authentic one” (M.H. Ananikian, *The Reforms and Religious Ideas of Sir Sayyid Ahmad Khan*. The Moslem World 14 (1934) p. 61).

Another example of a Muslim who agrees that the Bible is not corrupted is the Egyptian scholar, Muhammad ’Abduh. In regards to alleged biblical corruption, he notes that the

“charge of corruption of the Biblical texts makes no sense at all. It would not have been possible for Jews and Christians everywhere to agree on changing the text. Even if those in Arabia had done it, the difference between their book and those of their brothers, let us say in Syria and Europe, would have been obvious” (Jacques Jomier, *Jesus, The Life of the Messiah*, C.L.S., Madras, 1974, p. 216).

Furthermore, in the words of Mahmoud Ayoub:

“Contrary to the general Islamic view, the Qur’an does not accuse Jews and Christians of altering the text of their scriptures, but rather of altering the truth which those scriptures contain. The people do this by concealing some of the sacred texts, by misapplying their precepts, or by ‘altering words from their right position’ (4:26; 5:13, 41; see alS. 2:75). However, this refers more to interpretation than to actual addition or deletion of words from the sacred books. The problem of alteration (tahrif) needs further study” (“Uzayr in the Qur’an and Muslim Tradition” in *Studies in Islamic & Judaic Traditions*, ed. W.M. Brenner and S.D. Ricks, The University of Denver, 1986, p. 5.)

Finally, Islam’s premiere commentator, Ibn ’Abbas, believed in the preservation of all of God’s books:

“From Kitaab (the book of) Al-Tawheed, Baab (chapter) Qawlu Allah Ta’ala, ‘Bal Huwa Qur’aanun Majeed, fi lawhin Mahfooth’—Or, *the Book of the Oneness of God, the Chapter of Surat Al-Borooj* (no. 85), Verses 21, 22 which says, ‘Nay this is a Glorious



Qur'an, (Inscribed) in a Tablet Preserved': 'They corrupt the word' means 'they alter or change its meaning,' *Yet no one is able to change even a single word from any Book of God. The meaning is that they interpret the word wrongly.'* ”

And,

“The Imam Muhammad Isma'il al-Bukhari (p. 1127, line 7), records that Ibn 'Abbas said that 'the word TAHRIF (corruption) signifies to change a thing from its original nature; and that there is no man who could corrupt a single word of what proceeded from God, so that the Jews and Christians could corrupt only by misrepresenting the meaning of the words of God' ” (T. P. Hughes, *Dictionary of Islam* [Kazi Publications, Inc., 3023–27 West Belmont Avenue, Chicago, IL., 60618, 1994], p. 62).

Hence, the commentary of Abdullah Ibn 'Abbas, who is one of the Sahaba (companions) and Mohammed's cousin. His opinions are held to be above the opinions and commentaries of all other Sheiks who are not Sahaba.

Not only did Ibn 'Abbas believe that the scriptures remained uncorrupt, but others who wrote shortly after him concur:

“Ibn Mazar and Ibn Hatim state, in the commentary known as the *Tafsir Durr-I-Mansur*, that they have it on the authority of Ibn Muniyah, that the *Taurat* (i.e. the books of Moses), and the INJIL (i.e. the Gospels), are in the same state of purity in which they were sent down from heaven, and that no alterations had been made in them, but that the Jews were wont to deceive the people by unsound arguments, and by wresting the sense of Scripture... Shah Waliyu 'Illah, in his commentary, the *Fauzul'l-Kabir*, and also Ibn 'Abbas, support the same view” (T.P. Hughes, p. 62).

And,

“Ibn Kathir in his book *Al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya* quotes Muhammad saying about the Jews and Christians: 'David died in the midst of his friends. They were not led astray, nor changed [their books]. The Friends of Christ stayed in His ordinances and guidance for two hundred years' (proved by Ibn Hibban). It is wellknown that we have copies of the New Testament that go back to the fourth century A.D. These are in harmony with the books as they are today” (*True Guidance*, p. 179).

We must also point out that the idea of the Bible being corrupt was first promoted by Ibn Khazem (d. 1064 A.D.) as a means of avoiding the obvious contradictions between the Bible and the Quran. Believing that the Quran could not possibly have been corrupted, he then assumed that it was the Bible that underwent textual modifications. This, he felt, must have been the case (cf. Gerhard Nehls, *Dear Abdullah*, p. 9, Life Challenge [Africa, SIM International], July 1992).

This brief examination of the Quran should convince any open-minded Muslim that the Holy Bible has never suffered any textual corruption whatsoever, whether before, during, or after the advent of Islam. This factor makes it incumbent for all Muslims to earnestly study its message, embracing it wholeheartedly. To refuse to do so is to dishonor the very message of the Quran which came to confirm, not to correct, the truthfulness and authenticity of the Holy Bible, God's well-preserved Word.

For a more in-depth study into the Quranic affirmation of the authenticity of the Holy Bible, we recommend the following two books: Ernest Hahn & Ghiyathuddin Adelphi: *The Integrity of the Bible According to the Qur'an and the Hadith*, Fellowship of Faith for the Muslims, P.O.

Box 65214, Toronto, Ontario, Canada M4K 3Z2; and Dr. William Campbell: *The Quran and the Bible in the Light of History and Science*, Middle East Resources, ISBN 1-881085-00-7.

**Note:** Our usage of the Quran does not imply our belief in its authority nor its inspiration. We quote it solely for the sake of convincing the Muslims of the Bible's authority and authenticity as a fact confirmed by their religious text.

## Appendix

### Sura 5:48 And Its Translation

The following translations of Surah 5:48 are cited in order to demonstrate how other Islamic scholars define the term MUHAIMIN:

“And We have sent down to thee the Book with the truth, confirming the Book that was before it, and ASSURING IT” (*The Koran Interpreted*, A.J. Arberry [Touchstone Books, Simon & Schuster Inc., 1996], p. 135).

The Quran assures the Bible, it does not expose corruption to it.

“And to you We have revealed the Book containing the truth, confirming the earlier revelations, AND PRESERVING THEM (FROM CHANGE AND CORRUPTION)” (*Al-Quran—A Contemporary Translation* by Ahmad Ali [Princeton University Press, New Jersey, fifth ed. 1994], p. 104).

Note how this Muslim understands the verse to mean that the Quran protects the Holy Bible from being corrupted and changed, not exposing corruption to the biblical text.

“Now We have revealed unto thee this Book comprising the truth, fulfilling that which was revealed before it of the Book, and as A GUARDIAN OVER IT” (*The Quran Arabic Text With a New Translation* by Muhammad Zafrullah Khan [Olive Branch, New York, 1997], p. 107).

“And We have revealed to you the Book with the truth, verifying what was before it of the Book and A GUARDIAN OVER IT” (*The Quran* by Mahomedali Habib, trans. M.H. Shakir [Tahrike Tarsile Quran Inc., 1995], p. 103).

“And to thee We have sent down the Book of the Koran with truth, confirmatory of previous Scriptures, AND THEIR SAFEGUARD” (*The Koran* by J.M. Rodwell [Ivy Books, New York, 1993], p. 67). The Quran SAFEGUARDS the Bible.

“And We have revealed to thee the Book with the truth, verifying that which was before it of the Book and a guardian over it” (*Holy Quran Arabic Text, English Translation and Commentary* by Maulana Muhammad Ali [Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Ishaat Islam Lahore Inc., U.S.A., 1995] p. 256).

“And to you We have revealed the Book with the truth. It confirms the Scriptures which came before it and stands as A GUARDIAN OVER IT” (*The Koran Revised Translation* by N.J. Dawood [Penguin Books, England, 1997], p. 85).

The Quran assures, preserves, guards, and safeguards the Bible. These translations made by both Muslim and non-Muslim scholars clearly demonstrate the polemical nature of those Muslim apologists who try to read into this verse Bible corruption.

Further articles by Sam Shamoun about the Qur'an about the Bible can be found on the Answering Islam home page at [www answering-islam.org](http://www.answering-islam.org)

# **Muhammad, Aisha, Islam and Child Brides**

**By Silas**

## **Introduction**

Muhammad was 52 and Aisha was 9 when they married and sexually consummated their marriage. Muhammad followed an Arab custom in marrying a child who had her first menstrual cycle. This action must be questioned, regardless of it being a cultural norm, because Muhammad's action and teachings on marriage established an Islamic precedent: a girl is judged an adult following her first menses, and is eligible for marriage and sexual relations. Thus Muslim men are allowed to marry and have intercourse with young girls who have happened to have an early first menstrual cycle. As will be shown, this leads to physical and psychological damage to the child.

Muhammad's first wife, Khadija, died a few years before he fled to Medina. Later, he was encouraged to take another wife. At the age of 49 he was betrothed to Aisha, age six. Aisha was his closest friend, Abu Bakr's, daughter. At that time, she had already been betrothed to another man but by mutual consent the betrothal was dissolved. Three years later, following her first menstrual cycle, he then formally married and sexually consummated his marriage with her.

Most Western people know it is not in a 9 year old girl's best interest to engage in marriage and sexual relations with a 52 year old man, regardless of the cultural setting. We know that, in our culture today, a person doing such a thing could possibly be sent to prison for sex with a minor, statutory rape, or other related laws. Most of us find it questionable for Muhammad, a self proclaimed prophet of God, to do such a thing. We expect a real prophet to know better, or at least hear from God on the matter.

What is more critical than Muhammad's single action with Aisha is that he taught that a girl is considered an adult following her first menstrual cycle. He also taught that his followers were to follow his "sunnah" or lifestyle. Thus today, throughout much of the Mideast, girls as young as nine are often married by men old enough to be their grandfathers.

But why then do we find it objectionable? After all, Muhammad did not live in our culture or under our law. He lived under a Semitic culture. And this custom of marrying girls after their first menses existed in the Mideast long before Muhammad. What is the basis for rejection of this Semite custom and Muhammad's precedent? Are there any valid reasons to criticize it? Or should it simply be rejected based upon our own cultural bias?

I'll address this and other issues in this paper, and a discussion of the consequences of his deed as well. However some fundamental groundwork needs to be laid before moving on. Aisha's actual age is the first point that needs to be established. Within the Islamic world there is division concerning Aisha's age when she sexually consummated her marriage. Many Muslims in the West have a hard time accepting Aisha was only a little girl of 9 when their "prophet" had sex with her. Some Muslims, and even Western writers, wrote that she did not have sex with

Muhammad until she was 14 or so. I've never seen any textual Islamic support for their position, only conjecture. But the thought of their prophet committing such an act is embarrassing to them, so they invent, or re-write, documented Islamic history to make it more acceptable to their minds and the minds of other Western people as well.

## **Evidence that Aisha Was 9 When Her Marriage to Muhammad Was Consummated**

There are a number of sources, all written by Muslims, that detail Muhammad's marriage and consummation with his young child-bride Aisha.

### **From the Hadith of Sahih Bukhari**

I have used Bukhari's Hadith, translated into English by Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan, at the Islamic University in Medina. Bukhari's Hadith is considered authentic by the majority of Sunni Islamic scholars. It is second to the Quran in terms of importance. The central figure to approve and sign the translation is Dr. Amin AlMasri, Ph.D. Cambridge University. He is the Advisor and Head of the Sharia Department at the College of Sharia and Islamic Studies in Mecca.

From Bukhari vol. 7, No. 65:

“Narrated Aisha that the prophet wrote the marriage contract with her when she was six years old and he consummated his marriage when she was nine years old. Hisham said: ‘I have been informed that Aisha remained with the prophet for nine years (i.e. till his death).’ ”

Bukhari vol. 7, No. 88:

“Narrated Urwa: ‘The prophet wrote the (marriage contract) with Aisha while she was six years old and consummated his marriage with her while she was nine years old and she remained with him for nine years (i.e. till his death).’ ”

Bukhari vol. 5, No. 234 says:

“Narrated Aisha: The prophet engaged me when I was a girl of six. We went to Medina and stayed at the home of Harith Kharzraj. Then I got ill and my hair fell down. Later on my hair grew (again) and my mother, Um Ruman, came to me while I was playing in a swing with some of my girl friends. She called me, and I went to her, not knowing what she wanted to do to me. She caught me by the hand and made me stand at the door of the house. I was breathless then, and when my breathing became all right, she took some water and rubbed my face and head with it. Then she took me into the house. There in the house I saw some Ansari women who said, ‘Best wishes and Allah's blessing and a good luck.’ Then she entrusted me to them and they prepared me (for the marriage). Unexpectedly Allah's messenger came to me in the forenoon and my mother handed me over to him, and at that time I was a girl of nine years of age.”

### **From the Hadith of Sahih Muslim Volume 2, No. 3309**

“Aisha reported: Allah's Messenger married me when I was six years old, and I was admitted to his house at the age of nine.”

## **From the Hadith of the Sunan of Abu Dawud**

Abu Dawud's Hadith is the third most respected Hadith in Islam.

From Abu Dawud, Vol. 2, No. 2116:

“Aisha said, ‘The Apostle of Allah married me when I was seven years old.’ (The narrator Sulaiman said: ‘Or six years.’). ‘He had intercourse with me when I was 9 years old.’ ”

## **From the History of Tabari**

Tabari wrote the most authentic Islamic history. It covers 39 volumes. Tabari was one of the greatest Islamic scholars and the greatest Islamic historian.

From Tabari, volume 7, page 7:

“... my marriage (to Muhammad) was consummated when I was nine...”

From Tabari, volume 9, page 131

“ ‘Then the men and women got up and left. The Messenger of God consummated his marriage with me in my house when I was nine years old. Neither a camel nor a sheep was slaughtered on behalf of me’ ... (The Prophet) married her three years before the Emigration, when she was seven years old and consummated the marriage when she was nine years old, after he had emigrated to Medina in Shawwal. She was eighteen years old when he died.”

I also want to provide evidence from the best Islamic encyclopedia available in English, and other Islamic writers. They also acknowledge Aisha's age being 9.

## **From the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, Under**

**“Aisha” (Published by E.J. Brill).**

“Some time after the death of Khadija, Khawla suggested to Muhammad that he should marry either Aisha, the 6 year old daughter of his chief follower, or Sawda Zama, a widow of about 30, who had gone as a Muslim to Abyssinia and whose husband had died there. Muhammad is said to have asked her to arrange for him to marry both. It had already been agreed that Aisha should marry Djubayr Mutim, whose father, though still pagan, was friendly to the Muslims. By common consent, however, this agreement was set aside, and Muhammad was betrothed to Aisha... The marriage was not consummated until some months after the Hijra, (in April 623, 624). Aisha went to live in an apartment in Muhammad's house, later the mosque of Median. She cannot have been more than ten years old at the time and took her toys to her new home.”

From the Muslim book *Women in Islam* by Said Abjullah Seif-Al-Hatimy, published by Islamic Publications in Lahore, Pakistan:

“...(Aisha) She was the youngest of his wives. It is said that she was nine years of age when he married her.”

## **Summation of the Evidence of Aisha's Age**

I've belabored the point. But because of the controversy within the Islamic world I had to document her age thoroughly. The most respected Hadith and Islamic scholars from early on until this present day state that Aisha was 9 when Muhammad engaged in sexual relations with her.

### **Definition of the Word *Translated as Consummate***

There has been some confusion about the definition of the word "consummate." In Sahih Bukhari, vol. 7, No. 64, the root word used is "dakhala." From the *Hans-Wehr Arabic-English Dictionary*, p. 273, it means "to enter, to pierce, to penetrate, to consummate the marriage, cohabit, sleep with a woman."

I have also asked two native Arabic speakers to confirm the definition of the word used in Bukhari. They read Bukhari in Arabic for themselves, and did indeed say it meant that Muhammad had sexual intercourse with Aisha when she was 9.

### **Islam and the Age of Puberty**

Islam teaches that female puberty begins when the menses is started.

From Bukhari, volume 3, *Book of Witnesses*, chapter 18, page 513:

"The boy attaining the age of puberty and the validity of their witness and the Statement of Allah:

"And when the children among you attain the age of puberty, then let them also ask for permission (to enter)" Quran 24:59.

"Al Mughira said, 'I attained puberty at the age of twelve.' The attaining of puberty by women is with the start of menses, as is referred to by the Statement of Allah:

"Such of your women as have passed the age of monthly courses, for them the prescribed period if you have any doubts (about their periods) is three months... [65:4]

"...Al-Hasan bin Salih said, 'I saw a neighbouress of mine who became a grandmother at the age of twenty-one.'" [1] [1] The note for this reference says,

"This woman attained puberty at the age of nine and married to give birth to a daughter at ten; the daughter had the same experience."

My understanding of the above is that Islam considers that when a child "attains," or begins, "puberty," then he/she is considered an adult. Hence the validity of the witness.

Muhammad followed a cultural norm in marrying and having sex with a young girl. After all, she was considered an adult. Not only did he do that, but he taught his followers to do as he did. Therefore is acceptable for Muslim men to marry and have intercourse with girls who have had their menarche. Muhammad established this cultural practice as a precedent in Islam.

I add that there are other primitive cultures that allow girls to marry following their menarche. But that does not make it right or in the best interests of the child. Some cultures killed baby daughters for various reasons. Cultural norms do not make an action morally right.

### **Jewish Culture and Marriage**

The *Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible* says about Jewish marriage customs in volume 2, page 1407, under “Marriage”:

“Subsequently, minimum ages (for marriage) of 13 for boys and 12 for girls were set.”

And Jim West, Th.D., writes online [at <http://www.theology.edu/marriage.htm>], in “Ancient Israelite Marriage Customs”:

“The wife was to be taken from within the larger family circle (usually at the ‘outset of puberty’ or around the age of 13) in order to maintain the purity of the family line.”

Even in the Mishnah, the age of maturity for a female is 12.5 years:

“She won her case in court before she matured [at the age of twelve years and six months], lo, they belong to the father” Mishnah Ketubot, 4:1.

So we see that Jewish culture also allowed young girls to be married at an early age. Not as young as 9, but as young as 12. The beginning of puberty was not the cultural norm for the Jewish culture to allow marriage. I assume marriage was allowed if the girl had her menarche, AND she reached the age of 12. This is superior to Islam’s standard. Judaism insists that a girl must be at least 12, Islam allows for marriage following the first menses. I believe that there have been documented cases of girls having menarche as young as 8.

So here is the crux of the matter: do I, or anyone else, have the right to reprove Muhammad for instituting an accepted cultural norm as a legally permissible practice? Is it unjust criticism from me (and others) when we say that it is wrong to marry and engage in sex with young girls?

## Science and Puberty

How do the biological sciences address the topic of female puberty? Here are quotes from several college level text books, and the *World Book Encyclopedia*. There is a great deal of information presented, but it is necessary to provide scientific details to fully understand puberty.

### **From *Adolescence*, by L. Steinberg, Published by McGraw Hill, 1993.**

Page 22: “Puberty derives from the Latin word ‘pubertas,’ which means ‘adult.’ Technically, the term refers to the period during which an individual becomes capable of sexual reproduction, that is, it denotes the series of biological changes leading up to reproductive capability. More broadly speaking, however, puberty is used as a collective term to refer to all the physical changes that occur in the growing girl or boy as the individual passes from childhood into adulthood.”

Page 23: “Puberty may appear to be rather sudden, judging from its external signs, but in fact it is part of a gradual process that begins at conception (Petersen and Taylor, 1980). You may be surprised to learn that no new hormones are produced and no new bodily systems develop at puberty. Rather, some hormones that have been present since before birth increase, and other decrease.”

Page 26: “The effects of the endocrinological changes of puberty on the adolescent’s body are remarkable. Consider the dramatic changes in physical appearance that occur

during the short span of early adolescence. One enters puberty looking like a child and within FOUR years or so has the physical appearance of a young adult.”

Page 32: [This page shows a chart depicting that puberty lasts about 4 years in girls].

“Generally, full reproduction function does not occur until several years after menarche, and regular ovulation follows menarche by about two years (Hafetz, 1976)....

“The onset of puberty can occur as early as 8 years in girls and 9.5 in boys, or as late as 13 in girls and 13.5 in boys. In girls, the interval between the first sign of puberty and complete physical maturation can be as short as one and one-half years or as long as six years.... In more concrete terms, it is possible for an early-maturing, fast-maturing youngster to complete pubertal maturation by the age of 10 or 11—two years before a late-maturing youngster has even begun puberty.”

Pages 36–37: “(Although menarche does not signal the onset of puberty....) ...the average age at menarche generally is lower in those countries where individuals are less likely to be malnourished or suffer from chronic disease. For example, in western Europe and in the United States, the median menarcheal age ranges from about 12.5 years to 13.5 years. In Africa, however, the median menarcheal age ranges from 14 years to 17 years.”

Page 66: [There is a table depicting the four stages of cognitive development according to Piaget. It shows that the brain develops mature cognitive ability after age 11].

Page 73: [On page 73 he presents a table showing that the brain is not fully mature until about the age of 16. From this table, I estimate that at age 9, the maturation of the brain is between 50 to 60 percent.]

### **From *Adolescent Life Experiences*, by G. Adams and T. Gullotta, Published by Brooks/Cole, 1983:**

Page 89: “The onset of puberty is not a single, sudden event but a complex, gradual process. In perhaps oversimplified terms, puberty is characterized by (1) a spurt in physical growth, (2) maturation of physiological mechanisms, and (3) the appearance of secondary sex characteristics (for example, pubic hair or breast development). The onset of puberty is basically regulated by endocrine glands, important organs that create body changes through the secretion of chemicals into the bloodstream or lymphatic system.”

Page 92: “Although changes in height and breadth are important in adolescent development, society is more inclined to recognize the rapid maturation of the reproductive system during this period (D.D. Logan, Calder, & Cohen, 1980). The major stages in sexual maturation are (1) the initiation of puberty, which occurs approximately six months earlier in girls than in boys, (2) the development of secondary sex characteristics, which takes approximately four years; and (3) menarche, which occurs approximately two years after the onset of pubertal change (Marshall & Tanner, 1969, 1970).

Page 101: “Developmental Disorders: When the gonads become sexually mature and active before age 8 in girls or before age 9 in boys, pediatricians are inclined to diagnose ‘precocious puberty.’ When this condition occurs, the pubertal process is generally complete within two years.”



**From *From Adolescence—Transition from Childhood to Maturity*, by Lambert, Rothschild, Altland, & Green, Published by Brooks/Cole, 1978:**

Page 106: “The process of physical development that results in the end of childhood and the beginning of adolescence involves three overlapping stages: Prepuberty, pubescence, and puberty. Although this sequence is the same for all individuals, the times of onset and the lengths of these periods differ from one person to another (Thornburg, 1975).

“Prepuberty begins at the end of childhood with a rapid rise in hormone levels... It is also a period in which a rapid growth spurt begins and the secondary sex characteristics, such as the budding of the breast in girls and the enlargement of the testes and penises in boys, start to develop. Generally, girls experience these changes two years before boys; the average age of onset of this stage is 10 for females, 12 for males (Tanner, 1975).

“Pubescence, the second stage, is characterized by the proliferation of sex cells and near completion of the secondary sex characteristics (Thornburg, 1975). Pubescence begins with the menarche, or first menstruation, in girls... The appearance of these characteristics, however, does not necessarily indicate that the reproductive system is complete. It may be a matter of months or even years before the body is capable of reproduction.

“It is only with the third phase, puberty, that girls develop regular ovulatory menstrual cycles and the capability for procreation.... This period generally spans about two years for girls and about three years for boys, ending when all of the secondary sex characteristics have fully appeared and reproductive ability has been reached. Most boys are well into puberty by age 14 (Marshall, 1975), most girls by the age of 15–16.”

Page 108: “...the gradual decrease in the average age at which menarche has been occurring among Western European girls and apparently among girls of the United States and Canada as well (Botstein & McArthur, 1976).... The fact that research has indicated that this trend is just as evident among girls in temperate climates as among girls in warm climates would also tend to destroy the myth that girls mature earlier in warm climates than in more moderate ones.”

Page 111: “Abnormal growth and delayed or precocious puberty are usually associated with disorders in hypothalamic hormonal changes (Schonberg, 1975; Sizonenko, 1975).”

Pages 115–117: “In girls there initially appears a budding of the breasts, then the appearance of pubic hair, then the menarche, and finally ovulation.... Breast development and pubic hair first become visible at about 10–11 years of age, whereas the menarche occurs, on the average, in the range of 11–13 years, or approximately two years after initial breast development. Menstruation during pubescence is generally irregular, partly due to factors of emotion, tension, and nutrition. Reproductive maturity is usually attained from one to two years after the first menstruation, with maximum fertility developing in the early 20s (Lamburg et al., 1973)....

“The average age at menarche is 12.5 to 13. However, some normal girls may begin to menstruate as early as 9, while others may not start until the age of 16 (Offer & Offer, 1968)....

“Genital growth is usually not complete when menstruation begins, and this growth continues slowly for several more years. The menarche is frequently followed by a period

of sterility, which lasts until a regular ovulatory menstrual cycle is established. The duration of this period varies considerably; the first ovulation (the discharge of the first egg from the ovaries) may occur at menarche, or it may not take place until years later...

“For several months following the menarche, there is usually a lack of regularity in the extent and timing of the menstrual flow.”

**From “Child Adolescent Development,” By J. Brunk, Published by Wiley, 1975:**

Page 70: “Precocious puberty is the extreme opposite of delayed sexual maturation. In this condition, a girl may develop secondary sexual characteristics before the age of 8, or a boy before he is 10. This clearly can produce severe psychological problems for the affected child.”

**An Editor from *Psychology Today* States that:**

“Most research of which I’m aware shows that young people reach full intellectual maturity by age 11 or 12, whether or not they have achieved the physical changes of puberty.”

**From *The World Book Encyclopedia* Under “Sex” On Page 333 Regarding Puberty:**

“Puberty is the period of rapid growth that marks the end of childhood and the beginning of physical and sexual maturity (full development).”

**From the *World Book Encyclopedia* Under “Adolescent,” Page 61:**

“Most girls start puberty at about age 11. Most boys start at about age 13. Puberty ends when a girl or boy reaches sexual maturity—that is, becomes capable of reproduction. Most adolescents are sexually mature TWO OR THREE YEARS AFTER they start puberty” (Capitals mine).

**What are the Biological Sciences Telling Us About Puberty?**

To begin with, puberty does not begin with a girl’s menarche. It begins about a year or two earlier. Islam missed the mark on this. Islam considers that puberty and adulthood begin with the menarche.

Further, science teaches that puberty does not end with menarche. It takes at least two more years for a child to sexually mature. Islam also missed the mark on this end. Science shows that usually the female body still has a ways to go from the time a girl has her menarche to the time she is sexually able to reproduce, or is considered to have an adult body.

Science further documents that there are times when a child may have “precocious puberty” and have menarche as early as age 8. This is usually due to a dysfunction or disorder within the child. Aisha may have had precocious puberty. Although it happens, it is very rare that young children experience menarche at age 9. Aisha had been very sick prior to her “marriage” to

Muhammad. She had even lost some of her hair during her illness. Physically, she was having severe problems. Perhaps she was having some type of sickness that triggered her menarche, or she was experiencing some disorder that also caused the menarche. Either way, having menses at age 9 does not signify adulthood and justify marriage and engaging in sexual activities.

## **Puberty, Menarche, and Reproduction**

There is a misconception that when a young girl has her first menarche, she is capable of getting pregnant. Many primitive cultures believed that a girl can become pregnant following menarche; Muhammad's culture probably believed this as well. However, science tells us this is very rare. Instead, the average time for a girl to become pregnant following menarche is one to two years. Clearly then, girls are not "mature" following their menarche. There are no biological grounds to marry and engage post-menarcheal girls in sexual activity; they cannot conceive children yet. Puberty does not equal maturity, and therefore this misconception should not lead to marriage.

Logically then, menarche is not a sign of a female being able to bear children. Only at the end of puberty can a girl conceive, not at the beginning, not at the middle. Puberty usually takes several years to complete.

Muhammad erred in establishing Islamic grounds allowing men to marry post-menarcheal girls. The girls are not sexually mature, they are not mentally mature, and they are not physically mature. Muhammad's precedent (Sunnah) is a blight upon the children of the Muslim world.

## **Damage to Young Girls**

### **Scientific and Other Effects of Early Sexual Activity**

Besides the documented assessment of growth and puberty above, other scientific and research groups have specifically addressed the effects of teen pregnancy. This of course reflects upon Islam, since Muhammad took a child bride, and taught it was okay for others to do as well. Here are some excerpts from webpages that address this issue.

#### **From the American Academy of Pediatrics, at [Http://Www.Aap.Orgpolicy/02325.Html](http://www.aap.org/policy/02325.html)**

"Improvements in prenatal care have resulted in decreases in medical complications among babies born to teenage mothers, but mothers aged 14 years and younger continue to experience unacceptably high rates of adverse outcomes. The most significant medical risks for infants of teenage mothers are likely related to the parental care those infants receive after the first year of life. Infants born to younger teenage mothers have a higher rate of mortality by their second birthday than infants of older adolescents and adults. [3] The incidence of prenatal mortality and low birth weight increases with subsequent pregnancies in adolescents. [4] The morbidity experienced by the infants of young mothers is more subtle to define but has been reported to include increased rates of hospitalization and increased risks of accidents, poisonings, burns, and superficial injuries [5]...

“...In several studies the cognitive levels of infants of younger v older mothers have been compared, and the results indicate lower cognition among the infants of younger mothers.”

**From the United Way—March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation, Teenfacts,  
[Http://Babynet.Ddwi.Com/Tlc/Pregnancy/Teenfact.Html](http://Babynet.Ddwi.Com/Tlc/Pregnancy/Teenfact.Html)**

“Health Risks to the Mother”

“A teenage mother is more at risk of pregnancy complications such as premature or prolonged labor, anemia and high blood pressure. These risks are even greater for teens who are less than 15 years old.(3)”

“Health Risks to the Baby”

“A baby born to a teenage mother is more at risk than a baby born to an older mother.

“Nine percent of teenage girls have low-birthweight babies (under 5.5 lbs.), compared to 7 percent of all mothers nationally. (1)”

“Low-birthweight babies may have organs that are not fully developed. This can lead to lung problems such as respiratory distress syndrome, or bleeding in the brain.”

“Low-birthweight babies are 40 times more likely to die in their first month of life than normal-weight babies.”

**From the United Nations, [Http://Www.Unhchr.Ch/Html/Menu6/2/Fs23.Htm](http://Www.Unhchr.Ch/Html/Menu6/2/Fs23.Htm)**

**NOTE:** The webpage I obtained this from was particularly gruesome to read. Some sections, that did not pertain to this topic (like female genital circumcision, a practice found throughout the Islamic world and taught by one of the four major schools of Islamic theology), I could not finish reading myself. It was just too gross. Do not read it if you have a weak stomach, or are disturbed by reports about women being abused. In this paper, I have tried to edit out gruesome details that were not necessary.

“Harmful Traditional Practices’ Affect on the Health of Women and Children”

“An appraisal of harmful traditional practices and their effects on women and the girl child.

“Traditional cultural practices reflect values and beliefs held by members of a community for periods often spanning generations. Every social grouping in the world has specific traditional cultural practices and beliefs, some of which are beneficial to all members, while others are harmful to a specific group, such as women. These harmful traditional practices include female genital mutilation (FGM); forced feeding of women; early marriage; the various taboos or practices which prevent women from controlling their own fertility; nutritional taboos and traditional birth practices; son preference and its implications for the status of the girl child; female infanticide; early pregnancy; and dowry price. Despite their harmful nature and their violation of international human rights laws, such practices persist because they are not questioned and take on an aura of morality in the eyes of those practicing them....”

(NOTE: most of these are practiced by the Islamic world).

“Child marriage robs a girl of her childhood—time necessary to develop physically, emotionally and psychologically. In fact, early marriage inflicts great emotional stress as the young woman is removed from her parents’ home to that of her husband and in-laws. Her husband, who will invariably be many years her senior, will have little in common with a young teenager. It is with this strange man that she has to develop an intimate emotional and physical relationship. She is obliged to have intercourse, although physically she might not be fully developed....

“Health complications that result from early marriage in the Middle East and North Africa, for example, include the risk of operative delivery, low weight and malnutrition resulting from frequent pregnancies and lactation in the period of life when the young mothers are themselves still growing....

“The work of the Committee has also permitted the identification of certain areas where law reform should be undertaken, in both civil and penal areas, such as the minimum age for marriage and establishment of the age of criminal responsibility as being the attainment of puberty. Some States have argued that girls attain their physical maturity earlier, but it is the view of the Committee that maturity cannot simply be identified with physical development when social and mental development are lacking and that, on the basis of such criteria, girls are considered adults before the law upon marriage, thus being deprived of the comprehensive protection ensured by the Convention on the Rights of the Child. The International Conference on Population and Development, held at Cairo in September 1994, encouraged Governments to raise the minimum age for marriage. In her preliminary report to the Commission on Human Rights, the Special Rapporteur on violence against women, its causes and consequences, Ms. Radhika Coomaraswamy, also recognized that the age of marriage was a factor contributing to the violation of women’s rights...

“Early pregnancy can have harmful consequences for both young mothers and their babies. According to UNICEF, no girl should become pregnant before the age of 18 because she is not yet physically ready to bear children. Babies of mothers younger than 18 tend to be born premature and have low body weight; such babies are more likely to die in the first year of life. The risk to the young mother’s own health is also greater. Poor health is common among indigent pregnant and lactating women....

“An additional health risk to young mothers is obstructed labor, which occurs when the baby’s head is too big for the orifice of the mother. This provokes vesicovaginal fistulas, especially when an untrained traditional birth attendant forces the baby’s head out unduly....

“Generally throughout the developing world, the average food intake of pregnant and lactating mothers is far below that of the average male. Cultural practices, including nutritional taboos, ensure that pregnant women are deprived of essential nutrients, and as a result they tend to suffer from iron and protein deficiencies.”

So not only does science teach us that young girls are not mature just because they have had first menarche, but science teaches us that teen, or worse yet, pre-teenage girls should not be bearing children. Their bodies are not ready for it. These type of pregnancies are frequently harmful both to the mother and the child.

However, Islam does not take into account the child’s or mother’s health. Because it was part of Muhammad’s “sunnah,” (lifestyle), and because early marriage of girls is permitted in Islam (following menarche), it cannot change its position on this issue. Consequently, this type of

abuse occurs throughout the Islamic world. If anyone wants to see just how bad child abuse is in the Islamic world, read the above webpage posted by the United Nations.

Most of the barbaric cultural practices listed there are generally practiced in the Islamic world.

### **More Physical Damage to Young Girls**

Modern medicine teaches that a female's body is not fully developed at age 9. Sexual intercourse at that age could damage a female's sexual organs. For instance, at the age of 9 years old, the cervix of the female is yet undeveloped, as are many of the child's sexual organs. Further, intercourse at this age leads to an 80 percent increased risk in her developing cervical cancer later in life.

In the book *One River*, by Wade Davis, page 228 (Simon & Schuster), Davis documents how when young girls are subjected to intercourse with an adult male, their hips get damaged, because their bones are not fully formed:

“These were Loayza's concubines, Indian children who grew into adolescence physically deformed, their hips weak and permanently dislocated from intercourse.”

I am not saying that Aisha had deformed hips, or that Muhammad brutalized her. I am saying that just because a girl has her first menstrual cycle doesn't mean she qualifies as an adult. There are other factors that need to be considered. Islam however, fails to consider these factors.

### **Psychological Damage to Young Girls**

There have been several studies done on females who were married at a very young age, and then taken into sexual intercourse. Following is a citation from two of them.

“Sexual contact between children and adults: A life course perspective.” Browning, Christopher R.; Laumann, Edward O. Citation: *American Sociological Review*, v62n4, pp. 540–560, August 1997 Number: 03374356. Features: Table; Illustration; References. Copyright: American Sociological Association 1997.

“Research interest in the long-term effects of sexual contact between female children and adults has increased dramatically in the last two decades. Two sets of issues have driven this enhanced attention. The first concerns the nature and extent of the impact these experiences have on subsequent well-being in adulthood. Empirical research has offered evidence of the severe and wide ranging effects of adult-child sex by documenting its associations with a host of later ‘symptoms,’ such as low self-esteem, depression, anxiety, and sexual dysfunction.”

“In each reduced model (Model 1), we see that adult-child sexual contact is significantly associated with the outcome considered. Women who experienced adult-child sexual contact were 1.6 times as likely to report sexual desire dysfunction, 2.1 times as likely to report sexual response dysfunction, 2.4 times as likely to report high dysfunction, 1.6 times as likely to report low overall well being, 1.7 times as likely to report low relationship satisfaction, and had more sexual activities that they found appealing compared with those who had no coupled sexual experiences as children. For every outcome except high dysfunction and number of sex acts found appealing, the

introduction of the sexual trajectory variables (Models 2 and 3) renders the adult-child sexual contact coefficient insignificant, indicating that the effects of adult-child sex on adult outcomes are largely indirect, mediated through sexual trajectories.”

Another such study was done by Peter O. Ebigbo. In the German periodical for *Psychosomatic Medicine and Psychoanalysis* his work was published.

The abstract reads:

“Presents data on disturbed female clients whose marriages were arranged at age 9–13 years. When husbands had paid the dowry and fulfilled marriage customs, they were entitled to have sexual intercourse with their wives. Early sexual experience, mostly against the will of the underage girls, precipitated positive or negative reactions. In positive reaction cases, an imprinting fixation on the man took place. If the man died or rejected the young woman, a disorientation took place, resulting mostly in an inability to have sexual relationships with other men. If the reaction was negative, the woman did all she could to prevent sexual relationships with her husband through a variety of symptoms such as frequent pregnancies and secret love affairs.”

A quick review of Aisha’s life, during and following Muhammad’s death, shows that she exhibited some psychological problems:

1) She was extremely jealous of some of Muhammad’s other wives.

From Bukhari, 5.164:

“Narrated `Aisha:

“I did not feel jealous of any of the wives of the Prophet as much as I did of Khadija (although) she died before he married me, for I often heard him mentioning her, and Allah had told him to give her the good tidings that she would have a palace of Qasab (i.e. pipes of precious stones and pearls in Paradise), and whenever he slaughtered a sheep, he would send her women-friends a good share of it.”

2) She conspired with other wives and lied to and deceived Muhammad.

From Bukhari 7.192:

“Narrated `Ubaid bin `Umar:

“I heard `Aisha saying, ‘The Prophet used to stay for a long while with Zainab bint Jahsh and drink honey at her house. So Hafsa and I decided that if the Prophet came to anyone of us, she should say him, “I detect the smell of Maghafir (a nasty smelling gum) in you. Have you eaten Maghafir?” So the Prophet visited one of them and she said to him similarly. The Prophet said, “Never mind, I have taken some honey at the house of Zainab bint Jahsh, but I shall never drink of it anymore.” So there was revealed: “O Prophet! Why do you ban (for you) that which Allah has made lawful for you... If you two (wives of Prophet) turn in repentance to Allah,” ’ (66:1–4) addressing Aisha and Hafsa. ‘When the Prophet disclosed a matter in confidence to some of his wives’ (66:3) namely his saying: But I have taken some honey.”

3) She was a ringleader in the first Muslim civil war, the first time Muslims took arms up against other Muslims. According to the Hadith, Muslims went to hell for fighting in support of her. In the “Battle of the Camel,” thousands of Muslims were killed fighting against each other. Aisha’s side lost, and she was basically put under house arrest by Ali.

From Bukhari 9.204:

“Narrated Al-Hasan:

“(Al-Ahnaf said:) I went out carrying my arms during the nights of the affliction (i.e. the war between `Ali and `Aisha) and Abu Bakra met me and asked, ‘Where are you going?’ I replied, ‘I intend to help the cousin of Allah’s Apostle (i.e., `Ali).’ Abu Bakra said, ‘Allah’s Apostle said, “If two Muslims take out their swords to fight each other, then both of them will be from amongst the people of the Hell-Fire.” It was said to the Prophet, ‘It is all right for the killer but what about the killed one?’ He replied, ‘The killed one had the intention to kill his opponent.’ ”

5.116:

“Narrated Abu Wail:

“When `Ali sent `Ammar and Al-Hasan to (the people of) Kufa to urge them to fight, `Ammar addressed them saying, ‘I know that she (i.e. `Aisha) is the wife of the Prophet in this world and in the Hereafter (world to come), but Allah has put you to test, whether you will follow Him (i.e. Allah) or her.’ ”

So not only did Aisha help cause the death of thousands of Muslim men, she is pictured as acting against the very will of Allah.

One can only feel sorry for Aisha. Robbed of her childhood, becoming a bride to a man who had a large sexual appetite for many women, Aisha felt she had to at times lie to and deceive Muhammad to keep his attention. She ends up after her marriage to him, left all alone, forbidden to re-marry. Later, she helps lead the first Muslim civil war, causing the death of thousands of Muslims, who according to Islam, would go to hell for fighting each other. Finally defeated, she is not executed but ordered to live the rest of her days, basically under house arrest, in Medina.

Abusive Islamic religious practices in the world today

Sandra Mackey, in *Saudis, Inside the Desert Kingdom*, writes on page 161:

“Girls are considered marriageable from the time they reach puberty. The lower class marries very young. The ages for marriage and first pregnancy on Tarut Island, off the east coast, were published in a rare study on women that I unearthed from a library. In the group as a whole, the mean age for marriage was fourteen, with the first pregnancy occurring at sixteen. Out of 193 girls, three married as young as ten. Among the Bedouins and the rural poor, a girl can be the second of two wives, married to a man older than her father, the mother of several children, and suffering from severe depression by the age of eighteen.”

Miriam Ali, in *Without Mercy*, published by Warner Books, 1995, tells the story of her daughters being abducted and sold as wives in Yemen. Their names are Nadia and Zana. The girls were both in their early teens. Here are relevant excerpts:

Page 123: “Gowan (a man who purchased one of Miriam’s daughters) laughed in my face. ‘They are not your daughters Miriam, they are ours (because the men purchased the girls). Mine and Abdul Khada. I paid good money for Nadia to bear children for my son, as Abdul Khada paid for Zana.... Muthana (Miriam’s husband) knows this. He knew this when we struck our deal. He has no problem with it....’ ‘Do you think I would allow this, the sale of my own daughters?’ ‘What is it to do with you Miriam? This is man’s business, nothing for a woman to concern herself with.’ ”



Page 300: “I discovered that I wasn’t the only one to have suffered at the hands of a Shamiri. I now knew at least 5 other mothers who have had their children taken to Yemen. This had accounted for at least 10 other children, the majority of them female. I knew that there were many more like them.

“Zana had met so many girls taken from the Midlands (England), taken by force, who were now in Yemen. One was a petite blonde from Derby. She was 9 years old when she was taken and had already three miscarriages when she became pregnant a fourth time. This time the child had been stillborn. The death of this little baby had taken the child-mother’s sanity. She was 12 years old. Another, also 12 years old, often chatted to Zana, telling her she could still count to 10 in English. She told Zana how desperate she was to go home to England. As they talked together, she suckled a child at her breast.”

Page 387: “It’s the Islam man, I am Muslim, I can’t come home with you. He said he would bring me, but it is not up to me, if—if I can come home or not, it is up to him. I want to come home, but...”

Page 390: “Imagine if you will, that this is your life, that this has happened to your own flesh and blood. Imagine a strange man touching her, beating her, raping her, impregnating her, then laughing smugly in her face as she suffers.”

“Please don’t forget me, please don’t leave me here too long, please.”—Nadia Muhsen, Taiz, Yemen. February, 1992.

From Princess, by Jean Sasson

Page 74: “In Saudi Arabia, the appearance of the first menses means that it is time to select the first veil and abaaya.”

Page 75: “A child enters the store, but a woman emerges, veiled, and on that day, of marriageable age. Her life changes in that split second.”

There are other books I could quote from, but the above is enough to illustrate the point: in the Islamic world today, Muhammad’s “sunnah,” or lifestyle, has led to the legal abuse of young children. Many of them are coerced, either by their fathers, family, or their families’ financial situation, to accept marriage with a man old enough to be their grandfather. Other girls probably don’t even understand what they are getting into when they are approached to marry a man.

Starting after the first menses, these children are valued greatly for their virginity, exploited by lustful old men, who purchase the girl with a dowry, and use them for sexual gratification and child-bearing. They are left to live as second class people, in a culture based upon Muhammad’s life. This is the Islam that Muslims in the West don’t want to tell you about, or do not know about themselves at all, living in countries with better standards than their religion teaches.

### **Was Aisha Mature Enough to Decide for Herself? are Young Girls Old Enough to Decide for Themselves?**

From reading Aisha’s accounts in the Hadith and Tabari’s history, it is obvious that she raised no objection in marrying Muhammad. She was still playing with her dolls. It all happened so quickly that she didn’t know what was going on. This is not surprising. As stated, the brain’s ability to be maturely cognitive occurs well after age 9. At age 9, Aisha was barely able to comprehend the world around her. She knew that Muhammad was someone special, she knew that her father loved him. She went along for the ride. Literally. In fact, before the wedding

ceremony, Muhammad had her sit in his lap! One could only wonder what he was thinking. So because Aisha raised no objection does not make it right. She was too young to truly think and decide for herself.

And what about all the other little girls in the Islamic world who are not “fortunate” enough to marry a celebrity like Muhammad? Do they really have a choice? Are their voices heard? According to what is documented, many are not. Many little girls become severely depressed following Muhammad’s “Sunnah” in the Islamic world.

## **Cultural Norms**

Some Muslims insist that Muhammad should not be judged by our culture today. But what we are dealing with goes far deeper than cultural practices. Muhammad established a cultural “norm.” This practice of taking young girls continues to exist in the Muslim world today. Culture is important.

Muhammad had the ability to change and shape the culture of the people who followed him or submitted to him. He ordered his followers to not bury alive their baby daughters, he forbade the use of alcohol, he mandated inheritance rules for male and female, he instituted slavery as an Islamic norm. If this topic dealt with Muhammad alone (for example, only he was allowed to have 11 wives), then I wouldn’t judge him so harshly. But he proclaimed himself as the final prophet of God. He taught his followers to follow his lifestyle, i.e., to have their culture centered around his way of life. If it was good enough for Muhammad to take a young girl, then it is OK for Muslim men today to do this.

Just because an action is a cultural norm does not make it morally right. In Muhammad’s culture it was morally acceptable for him to do what he did to Aisha. The people of Muhammad’s time, both his followers and enemies, did not think it was wrong for Muhammad to do this. But it is no longer morally acceptable to continue this barbaric practice. Today, we know better.

Take for example smoking cigarettes. About 50 years ago, 50 percent of all American males were smokers. It was culturally acceptable to smoke. It was a sign of being cool, tough, with-it, etc. However, that has changed. From science, today we know that smokers are addicted to the drug nicotine. From science, we know that smoking causes cancer and other illnesses. Praise God, our culture regarding smoking has changed, and is continuing to change. What was once culturally acceptable is now becoming culturally unacceptable. We have learned, and changed.

In the same way, just because Muhammad’s culture accepted marrying and having sex with girls following their menarche, does not make it absolutely morally right. In the light of today’s science, we know it is morally wrong to do this to young girls. Muhammad should be condemned, not for what he solely did to Aisha, but because he instituted this evil practice as part of Islam’s culture.

## **Muhammed’s Reasons for Marrying Aisha**

Another claim Muslims make to justify Muhammad’s marriage is that Muhammad was cementing his bond with Aisha’s father, Abu Bakr. But, we read in Tabari that that was not the reason Muhammad married her: Here is the quote from Tabari, volume 9, page 129.

“The Reason Why the Messenger of God Asked for the Hands of Both Aisha and Sawdah in Marriage...

“...When Khadijah died, Khawlah, wife of Uthman, who was in Mecca, said (to the Messenger of God), ‘O Messenger of God, will you not marry?’ He replied, ‘Whom?’ ‘A maiden [virgin],’ she said, ‘if you like, or a non-maiden.’ He replied, ‘Who is the maiden?’ ‘The daughter of the dearest creature of God to you,’ she answered, ‘Aisha bint Abi Bakr.’....

“She went to Abu Bakr’s house, where she found Umm Ruman, mother of Aisah and said, ‘O Umm Ruman, what a good thing and a blessing has God brought to you!’ She said, ‘What is that?’ Khawlah replied, ‘The Messenger of God has sent me to ask for Aisha’s hand in marriage on his behalf.’ ”

The story goes on to describe how Abu Bakr then gave his daughter in marriage (equal to betrothal) when she was 6.

Note here there is nothing at all about “cementing ties,” between Abu Bakr and Muhammad. Instead, all we see is a match maker hooking up Muhammad with Aisha. Anyone familiar with Abu Bakr knows that his relationship to Muhammad needed no cementing. He put his life on the line for Muhammad many times and followed him through thick and thin.

## **Examination**

Muhammad said that God said about Muhammad in the Quran:

“Surely in the Messenger of God you have a good example” 33:21.

What kind of example was he in allowing child abuse? Was there any wisdom in what Muhammad allowed? Were there any lessons to be learned from allowing this type of child abuse? Was God in any of this? Did Muhammad’s people and culture benefit from establishing this practice? Of course not. Muhammad proclaimed himself as a guide and a light for his followers. Yet through his actions alone, thousands, if not millions of Muslim girls have been subjected to this harmful practice. Where was the light? Where was the guidance? Where was the wisdom? It was nothing more than a cultural practice, instituted by Muhammad as part of Islam. It turns out to be destructive. But because it was good enough for Muhammad, it is good enough for Muslims; many of their female children suffer as a result.

## **What’s the Verdict?—Evidence from the Biological Sciences=Muhammad Judged**

How then should Muhammad be judged? By our cultural and legal standards, Muhammad committed a crime. And I do thank God that our standards are better than his and those of Islam’s when it comes to protecting children. But Muhammad didn’t live under our standards. Instead, he lived under the standards of his own time, and those of his making.

I am not saying Muhammad was a pedophile or a pervert. But I am saying that what he did was wrong, and worse, he established it as an acceptable act. He may not have committed misconduct according to his cultural norms, but since he claimed to set up his “sunnah,” i.e. “lifestyle,” for all his followers, we can judge him accordingly. Muhammad instituted a convention of sexual misconduct, i.e. allowing girls, who were not truly ready for marriage, to be taken.

He may have not known better, but he should not be excused for setting up a system that institutionalizes child abuse. He proclaimed that his lifestyle was the one to be emulated, and in part, he bears the judgment for this child abuse in the Islamic world today. Girls at age 9 are not mature enough, either physically, emotionally, or mentally, to be put into those types of “marriage” situations. Shouldn’t he be found guilty according to his own words and actions?

## Questions

1) Muhammad and Islam establish the right to marry and have intercourse with any girl who has had her first menstrual cycle. Science proves this is bad for the child. If Muhammad were from God, would God have allowed that perverse dictum to be set in motion?

2) What consideration is given to the young girls in Saudi, Yemen, and elsewhere in the Islamic world, who for one reason or another, are taken in marriage following their first menstrual cycle? Many accounts of life in Saudi Arabia for women detail how depressing life is for Saudi women, especially for those who do not have access to Saudi’s great wealth. Shouldn’t these young girls be given a chance to live a better life?

3) Wouldn’t a real God have put in place better, more responsible guidelines for dealing with children? Couldn’t God have given Muhammad a “revelation” to protect young female children until they are older or more mature for marriage? After all, why did it have to be allowed following the first menstrual cycle?

## Conclusion

It is clear that Muhammad had intercourse with Aisha when she was 9 years old. Since girls at that age are not fully mature either physically, emotionally, or psychologically, we know that it is wrong for a man, regardless of his age, to engage a child in sexual relations. No other conclusion can be drawn. No one would expect a real prophet of a righteous God to engage in, justify, allow, and prescribe for his followers such an malignant act.

Muhammad established an appalling precedent for Islam, Muslims, and young girls. This was not based upon wisdom, knowledge, or science, but only upon his culture, desires, actions, and teachings. He should be judged as a man who established child abuse as a norm in Islam.

Does an Arab CUSTOM of having sexual intercourse with young girls after their first menstrual cycle, mitigate the action of a 52 year old man who claimed to be a Prophet of God? Or is the fact that Muhammad followed these customs and had sexual intercourse with Aisha at the age of 9 years, while she is still playing with toys, to be overlooked? That’s for you to decide.

Jesus said, “You shall know them by their fruits,” [Matthew 7:20](#). We see that one of Muhammad’s fruits was allowing young girls to be subjected to a brutal custom.

## Bibliography

Bukhari’s Hadith, translated into English by Dr. Muhammad Muhsin Khan.

Abu Dawud’s Hadith is the third most respected Hadith in Islam.

*The History of Tabari*

*The Encyclopedia of Islam*

From the Muslim book *Women in Islam* by Said Abjullah Seif-Al-Hatimy, published by Islamic Publications in Lahore, Pakistan.

*The Baker Encyclopedia of the Bible*

*Ancient Israelite Marriage Customs*, by Jim West, <http://www.theology.edu/marriage.htm>

*Adolescent Life Experiences*, by G. Adams and T. Gullotta, published by Brooks/Cole, page

4.

*Adolescence*, by L. Steinberg, published by McGraw Hill, 1993.

*Adolescence—Transition from Childhood to Maturity*, by Lambert, Rothschild, Altland, and Green, published by Brooks/Cole.

*Child Adolescent Development*, by J. Brunk, published by Wiley, 1975.

From the American Academy of Pediatrics, at <http://www.aap.org/policy/02325.html>

From the United Way—March of Dimes Birth Defects Foundation: Teenfacts

<http://babynet.ddwi.com/tlc/pregnancy/teenfact.html>

From the United Nations <http://www.unhchr.ch/html/menu6/2/fs23.htm>

childbrides.htm Rev A: 97-07-10, Rev B: 97-11-24, Rev C: 97-12-10, Rev D: 98-4-1, Rev

E: 98-8-8, Rev F: 99-1-1, Rev G: 9/8/01

For more articles by Silas see the Answering Islam home page at [www.answering-islam.org](http://www.answering-islam.org)

# Muhammad

## And the Female Captives

By Silas

### Introduction

Muhammad and his followers fought many battles. Some were offensive, some were defensive. Following a victory the Muslims would take captives, or prisoners of war. Muhammad would usually distribute the captives, both male and female, as slaves to his soldiers. Islam provides some basic rights to its slaves but these rights are limited. Naturally, the rights or demands of the slave owner were greater than those of the slaves.

Female slaves were used primarily for work. But they also provided another service to their male masters.

The material I present is detailed but it needs to be provided to document support from all Islamic sources.

Here is the source material I use.

1) The Quran-N.J. Dawood's translation.

2) The Hadith collection of Bukhari. This collection of stories/traditions is the second most important set of books in Islam. It follows the Quran.

3) The Hadith collection of Muslim (third most important set of writings).

4) The Hadith collection of Abu Dawud.

5) The biography of Muhammad, known as "Sirat Rasulallah," written by Ibn Ishaq, and translated by A. Guillaume as *The Life of Muhammad* (the most authentic biography of Muhammad's life).

6) The biographical material found in Ibn Sa'd's "Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir" (*Book of the Major Classes*). This was translated by S. Moinul Haq.

7) *The History of Tabari*. This 39 volume set is almost finished being translated by a collection of both Muslim and non-Muslim scholars.

From the Quran — 70:22–30

“Not so the worshippers, who are steadfast in prayer, who set aside a due portion of their wealth for the beggar and for the deprived, who truly believe in the Day of Reckoning and dread the punishment of their Lord (for none is secure from the punishment of their Lord); who restrain their carnal desire (save with their wives and their slave girls, for these are lawful to them: he that lusts after other than these is a transgressor...”

This verse shows that Muslim men were allowed to have sex with their wives (of course) and their slave girls.

From the Quran — 23:5,6

“...who restrain their carnal desires (except with their wives and slave girls, for these are lawful to them...”

Again, Muslim men were allowed to have sexual relations with their wives and slave girls.

From the Quran — 4:24

“And all married women are forbidden unto you save those captives whom your right hand possess. It is a decree of Allah for you. (Muhammad Pickthall’s English translation of the Quran).

This verse is one verse out of a long passage dealing with who Muslim men can marry or have sexual relations with. The phrase “captives whom your right hand possess,” means the slave girls Muslim men own.

Note also that this passage deals with more than just marriage. In Sahih Muslim volume 2, No. 3432, the background context for this Quranic verse is given. It relates to the events at Autus, and it permitted the Muslim men to have sex with their female slaves.

From the Quran — 33:50

“Prophet, We have made lawful to you the wives whom you have granted dowries and the slave girls whom God has given you as booty...”

This verse is for Muhammad. Supposedly, God allows Muhammad to have sex with his slave girls.

These verses establish that it was permissible for Muslim men to have sex with female slaves.

### **Islamic Examples of Muslim Men Having Sex with Their Female Slaves**

Muhammad had sex with a slave girl named Mariyam. He probably also had sex with another slave girl of his—Rayhana.

Mariyam was a Christian slave girl and she was given to Muhammad as a gift by the governor of Egypt. Muhammad got her pregnant and she gave birth to a son. Afterwards Muhammad married her. The son died 18 months later.

Here is the reference. Note: Words in [ ] type brackets are mine.

In the “Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir,” mention is made of Mariyah. On page 151, it says:

“He [the Lord of Alexandria] presented to the prophet Mariyah, her sister Sirin, a donkey and a mule which was white.... The apostle of Allah liked Mariyah who was of white complexion and curly hair and pretty.... Then he cohabited with Mariyah as a handmaid and sent her to his property which he had acquired from Banu al-Nadir.”

The note for the word “handmaid” says:

“Handmaids gained the status of wedded wives if they bore children. They were called ‘umm walad’ and became free.”

This story is also supported by Tabari’s History, volume 39, page 194. Here is the quote: my words are in ( ) parentheses.

“He (Muhammad) used to visit her (Mariyah) there and ordered her to veil herself, (but) he had intercourse with her by virtue of her being his property.”

The note (845) on this says:

“That is, Mariyah was ordered to veil herself as did the Prophet’s wives, but he did not marry her.”

We see that Muhammad had sex with his female slave without marrying her, that it was legal in Islam for Muslim men to have sex with their female slaves. They were after all, the Muslim man’s property. Although the slave girls had some human rights, when it came to satisfying their master’s desires they had to comply.

Let’s examine some background material found in the Hadiths of Bukhari, Muslim, and Abu Dawud, and in the Sirat literature of Ibn Ishaq’s—“Sirat Rasulallah,” and Ibn Sa’d’s “Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir.” Note that both Sirat works were written BEFORE the Hadith, but they do not supersede the Hadith or Quran in authenticity according to Muslim scholars.

From Sahih Bukhari Volume 3, No. 432:

“Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri that while he was sitting with Allah’s messenger we said, ‘Oh Allah’s messenger, we got female captives as our booty, and we are interested in their prices, what is your opinion about coitus interruptus?’ The prophet said, ‘Do you really do that? It is better for you not to do it. No soul that which Allah has destined to exist, but will surely come into existence.’ ”

(also refer to Bukhari Volume 3, No. 718)

From Sahih Bukhari Volume 9, No. 506:

“Narrated Abu Said Al-Khudri that during the battle with Bani Al-Mustaliq they (Muslims) captured some females and intended to have sexual relations with them without impregnating them. So they asked the prophet about coitus interruptus. The prophet said, ‘It is better that you should not do it, for Allah has written whom He is going to create till the Day of Resurrection.’ Qaza’a said, ‘I heard Abu Said saying that the prophet said, ‘No soul is ordained to be created but Allah will create it.’ ”

(also refer to Bukhari 5:459).

From Sahih Bukhari Volume 5, No. 637:

“Narrated Buraida: The prophet sent Ali to Khalid to bring the Khumus (part of the war booty) and I hated Ali, and Ali had taken a bath (after a sexual act with a slave girl from the Khumus). I said to Khalid, ‘Don’t you see this (i.e. Ali)?’ When we reached the prophet I mentioned that to him. He said, ‘O Buraida! Do you hate Ali?’ I said, ‘Yes.’ He said, ‘Do you hate him for he deserves more than that from the Khumus?’ ”

The note for 637 explains that Buraida hated Ali for taking from the Khumus, and Buraida thought that was not good.

From Sahih Muslim Volume 2, No. 3371:

“Abu Sirma said to Abu Said al Khudri: ‘O Abu Said, did you hear Allah’s messenger mentioning about al-azl (coitus interruptus)?’ He said, ‘Yes,’ and added: ‘We went out with Allah’s messenger on the expedition to the Mustaliq and took captive some excellent Arab women; and we desired them for we were suffering from the absence of our wives, (but at the same time) we also desired ransom for them. So we decided to have sexual intercourse with them but by observing azl’ (with-drawing the male sexual organ before emission of semen to avoid conception). But we said: ‘We are doing an act whereas Allah’s messenger is amongst us; why not ask him?’ So we asked Allah’s messenger and he said: ‘It does not matter if you do not do it, for every soul that is to be born up to the Day of Resurrection will be born.’ ”

From Sahih Muslim Volume 2, No. 3432:

“Abu Said al-Khudri reported that at the Battle of Hunain Allah’s messenger sent an army to Autas and encountered the enemy and fought with them. Having overcome them and taken them captives, the Companions of Allah’s messenger seemed to refrain from having intercourse with captive women because of their husbands being polytheists. Then Allah, Most High, sent down regarding that: ‘And women already married, except those whom your right hands possess’ (Quran—4:24), (i.e. they were lawful for them when their Idda (menstrual) period came to an end).”

From the Hadith of the Sunan of Abu Dawud Volume 2, No. 2150:

“Abu Said al-Khudri said: ‘The apostle of Allah sent a military expedition to Autas on the occasion of the battle of Hunain. They met their enemy and fought with them. They defeated them and took them captives. Some of the Companions of the apostle of Allah were reluctant to have intercourse with the female captives in the presence of their husbands who were unbelievers. So Allah, the Exalted, sent down the Quranic verse, “And all married women (are forbidden) unto you save those (captives) whom your right hand possesses.” That is to say, they are lawful for them when they complete their waiting period.’ ” [The Quran verse is 4:24.]

The note on this Hadith says that “after the distribution of the spoils of war a man may have intercourse with the female slave after passing one menstrual period, if she is not pregnant. If she is pregnant one should wait till she delivers the child. This is the view held by Malik, al-Shafi and Abu Thawr. Abu Hanifah holds that if both the husband and wife are captured together, their marriage tie still continues; they will not be separated. According to the majority of scholars,



they will be separated. Al-Awzai maintains that their marriage tie will continue till they remain part of the spoils of war. If a man buys them, he may separate them if he desires, and cohabit with the female slave after one menstrual period.

From the Hadith of the Sunan of Abu Dawud Volume 2, No. 2167:

“Muhaririz said: ‘I entered the mosque and saw Abu Said al-Khudri. I sat with him and asked about withdrawing the penis (while having intercourse), Abu Said said: We went out with the Apostle of Allah on the expedition to Banu al-Mustaliq, and took some Arab women captive, and we desired the women, for we were suffering from the absence of our wives, and we wanted ransom; so we intended to withdraw the penis (while having intercourse with the slave-women). But we asked ourselves: “Can we draw the penis when the apostle of Allah is among us before asking him about it?” So we asked him about it. He said, “It does not matter if you do not do it, for every soul that is to be born up to the Day of Resurrection will be born.” ’ ’ ”

The note on 2167 says:

“This means that the Companions wanted to have intercourse with the slave girls, but they were afraid of conception. In case they were pregnant and gave birth to a child they could not be sold as it was prohibited that a slave mother should be sold. So they withdrew the penis while having intercourse with them. By this they meant to sell the slave girls and obtain the ransom.”

### **Comment on Hadith**

All of these Hadith relate to Muslim soldiers having sexual relations with newly captured female slaves. In some cases the women’s husbands were still alive. After a battle, the captured women and children were divided between the Muslim soldiers as “booty,” or spoils of war.

In Bukhari Volume 5 No. 637, it is shown that Ali had sex with one of the females before the distribution of “Khumus” occurred. This “Khumus” was one fifth of the war booty to be used by Muhammad and his family (Ali was Muhammad’s son-in-law), and be used and distributed to the poor and needy. Here, Khalid, himself a member of Muhammad’s family, took part of the Khumus prior to the distribution. That is why Buraida hated him in this case. Note that Muhammad supported Ali in this. There was no reproof at all. If anything, Muhammad thought Ali deserved more!

Here is the point: Muslim men were allowed to use female slaves for sex. If the slave was not pregnant she could be sold at a slave market. This is what Muhammad’s soldiers intended to do.

### **Corroborating Material From the Sirat Literature**

Ibn Ishaq’s biography of Muhammad, “Sirat Rasulallah,” is the most reliable extant biography of Muhammad available today. It corroborates the events with the Mustaliq on pages 490 and 493. This event took place just before Aisha was accused of having sexual relations with another man.

It also corroborates the events at Autas on pages 574–576. This event took place just after the initial battle of Hunain.

Ibn Sa'd corroborates the events at Autas (Awtus) on pages 187, 188. He notes that 6,000 slaves were taken.

## Analysis

The Hadith I quoted show that:

- 1) The Muslim men were out in the field, and took female captives following a battle.
- 2) They were divided up between the men, and the men were very horny. They were without their wives who were back home.
- 3) So, the men prepared to have sex with the females, out on the field, away from home, and asked Muhammad about coitus interruptus. They didn't want to get the females pregnant because they wanted to later sell the female slaves for money. Had they gotten them pregnant the Muslim men would be forced to be responsible for the children.
- 4) Marriage wasn't required to have sex with the females. Listen to the men's own words: "we were interested in their prices," i.e., they wanted to sell them. No Muslim man would marry a woman intending to sell her later. That is not what "nikah"—marriage was all about. These men wanted to have sex with their slaves, enjoy them, and they later sell them.
- 5) And if you note what Ali did—had sex with a female before the "human booty" was divided up between the Muslim soldiers. Muhammad allowed him to do this.

What does all of this boil down to? Muslim men were allowed to have intercourse with their female slaves after the slaves had had one menstrual period. The reason for waiting one menstrual cycle was to insure that the female slaves were not already pregnant prior to being captured.

In some cases, the female slaves' husbands were also captives and it was still legal for the Muslim men to have sex with the female captives. Muhammad received a "revelation" allowing the Muslim men to have sex with the female slaves while they were still married to their captive husbands. A note on the Hadith says that according to Islam, when the married couple is captured, their marriage is automatically annulled!

Muslims did not need to marry the female slave or give her any type of dowry in order to have sex with her.

Muslims did not need to have the female slave's permission to have intercourse with her. She was his property (as was noted by Tabari), and thus, as property, the Muslim owner had an Allah-given right to have intercourse with her if he desired. I have yet to find one Quranic verse or Hadith that says that the female slave's permission was required. All Hadith and Quranic verses that pertain to Muslim men having intercourse with female slaves always put the option on the slave-owning man, whether he wants it or not. The slaves were not given a choice.

**THE MUSLIM MEN WERE RAPING THEIR FEMALE SLAVES AND MUHAMMAD ALLOWED IT!**

Think about it from the women's point of view. A battle is fought and her side lost. Many of the husbands, fathers, and sons are now dead. Some have been captured. The women and children are also taken as captives. Imagine the horror of the females. Family members dead, homes and possessions are now gone, they are in the total power of their captors.

The captives are distributed amongst the Muslim men as slaves, husband and wife captives are separated. As soon as a female has her menstrual cycle her owner appears. He has been separated from his wife for a while out on the field of battle, sexually hungry, and he proceeds to have sex with his female slave.

Do you think that this female slave willingly has intercourse with him? Is that her wish? She has just experienced one of the most horrible events in her life—the destruction of her tribe and family, the taking of her possessions, and being made someone’s slave, and now she willingly consents to have sex with the very men who brought this disaster upon her!? Of course not!

What women would look upon with loving eyes the men that brought destruction upon her family and tribe!

Would Jesus Christ allow soldiers to rape female slaves?

What would the world say if Israel allowed its soldiers to take Palestinian females prisoner and rape with them? There would be a horrible outcry!

Examine the events in Kosovo and Bosnia. Here the same situation occurred. The Muslims were defeated by the Serbs and some Serbs raped Muslims. It is a horrible crime and we all condemn it. But if we examine what Muhammad allowed his soldiers to do we see that their actions are identical. Muhammad’s standards were little better than Serbs who raped Muslim women.

The Japanese did this to the Chinese, Korean and Filipino women during World War II. The Germans did likewise to the Russian women. In a similar way the Muslim soldiers only waited a few weeks to do likewise to their female captives.

Muhammad and his soldiers treated these female slaves just like the Japanese did to their female captives. Much has been written condemning the treatment of black slaves in the West: how much more should a man who claimed to be a prophet of God be condemned for these acts?

## Discussion

Some attention needs to be paid to the Quranic term used here for slave. I’m told that the Quranic classical Arabic reads “ma malakat aymanukum.”

Let’s examine a fuller definition of this term. Starting with the *Encyclopedia of Islam*, Published by E.J. Brill, Vol. 1, page 24 under the word “abd” it says:

“Abd is the ordinary word for ‘slave’ in Arabic of all periods, more particularly for ‘male slave,’ ‘female slave’ being ama. On the other hand, the Quran frequently uses the term ‘rakaba,’ literally ‘neck, nape of the neck,’ and still more frequently, the periphrasis ‘ma malakat aymanukum’—‘that which your (their) right hand possesses.’ ”

So, the Quran uses the phrase “that which your right hand possesses” as a term for slave. Moving to the *Shorter Encyclopedia of Islam*, we find similar. Under “mamluk” it says:

“The term (mamluk) owes its origin probably to the current phrase of the Quran ma malakat aimanukum—‘what your right hand possesses,’ a general designation of slaves without specialization of gender.”

Referencing *Hughes Dictionary of Islam*, page 596 on slavery, it says:

“The term generally used in the Quran for slaves is ‘ma malakat aimanukum,’—that which your right hand possesses.’ ”

There is no doubt that “right hand possesses” is a phrase used to describe a slave, whether newly captured or not.

Some Muslims may feel that I have taken the Quran and Hadith out of context. Here is supporting material from famous Islamic scholars.

### **Support from Islamic Scholars Allowing Muslim Men to Have Sex with Female Slaves**

1) Dr. Abdul Latif, from Al-Azhar writes:

“The second reason (to take slaves) is the sexual propagation of slaves which would generate more slaves for the owner” [Taken from *You Ask, Islam Answers*, page 51, 52].

2) The great Islamic scholar Ibn Timmiya wrote:

“The one who owns the mother also owns her children. Being the master of the mother makes him the owner of her children whether they were born to a husband or they were illegitimate children. Therefore, the master has the right to have sexual intercourse with the daughters of his maid slave because they are the daughters of his property, provided he does not sleep with the mother at the same time.” Volume 35, page 54.

3) I also want to note that Umar, the 2nd Caliph, also committed what seems to be rape of a female slave. From Ibn Sa’d, volume 2, Page 438:

“A slave girl passed by me who attracted me, and I cohabited with her while I was fasting.”

In effect, during his fast, he noticed an attractive slave girl. He used her sexually. There is no mention of her being his “wife.” There is no mention that he ever “married” her. She looked good, and he took her.

### **Questions**

1) Do Muslims really understand how brutal a man Muhammad was? He willingly allowed those women to be raped! Why do Muslims follow such a man if they know he did such evil actions?

2) Do Muslims in this day and age adhere to this barbaric act? Would they allow the rape of non-Muslim slaves in the Muslim world today? Even in Mecca in 1960 there were black slave markets in operation.

3) Why do non-Muslim standards exceed those of a man who claimed to be God’s final messenger? If Muhammad were really the final prophet, why were his standards so poor? Why did he allow, even support, such abusive actions? Wouldn’t we call a man who did this a criminal today?

### **Summary**

So, all three main sources of Islam—the Quran, the Hadith, and the Sirat all support Muslim men, including Muhammad, having sex with female slaves. Also, both prior and present Islamic scholars also declare that Muslim men can have sex with female slaves.

These verses from the Quran and Hadith prove that Muhammad allowed his men to do to female slaves what essentially amounts to as RAPE. No true prophet of God would willingly allow this. The icing on the cake is that Muhammad claimed to receive “revelations” from Allah permitting this. One has to ask what kind of god Muhammad really worshipped.

## **Appendix 1: A Muslim’s Attempt to Justify the Rape Based on Deuteronomy**

A Muslim seeking to justify Muhammad’s evil actions implies that God allowed the rape of female slaves in the Old Testament. He asks the following question:

“So what do you think the God of the Bible is telling you here ... and since you believe Jesus to be God he is also telling you this.” [Deuteronomy 21:10–14]

Deuteronomy 21:10–14: “When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and the LORD thy God hath delivered them into thine hands, and thou hast taken them captive, And seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife; Then thou shalt bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails; And she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and her mother a full month: and after that thou shalt go in unto her and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife. And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her.”

Here is the same passage from the NIV

Deuteronomy 21:10: “When you go to war against your enemies and the LORD your God delivers them into your hands and you take captives, 11 if you notice among the captives a beautiful woman and are attracted to her, you may take her as your wife. 12 Bring her into your home and have her shave her head, trim her nails 13 and put aside the clothes she was wearing when captured. After she has lived in your house and mourned her father and mother for a full month, then you may go to her and be her husband and she shall be your wife. 14 If you are not pleased with her, let her go wherever she wishes. You must not sell her or treat her as a slave, since you have dishonored her.”

## **Response**

The answer to the question: “What is God telling His people to do?”

It is obvious that God is speaking to His people about marriage to a woman who was captured as a slave. And kindness, protection and marriage is the context of the passage.

Looking at the passage there is not even the hint of a rape. In fact, just the opposite is given. When a woman who is not a Jew is made a captive, and the Israelite falls in love with her because of her beauty, he is not allowed to touch her for those 30 days so that she may mourn the loss of her family and country. The intention of this law is to protect her against any rude passion on the part of the man (i.e., rape), and give her time to get used to the Jewish culture and begin to learn an affection for the man. This law provided protection from her against rape. This is not to be simply a thing of passion, but of true love and care. It is a compassionate law for this foreign woman taken in war. Remember this woman was a Gentile, and as such was not expected to

have the covenant protection as a Jewish woman would have been. But this law is giving her that protection. She is to be given the status of a woman in Israel and is not to be regarded as a slave, or simply as contraband from the battle. She was to be treated with dignity.

Now the question comes at verse 13 where at the end of the 30 days the man is then allowed to go into her (i.e., have intercourse) ... but as a wife. Is this verse suggesting rape? Not at all. It is upholding the normal sexual union permitted a man and a wife.

M.G. Kline (perhaps one of the leading Old Testament theologians of the last century) commented on [Deuteronomy 21:10–14](#):

“This first of three stipulations concerned with the authority of the head of the household (cf. vv. 15–21) deals with the limits of the husband’s authority over his wife. The case of a captive woman (vv. 10, 11 cf. 20:10 contra S. 7:3) is used as a case in point for establishing the rights of the wife, perhaps because the principle would obviously apply, a fortiori in the case of an Israelite wife. On the purificatory acts of verses 12b, 13a, which signified removal from captive-slave status, compare [Lev. 14:8](#); [Num. 8:7](#).

“On the month’s mourning, see [Num 20:29](#) and [Deut 34:8](#). This period would provide for the achieving of inward composure for beginning a new life, as well as for an appropriate expression of filial piety. 14. Thou shalt not sell her. A wife might not be reduced to slave status, not even the wife who had been raised from slave status. ... then thou shalt let her go whither she will. The severance of the marriage relationship is mentioned here only incidentally to the statement of the main principle that a man’s authority did not extend to the right of reducing his wife to a slave. This dissolution of the marriage would have to be accomplished according to the laws of divorce in the theocracy (cf. [Deut. 24:1–4](#)). Not that divorce was mandatory, but the granting of freedom in case the man should determine to divorce his wife according to the permission granted by Moses because of the hardness of their hearts (cf. [Matt 19:8](#))” [Wycliff Bible Commentary (London: Oliphants, Ltd., 1963), p. 184].

Then Chief Rabbi J. H. Hertz (late chief rabbi of the British Empire) has said this:

“A female war-captive was not to be made a concubine till after an interval of a month. The bitter moments of the captive’s first grief had to be respected. She must not subsequently be sold or treated as a slave. 12. bring her home. This law inculcates thoughtfulness and forbearance under circumstances in which the warrior, elated by victory, might deem himself at liberty to act as he pleased (Driver). ‘After the countless rapes of conquered women with which recent history has made us so painfully familiar, it is like hearing soft music to read of the warrior’s duty to the enemy woman, of the necessary marriage with its set ritual and its due delay. And the Legislator proceeds to trace the course of the husband’s duty in the event of the conquered alien woman failing to bring him the expected delight. “Then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not deal with her as a slave, because thou hast humbled her” ’ (Zangwill)... 13. she shall be thy wife. And enjoy the full rights and duties of a Jewish wife; [Exodus 21:10, 14](#) no delight in her, i.e. no longer any delight in her. The Rabbis deemed such a marriage a concession to human weakness, as a preventive against worse manifestations of the unbridled passions of man ... humbled her. Dishonored her” [Pentateuch & Haftoraht, edited by Dr. J. H. Hertz (London: The Soncino Press Limited, 1960), p. 840].

The question of allowed rape seems to me is not the traditional Jewish understanding. You have to comprehend what the Hebrew text says. The Hebrew for the verb “dishonor” (NIV) in v. 14 is *inah*, which can mean sexual abuse. But it is used in v. 14 to describe a subsequent time, as seen in Hebrew *WEHAYAH* (“and when it will happen”), which begins v. 14, when he refuses to continue to be her husband but to send her away. In that case, he can no longer treat her as a captive. The act “going into her” (v. 13) after 30 days was to become her husband.

Additional Judaistic references are found in these:

Deuteronomy [Devarim] the traditional Hebrew text with the new JPS translation/commentary by Jeffrey H. Tigay.

*Studies in Devarim* (Deuteronomy) by Nehama Leibowitz; translated and adapted from the Hebrew by Aryeh Newman.

Sifre: a Tannaitic commentary on the book of Deuteronomy translated from the Hebrew with introduction and notes by Reuven Hammer.

The main point of this text is the compassion the Lord has on a foreign woman taken in battle. The man is not allowed to rape her, but to treat her with all the respect a wife of the covenant is due. If a Muslim reads this as rape, then he must be reading his own cultural bias into it. But that is not the Biblical understanding of a woman. What this text is saying is that even in battle, a woman was not to be raped by a Jew. If he really wanted her—he had to marry her. And even then, he had to wait a month to let the passion wear off, and for her to get used to the new culture she was about to be committed to, and to mourn for her own father. The context of the passage is very clear, it is very easy. How has he dishonored her if he sends her away? Not because he raped her, but because she has been cast away, discarded as unwanted. Divorce was an embarrassing thing (even as it was in this country 50 years ago).

## **Comparison of the Old Testament Vs. Islam’s Treatment of Female Slaves**

Let’s compare the two cases. This will show clearly Islam’s brutal system. Below are two Hadith—one which provides the context of a Quranic verse.

From Sahih Muslim Volume 2, No. 3371:

“Abu Sirma said to Abu Said al Khudri: ‘O Abu Said, did you hear Allah’s messenger mentioning about al-azl (coitus interruptus)?’ He said, ‘Yes,’ and added: ‘We went out with Allah’s messenger on the expedition to the Mustaliq and took captive some excellent Arab women; and we desired them for we were suffering from the absence of our wives (but at the same time), we also desired ransom for them. So we decided to have sexual intercourse with them but by observing azl (withdrawing the male sexual organ before emission of semen to avoid conception).’ But we said: ‘We are doing an act whereas Allah’s messenger is amongst us; why not ask him?’ So we asked Allah’s messenger and he said: ‘It does not matter if you do not do it, for every soul that is to be born up to the Day of Resurrection will be born.’ ”

From Sahih Muslim Volume 2, No. No. 3432:

“Abu Said al-Khudri reported that at the Battle of Hunain Allah’s messenger sent an army to Autas and encountered the enemy and fought with them. Having overcome them and taken them captives, the Companions of Allah’s messenger seemed to refrain from having intercourse with captive women because of their husbands being polytheists. Then

Allah, Most High, sent down regarding that: ‘And women already married, except those whom your right hands possess (Quran — 4:24), (i.e. they were lawful for them when their Idda (menstrual) period came to and end).’ ”

## Comparison

1M) Muslims were allowed to take female captives/slaves.

1J) Israelites were allowed to take female captives/slaves.

2M) Muslim men had to wait until the female had her first period, then they could rape the female slaves—a right recognized in Islam because the slave was the man’s property: this is stated in Tabari’s History, volume 39, page 194.

Here is the quote: (my words are in parentheses).

“He (Muhammad) used to visit her (Mariyam) there and ordered her to veil herself, [but] he had intercourse with her by virtue of her being his property.”

2J) Israelite men had to wait an entire month before they could marry the woman.

3M) Muslim men did not have to allow the woman a time to mourn.

3J) Israelite men had to give the woman a month to mourn.

4M) Muslim men did not have to marry the slave in order to have sex with her.

4J) Israelite men had to marry the slave in order to have sex with her.

This marriage gave the woman full rights as a free woman. And, in the event of a divorce, she had complete freedom.

5M) Muslim men could use the slave for sex, then later sell her to another owner who could use her for sex, and so on.

5J) Israelite men could not sell the woman they married as a slave.

6M) Muslim men had the option, but were not obligated to marry or free her. He was not obligated to change her status of slave.

6J) Israelite men “purified” their prospective wives as cleansed from slavery’s status.

## Prayer for Salvation

This prayer is written for anyone. This includes Muslims who are seeking the truth and who want to know God in a personal way.

“Lord Jesus, I believe in You. I believe that You are the Son of God and the Lord. I believe that You died for my sins and were raised from the dead. I confess that I am a sinner and I ask You to come into my heart, cleanse me from my sins, and forgive me for my sins. I turn to follow and obey You. I now receive You as Messiah and Lord and totally commit my life to You.” Amen.

For more articles by Silas see the Answering Islam home page at [www.answering-islam.org](http://www.answering-islam.org)

# Slavery In Islam



**By Silas**

## **Abstract**

Islam institutionalized slavery. Muhammad began to take slaves after he moved to Medina, and had power. Slaves were usually taken in raids on nearby Arab tribes, or war, either through offensive or defensive actions. Islam allows the taking of slaves as “booty,” or reward for fighting. This has led to numerous “jihads” by Muslim states and tribes to attack other non-Muslim groups and obtain slaves. Islamic jurisprudence laid down regulations for the proper treatment of slaves. However, abuses have occurred throughout history.

## **Introduction**

The West is familiar with the history of slavery in the New World. It was sinful and terrible, and it lasted for several hundred years. And it was abolished mainly through the efforts of Christians in England (Wilberforce, Clarkson) and America (the Abolitionists, primarily Protestant).

However, few people in the West know about Islam and slavery. Most would be surprised that Islam authorizes the taking of slaves as spoils of war. From the days that Muhammad drew his sword to rob and conquer non-Muslims to this very day, Muslims have been taking non-Muslims, and even other black Muslims, as slaves.

Muslims were enslaving black Africans long before any slave ships sailed for the New World. Muslims were taking and making slaves all over the lands they had conquered. Later, when slave ships were loaded with black slaves, often, a Muslim slave broker had the human cargo all ready to go. The white Southerners rarely had to go into inland to capture slaves, they were already waiting there, courtesy of some Muslim ruler, and/or slave broker! In many cases, if the black slaves were not sent to the New World, they were sent to the Mideast to be enslaved by Arabs, or kept by other black Muslims as slaves.

## **Muhammad, Muslims, the Quran, and Slavery**

To begin with, the Quran justifies slavery, and often mentions slaves. Here are some relevant verses:

33:50—“Prophet, We have made lawful to you the wives to whom you have granted dowries and the slave girls whom God has given you as booty.”

This verse clearly shows that Muslims believe that taking slaves in war was a God-given right. These slaves were considered “booty” or the spoils of war. As the saying goes: to the victors go the spoils.

23:5—“... except with their wives and slave girls, for these are lawful to them: ...”

The passage’s context here (not quoted in full) details how Muslim males are allowed to have sexual relations with their wives and slave girls. Implicit in this is that Muslim males had slave-concubines. 70:30 is basically a repeat of 23:5.

Ibn Sa'd's "Tabaqat," gives a clear description of Muhammad having "relations" with at least one of his slave girls. Muhammad had sexual relations with Mariyah, his Coptic slave. Mariyah and her sister, Sirin, were slaves given as gifts to Muhammad. Muhammad gave Sirin to Hasan Thabit, the poet. Ibn Sa'd says that Muhammad "liked Mariyah, who was of white complexion, with curly hair and pretty" [Taken from Ibn Sa'd's "Kitab al-Tabaqat al-Kabir" (*Book of the Major Classes*), p. 151].

Ibn Sa'd also writes that Mariyah bore Muhammad a son named Ibrahim. He died 18 months later. Sa'd writes:

"If he had lived, no maternal uncle of his would have remained in bondage" (p. 164).

This shows that there were other Coptic slaves owned by the Muslims.

The Quran also instructs Muslims NOT to force their female slaves into prostitution (24:34), and even allows Muslims to marry slaves if they so desire (4:24), and to free them at times as a penalty for crime or sin (4:92, 5:89, 58:3) and even allows slaves to buy their liberty, if they meet certain of their master's conditions (24:33). [90:10 "freeing of a bondsman" refers to Muslims ransoming other Muslims who were slaves of non-Muslims.]

While I think it's nice to allow a slave to obtain his freedom (at his master's discretion), it is tragic that Islam allows them to be enslaved in the first place. That's like robbing a bank and giving some of the money back to the bank, and thinking you did the right thing!

The above verses show that taking slaves was ordained by Allah, and that it was permissible for Muslim males to have sex with their female slaves. It also shows that slaves were a valuable commodity to the Muslims, otherwise, Allah would not have imposed the penalty of freeing a slave to make up for a crime.

## **Bukhari's Hadith and Slavery**

There are hundreds of Hadith that deal with slavery. Whole chapters of Hadith are dedicated to dealing with the taxation, treatment, sale, and jurisprudence of slaves. In addition to this, numerous Hadith mention slaves, and their relation to their Muslim masters. Here is a selection of Hadith on slaves: [all Hadith are from Sahih Bukhari, unless noted].

Volume 7, Number 137: "Narrated Abu al-Khudri: 'We got female captives in the war booty and we used to do coitus interruptus with them. So we asked Allah's messenger about it and he said, "Do you really do that?" repeating the question thrice, "There is no soul that is destined to exist but will come into existence, till the Day of Resurrection." ' ' "

Here, Muslims had taken female slaves, and had sex with them. Muhammad approved of this. He only admonished them not to practice coitus interruptus.

Volume 5, Number 459: [This Hadith is similar to the above. However, additional details are added.] "Narrated Ibn Muha iriz: 'I entered the mosque and saw Abu Khudri and sat beside him and asked him about coitus interruptus. Abu said, "We went out with Allah's messenger for the Ghazwa (attack upon) Banu Mustaliq and we received captives from among the Arab captives and we desired women and celibacy became hard on us and we loved to do coitus interruptus. So when we in tended to do coitus interruptus we said 'How can we do coitus interruptus without asking Allah's messenger while he is

present among us?’ We asked (him) about it and he said “it is better for you not to do so, for if any soul (till the Day of Resurrection) is predestined to exist, it will exist.” ’ ”

Here, the Muslims attacked the Banu Mustaliq, and took slaves. The female slaves were distributed as booty to the Muslim soldiers. Being away from home, the soldiers became horny, and wanted to have sexual relations with the newly captured female slaves. They went to Muhammad and asked about coitus interruptus. He told them not to practice that, but to complete the sexual act with the slaves. Related Hadith show that they didn’t want to get the women pregnant because they wanted to be able to sell them later on. Under Islamic law they were not allowed to sell pregnant female slaves.

In effect, Muhammad okayed the rape of female prisoners.

Volume 3, Number 765:

“Narrated Kuraib: the freed slave of Ibn ’Abbas, that Maimuna bint Al-Harith told him that she manumitted a slave-girl without taking the permission of the Prophet. On the day when it was her turn to be with the Prophet, she said, ‘Do you know, O Allah’s Apostle, that I have manumitted my slave-girl?’ He said, ‘Have you really?’ She replied in the affirmative. He said, ‘You would have got more reward if you had given her (i.e. the slave-girl) to one of your maternal uncles.’ ”

Here a woman frees a slave girl, but Muhammad says that she would have gotten more (heavenly) reward if she had given the slave one of her uncles, thus keeping the slave in slavery.

Volume 7, Number 734: “...At the door of the [Muhammad’s] room there was a slave to whom I went and said, ‘Ask the permission for me to enter’ ”....

This is a long Hadith, and the quote reveals that Muhammad had slaves working in his house.

Volume 7, Number 344: “Narrated Anas: ‘Allah’s messenger went to the house of his slave tailor, and he was offered a dish of gourd of which he started eating. I have loved to eat gourd since I saw Allah’s messenger eating it.’ ”

This Hadith shows that another one of Muhammad’s slaves was a tailor. No. 346 gives additional details.

Volume 5, Number 541: “Narrated Abu Huraira: When we conquered Khaibar, we gained neither gold nor silver as booty, but we gained cows, camels, goods and gardens. Then we departed with Allah’s apostle to the valley of Al-Qira, and at that time Allah’s messenger had a slave called Midam who had been presented to him by one of Banu Ad-Dibbab. While the slave was dismounting the saddle of Allah’s messenger an arrow the thrower of which was unknown, came and hit him...”

This Hadith shows that Muhammad held a slave, who was struck with an arrow.

Volume 5, Number 637: “Narrated Buraida: The prophet sent Ali to Khalid to bring the Khumus ([one fifth] of the booty) and I hated Ali, and Ali had taken a bath (after a sexual act with a slave girl from the Khumus). I said to Khalid, ‘Don’t you see this (i.e. Ali)?’ When we reached the prophet I mentioned that to him. He said, ‘O Buraida! Do you hate Ali?’ I said, ‘Yes.’ He said, ‘Do you hate him, for he deserves more than that from the Khumus.’ ”

The note for this Hadith says:

“Buraida hated Ali because he had taken a slave girl from the booty and considered that as something not good.”

Here Ali took a newly captured slave girl, and had sex with her. When Muhammad was told about it, he approved of it. Note that slaves were considered as booty, and as a man’s property, they could use the female slave for sex, i.e., rape them.

Volume 5, Number 512: “Narrated Anas: ‘...The prophet had their warriors killed, their offspring and women taken as captives....’ ”

This Hadith details the attack on the Jews of Khaibar. Again, many of the women and children were taken and made into slaves.

Volume 5, Chapter 67: “Narrated Ibn Ishaq: The Ghazwa (attack upon) Uyaina bin Hisn waged against Banu Al-Anbar, a branch of Banu Tamim. The prophet sent Uyaina to raid them. He raided them and killed some of them and took some others as captives.”

Here, Muhammad sent out his men to attack another tribe. They killed some of them and took others as captives. Once again, the Muslims attacked a neighboring tribe.

Volume 5, Number 182: “Narrated Aisha: ‘Abu Bakr had a slave who used to give him some of his earnings.’ ”

Volume Volume 5, Number 50: “Narrated Amr Maimun: ‘...The slave of Al-Mughira...’ [another Muslim who owned the slave that killed Umar].

“...Al-Abbas had the greatest number of slaves.... [Al-Abbas, the future Muslim leader had many slaves].”

Volume 9, Number 462: “Narrated Aisha: ‘...Furthermore you may ask the slave girl who will tell you the truth.’ So the prophet asked Barira (my slave girl)”...

Aisha had her own slave.

Also, volume 7, numbers 845, 341, 352, 371, 410, 413 and 654; chapter 22, chapter 23, and volume 1, Numbers 29, 439, 661; Volume 9, chapter 23, chapter 32, numbers 293, 296, 277, 100, 80.

All these Hadith detail that many other Muslims owned slaves.

## **Muhammad, Abu Dawud’s Hadith and Slavery**

Abu Dawud, volume 2, chapter 597—“On a Man who Beats His Slave While he is in the Sacred State (wearing Ihram).”

No. 1814—“(Abu Bakr) began to beat him (Bakr’s slave) while the apostle of Allah was smiling and saying: ‘Look at this man who is in the sacred state, what is he doing?’ ” [The note for this Hadith says “Abu Bakr beat his slave to teach him sense of responsibility.”]

Abu Dawud, volume 2, chapter 683—“On the Marriage of a Slave Without the Permission of His Masters.”

Number 2074—“Ibn Umar reported the prophet as saying: ‘If a slave marries without the permission of his master, his marriage is null and void.’ ”

Abu Dawud, volume 2, chapter 1317—“Contractual Obligation of a Slave.”

Numbers 3499, 3500—“The contractual obligation of a slave is three days. If he finds defect in the slave within three days, he may return it without any evidence; if he finds a defect after three days, he will be required to produce evidence that the slave had the defect when he brought it.”

### **Muhammad, the Muwatta of Imam Malik, and Slavery**

The chapters mentioned below show just how intrinsic slavery was during Muhammad’s life, and the lives of the Caliphs. The Muwatta is a book of Islamic jurisprudence. It is full of regulations on dealing with slaves. Slaves were used throughout the Islamic world. Judging from the amount of Hadith here, it is safe to assume that many Muslims owned slaves.

Chapter 368—“Who takes the Property of a Slave When He is Freed.”

Chapter 371—“Slaves who cannot be set Free in the Obligatory Freeing of a Slave.”

Chapter 383—“Cohabitation with a Slave Girl after Declaring Her ‘Mudabbir’ ” (free after the master’s death).

Chapter 387—“Who is Entitled to the Property of a Slave or Slave Girl at the time of Sale.”

Chapter 388—“The Limit of Responsibility of the Seller in the Sale of a Slave or Slave Girl.”

Chapter 390—“On the Conditional Sale of a Slave Girl.”

There are additional chapters dealing with slaves. This list is enough to show that dealing with slaves during and after Muhammad’s time was extensive.

### **Other Islamic Writings on Muslims Owning Slaves**

There are additional Islamic writings that document how Muhammad took, purchased, sold, and gave away slaves. The following quotes are from “*Behind the Veil*.”

Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, a great scholar and Islamic historian, says in his book *ZAD AL-MA AD*, part 1, p. 160:

“Muhammad had many male and female slaves. He used to buy and sell them, but he purchased more slaves than he sold. He once sold one black slave for two. His purchases of slaves were more than he sold.”

“Muhammad had a number of black slaves. One of them was named ‘Mahran.’ Muhammad forced him to do more labor than the average man. Whenever Muhammad went on a trip and he, or his people, got tired of carrying their stuff, he made Mahran carry it. Mahran said, ‘Even if I were already carrying the load of 6 or 7 donkeys while we were on a journey, anyone who felt weak would throw his clothes or his shield or his sword on me so I would carry that, a heavy load.’ Tabari and Jawziyya both record this, so Islam accepts this as true.”

Ali, who was Muhammad’s son-in-law, whipped Aisha’s slave in front of Muhammad to make her talk about the adultery charges against Aisha. Muhammad did not say a word to Ali about beating the female slave. [From the *Sirat Rasulallah*, p. 496.]

In the Sirat Rasulallah, Muhammad massacred 800 males and took their women and children as slaves. He kept at least one Jewish female named Rayhana as his concubine, and gave the rest away to the Muslims.

The Sirat says (p. 466):

“Then the apostle divided the property, wives, and children of Banu Qurayza among the Muslims....”

and

“Then the apostle sent Sa’d Zayd brother of Ashhal with some of the captive women of Banu Qurayza to Najd and he sold them for horse and weapons.”

One thing for certain: MUHAMMAD WAS A SLAVER. The names of many of Muhammad’s slaves are detailed in Muslim writings and they can be found in *Behind the Veil*.

Some Muslims claim that slaves under Islam were always treated fairly and kindly, and that slaves in the West were always treated like “chattel.” The fact is that the real treatment slaves in both the West and under Islam has varied. Some slaves were treated fairly, others were treated brutally. Both the Quran and New Testament command masters to treat slaves fairly. Compare [Ephesians 6:9](#) with Sura 4:36. Both are similar. However, the New Testament condemns slave trading in [1 Timothy 1:10](#) (menstealers is the same word for slave-traders), the Quran allows for, even urges slave-taking.

### **The Rights of Slaves Under Islam**

According to the *Hughes Dictionary of Islam*, slaves had few civil or legal rights. For example:

- a) Muslim men were allowed to have sex anytime with females slaves—Sura 4:3,4:29, 33:49.
- b) Slaves are as helpless before their masters as idols are before God—Sura 16:77.
- c) According to Islamic Tradition, people at the time of their capture were either to be killed, or enslaved. Shows you that they were at the bottom of the barrel to start with.
- d) According to Islamic jurisprudence, slaves were merchandise. The sale of slaves was in accordance with the sale of animals.
- e) Muhammad ordered that some slaves who were freed by their masters be RE-ENSLAVED!
- f) It is permissible under Islamic law to whip slaves.
- g) According to Islam, a Muslim could not be put to death for murdering a slave. Ref. 2:178 and the Jalalayn confirm this.
- h) According to Islam, the testimony of slaves is not admissible in court. Ibn Timiyya and Bukhari state this.
- i) According to Islamic jurisprudence, slaves cannot choose their own marriage mate—Ibn Hazm, vol. 6, part 9.
- j) According to Islamic jurisprudence, slaves can be forced to marry who their masters want—Malik ibn Anas, vol. 2, page 155.

Slavery continued in Islamic lands from about the beginning to this very day. Muslim rulers always found support in the Quran to call “jihad,” partly for booty, part for the purpose of taking slaves. As the Islamic empire disintegrated into smaller kingdoms, and each ruler was able to decide what Islam’s theology really meant, usually, he found it in support of what he wanted to

do. Their calls of jihad against their neighbor facilitated the taking of slaves for Islam. The Quran and Islamic jurisprudence support the taking of slaves, so, those petty Muslim rulers were following the Quran when they needed slaves.

### **Who Could Be Made Slaves Under Islam?**

- 1) Islam allows Muslims to make slaves out of anyone who is captured during war.
- 2) Islam allows for the children of slaves to be raised as slaves.
- 3) Like No. 1, Islam allows for Christians and Jews to be made into slaves if they are captured in war. After Muslim armies attacked and conquered Spain, they took thousands of slaves back to Damascus. The key prize was 1,000 virgins as slaves. They were forced to go all the way back to Damascus.
- 4) Christians and Jews, who had made a treaty with the ruling Muslims, could be made into slaves if they did not pay the “protection” tax. This paying for “protection” was just like paying a Mafia racketeer! This allowed Muslim rulers to extort money from non-Muslim people.

### **Post Muhammad Slavery**

#### **Where Did Many Of the Muslims’ Slaves Come from?**

Although Muslims took slaves from all over the lands they conquered, many of the Muslim slaves were black Africans. There were forced to do the harshest labor.

There was a famous black slave revolt in Iraq where thousands of black slaves revolted and killed tens of thousands of Arabs in Basrah. These slaves were forced to work in the large Muslim saltpeter mines. During their revolt, they conquered the city of Basrah. They conquered city after city, and they couldn’t be stopped. Their uprising and drive for freedom lasted for about 11 years [*The History of Islam*, Robert Payne, p. 185].

As the Muslim armies continued to conquer land, they acquired many slaves. Bernard Lewis in *The Arabs in History* writes:

“Polytheists and idolaters were seen primarily as sources of slaves.”

In the early years of the Arab conquests, vast numbers of slaves were acquired by capture. C.E. Bosworth in *The Islamic Dynasties* writes:

“The use of this labor enabled the Arabs to live on the conquered land as a rentier class and to exploit some of the economic potential of the rich Fertile Crescent.”

Ibn Warraq writes:

“Arabs were deeply involved in the vast network of slave trading—they scoured the slave markets of China, India, and Southeast Asia. There were Turkish slaves from Central Asia, slaves from the Byzantine Empire, white slaves from Central and East Europe, and Black slaves from West and East Africa. Every city in the Islamic world had its slave market.”

## Abuses of Slaves in Islam Today

Muhammad did say that slaves should be treated fairly. But they were still a Muslim's property. Just as abuses occurred under Christianity, so too, many abuses occurred, and still occur under Islam. The difference between the two is that Islam ordains the taking of slaves during war, thus perpetuating slavery. Christianity does not. In slavery's perpetual existence, Islam has seen great abuses of slaves.

Everyone knows about the abuses of slaves in the New World. What do you know about the abuses of slaves under Islam? I found two very good books on slavery and Islam.

1) *Slavery and Muslim Society in Africa*, by Allan Fisher, published in 1971,  
and

2) *The Slave Trade Today*, by Sean O'Callaghan, published in 1961.

Both books really opened my eyes to how terrible slavery under Islam really is. I use the present tense, because it is obvious that these abuses continue to this day.

I also have a number of other references concerning slavery in Islam. A general survey is *Hughes Dictionary of Islam*. It notes a few basic points:

a) Slaves have no civil liberty, but are entirely under the authority of their owners.

b) Slavery is in complete harmony with the spirit of Islam. Islam did make life better for the average slave, but Muhammad intended it to be a perpetual institution.

c) Hughes also says that it is a righteous act to free a slave. I just find it hard to understand that the god who told Muhammad to take slaves, later tells him it's good to free slaves.

In *The Slave Trade Today*, Sean O'Callaghan toured the Mideast and Africa and covertly visited many slave markets. Since Islam allows for slavery and slave trading, he was able to see much of the real world of Islamic slavery. Remember O'Callaghan saw this less than 40 years ago. This probably still continues today, albeit more discreetly.

In Djibouti he writes:

“Ten boys were ranged in a circle on the dais (used to display the slaves), their buttocks toward us. They were all naked, and I saw with horror that five had been castrated. The (slave dealer) said that usually 10 percent of the boys are castrated, being purchased by Saudi homosexuals, or by Yemenis, who own harems, as guards” p. 75.

“ ‘Why had the girls (female slaves who had just been sold) accepted their fate without a murmur, and the boys howled and cried?’ ‘Simple,’ said the Somali, ‘we tell the girls from a very early age —7 or 8—that they are made for love, at age NINE we let them practice with each other, and a year later with the boys.’ ”

In Aden he writes:

“The Yemeni told me that the girls (slave girls used as prostitutes) were encouraged to have children, especially by white men. For if a slave girl had a white child, she was given a bonus of 20 pounds when the child was taken from her.”

As you can see, the child of a slave remained a slave, the owner could sell the child and make money. This sale is allowable under Islamic law.

“Only one offense was severely punished; attempting to escape from the harem... The wretched girl was stripped and spread eagle in the courtyard ... punishment was



administered by a eunuch, a huge powerful Negro who seemed to enjoy his task. Seventy lashes were given.”

“Because of this (the fact that eunuchs can perform sexually), the eunuch often has his penis removed as well as his testicles”!

This is also legal under Islamic law, since it is preparing the slave for service. In Saudi Arabia he writes:

“The slave population was estimated at 450,000”!... Slave auctions are no longer held regularly, only in an alley in Mecca.”

“I was awakened by shouts and screams coming from the courtyard. Rushing to the window I looked down to see a dozen slaves being herded through a door at the far end of the yard. They were being driven in like cattle by three hefty guards armed with long lashed whips. Even as I watched, one of the poor wretches, a Sudanese girl with huge breasts, received a savage lash across her naked buttocks and let out a shriek of agony.

“As the next slave was led in, a murmur of excitement went up among the buyers and they crowded closer around the rostrum. He was a slender boy of about 12 years old with beautiful classical Arab features. Although much has been written about Arab brotherhood and solidarity, I knew that the Arab has no compunction in enslaving his fellows should they fall into his hands.

“The boy was naked and tried to cover his privates with his little hands and he ran up the steps of the rostrum. ... There is an age old saying among the Bedouins: ‘A goat for use, a girl for enjoyment, but a boy for ecstasy.’ He (the now purchased slave boy) was claimed by a tall bearded Arab who led him from the rostrum with an arm around his waist.”

This is just a portion of what O’Callaghan saw. This happens because Islam has made slavery legal. Yes, some of this is against Islam, but because Islam has made it into an institution, abuses will occur.

Remember, this happened just 35 years ago or so, and it is probably still happening today.

It is also noted that as the slaves get too old to perform service or sexually satisfy their masters, their masters “manumit” the slaves. Now, aged, worn out, they are put out on the streets to fend for themselves. These ex-slaves are left to fend for themselves. Their former owner has committed a great, righteousness act in freeing a slave! He gets rid of the burdensome slave, and gets a bonus in heaven. What a religion!

In Fisher’s book, other observations are recorded:

In Mecca:

“We take note of 20 tall Negroes in turbans walking near the Kaba. They are eunuch slaves and are employed as police in the great Mosque. There are about 50 of them all together.”

“The streets are full of slaves... we see a few old slave women. They are recognized by the poverty of clothing ... but we see nothing of the younger women slaves who are kept in the houses of the city.”

“As we move along we see two or three very old men and women who look like black skeletons. If we go to the mosque at sunrise we shall see some of these, if we go at sunset they will be there too, and if we pass by at midnight, we shall see them there still... Sleeping on the stones in their rags. They have no home but the mosque, and no

food but what they receive in alms; (they were) turned out to seek the bounty of Allah, as their masters would say.”

Speaking of how Saudi obtains so many black slaves:

“They (the slave traders) pose as Muslim missionaries who guide their compatriots (black African Muslims), to the Holy Places of Islam, to make the Pilgrimage, and be instructed in the Quran in Arabic.”

Once transported, they are made into slaves.

“So with the connivance of the Saudi authorities the ancient trade in black ivory is perpetuated in our time in spite of the international conventions.”

Fisher also notes that white slaves are most highly prized.

Another interesting comment I’ve come across is that there were regions in black Africa that Muslim missionaries wouldn’t go into. The reason is that if those blacks became Muslims, they could no longer enslave them. So, the Muslims banned spreading the word of Islam among certain black tribes. It was from these tribes that local Muslim rulers would harvest slaves, and sell them throughout the Islamic world.

Time and time again, slavery in Islam is abused. The West has finished with slavery, Islam continues it, and with that, the abuses go on.

An article on slavery in Sudan is found in *Newsweek*, Oct. 12, 1992. Since that time, there have been numerous articles written by every form of press on Islamic slavery in Sudan. Basically, southern Sudanese, who are not Muslim, are attacked, and rounded up, and sold into slavery. Anyone willing to do a search at a library could find these articles quite easily.

Lastly, I remember watching a Tony Brown’s Journal show. It covered the slavery existing in Muslim lands today, the torture of slaves, the hobbling by breaking the young boys’ ankles, the seizure of Negro lands by Arabs, etc. Anyone is able to call the show and order this tape. A Negro Muslim from Mauritania was on the show. He described what the Arabs in Mauritania were doing to the Negroes (all Muslim) there. Recent human rights publications have also stated that the same is happening in Mali. Arab Muslims are forcibly taking land, and enslaving Negro Muslims there.

Just a short while ago, a group of Negro pastors in the United States formed a group to combat Islamic slavery amongst the blacks, both Muslim and non-Muslim in Africa. The information on this can be found in the August 1997 issue of *Charisma* magazine, and in the November 17, 1997 issue of *Christianity*. The group is called “Harambee” and is affiliated with the Loveland Church in Los Angeles, California.

Islam, when compared to Christianity, is a step backwards; a step into “justification” of the enslavement of others.

More articles by Silas can be found on the Answering Islam home page at [www.answeringIslam.org](http://www.answeringIslam.org)

## **Does the Quran Teach a Local Flood?**

**By Sam Shamoun**

An area of criticism applied by Muslim apologists against the Holy Bible and in support of the Quran is the issue of Noah's flood. Following the example set by Dr. Maurice Bucaille in his book, *The Bible, the Qur'an & Science*, Muslims assert that whereas the Holy Bible wrongly teaches a universal flood, the Quran however, in agreement with both modern science and archeology, affirms that the flood during Noah's time was a local event. The Quran clearly teaches that the flood only affected the people of Noah and did not stretch across the entire globe.

Unfortunately, many who are not familiar with the Quran or the early Islamic writings are left with the impression that the Quran inarguably teaches that the flood of Noah's day was merely a local event. The problem with this is that the Muslim apologists who make such statements must often read into the text something not explicitly stated and/or ignore the early Muslim exegetes and their interpretation of Quranic passages dealing with the flood.

For example, the Quran never says that the flood affected only the people living within close proximity to Noah and his family. The only reason why the Quran singles out the people of Noah is simply due to the fact that the Islamic scripture is recording the message Noah proclaimed to his contemporaries. It has absolutely nothing to do with the extent of the flood since it would be impossible for the Quran to include all the peoples of the world in these passages seeing that they had never heard Noah's preaching.

Furthermore, there are passages in the Quran where a universal flood is clearly implied, if not explicitly stated. In fact, these very same passages are appealed to by Muslim writers, such as al-Tabari, to support the fact that the flood was universal. Before proceeding to the Muslim writings, let us first examine the Quranic witness to the universality of Noah's flood:

“At length, behold! There came Our Command, and the fountains of the earth gushed forth! We said: ‘Embark therein, of each two, male and female, and your family—except those against whom the Word has already gone forth,—and the believers.’ But only a few believed with him” (S. 11:40).

“Then the word went forth: ‘O earth! Swallow up thy water, and O sky! withhold (thy rain)! And the water abated, and the matter was ended. The Ark rested on Mount Judi, and the word went forth: ‘Away with those who do wrong!’ ” (S. 11:44).

These verses state that the earth gushed forth with water, implying that the flood was universal. It does not say that only the land where Noah lived gushed forth with flood waters.

“So We inspired him (with this message): ‘Construct the Ark within Our sight and under Our guidance: then when comes Our command, and the oven gushes forth, take thou on board pairs of every species, male and female, and thy family—except those of whom the Word has already gone forth: and address Me not in favour of the wrong-doers: for they shall be drowned (in the Flood)’ ” (S. 23:27).

One might ask that if the flood was merely local, why the need to take two kinds of every species seeing that a local flood would not wipe out the entire animal life globally? This again implicitly affirms the universality of Noah's flood.

“So We opened the gates of heaven, with water pouring forth. And we caused the earth to gush forth with springs. So the waters met (and rose) to the extent decreed. But We bore him on an (Ark) made of broad planks and caulked with palmfibre: She floats

under Our eyes (and care): a recompense to one who had been rejected (with scorn)!” (S. 54:11–14).

Again, heaven pouring forth and the earth gushing springs seem to imply a universal event.

“And Noah said: ‘O my Lord! Leave not of the Unbelievers, a single one on earth! For if Thou dost leave (any of them), they will but mislead Thy devotees, and they will breed none but wicked ungrateful ones’ ” (S. 71:26–27).

Noah’s plea does not fit in well with a local flood since his request was that no evildoer be left on the earth, not just locally within close proximity of his land. A local flood would entail the fact that not only did evildoers survive but that they also possibly had offspring who were “wicked ungrateful ones,” something Noah prayed against. Clearly, this passage fits in better with a global event.

Someone might argue that these verses do not convincingly prove that the Quran teaches a universal flood since these passages are open to interpretation. The only problem with this assertion is that the Quran never explicitly states that the flood was only local. Yet, this fact does not stop Muslims from making the inference that the flood was a local event.

Furthermore, the evidence from historians such as al-Tabari is that the flood was viewed as a global event, wiping out all life with the exception of those in the Ark. The following citations are taken from the book, *The History of al-Tabari*, vol. 1, General Introduction and From the Creation to the Flood, as translated by Franz Rosenthal:

“According to Ibn Humayd-Salamah Ibn Isahq-al-Hassan b. Dinar- Ali b. Zayd-Yusuf b. Mihran- Ibn Abbas: I [Yusuf b. Mihran] heard him [Ibn Abbas] say: ... The water increased wildly, and, as is assumed by the people of the Torah, rose fifteen cubits over the mountain tops. All creatures on the face the earth, every inspirited being or tree, disappeared. No creature remained except Noah and those with him in the boat, as well as Og b. Anak, as is assumed by the people of the Book. The time between God’s sending the Flood and the receding of the water is six months and ten nights” (*History of al-Tabari* [State University of New York Press; Albany, NY 1989], pp. 360–361).

“According to al-Harith-Ibn Sa’d-Hisham- his father-Abu Salih-Ibn Abbas: God sent rain for forty days and forty nights. When the rain hit them, the wild animals, the domestic animals, and the birds all went to Noah and were subjected (to labor) for him. As commanded by God, he carried along ‘pair(s), two of each kind.’ He also carried along Adam’s corpse, making it a barrier between women and men. They boarded the ark on the tenth day of Rajab, and they left it on the Ashura Day (the tenth day) of al-Muharram; therefore, all those people fast on the Ashura Day. The water was brought forth in two equal parts. This is (meant by) God’s word: ‘And We opened for water *munhamirin*’—that is, MUSABBIN pouring—‘and We FAJJARNA’—that is, SHAQQAQNA split—‘the earth for springs (to gush forth). The water (from above and below) met for a matter (pre)determined.’ Thus, (because of the word ‘meeting’ that is used in the verse, it appears that) the water came in two equal parts, one from heaven, and the other from the earth. It rose fifteen cubits above the highest mountain on earth.

“The ark carried them around the entire earth in six months. It did not come to rest anywhere until it came to the Sacred Territory (of Mecca and Medina). However, it did not enter the Sacred Territory but circled around for a week. The House built by Adam was lifted up—lifted up, so as not to be submerged—‘the inhabited House’ with the

Black Stone—on Abu Qubays. After the ark had circled around the Sacred Territory, it traveled with (those aboard) over the earth and eventually reached al-Judi... When it had come to rest upon al-Judi, ‘it was said: Earth, swallow your water!’—meaning, absorb your water that came forth from you—‘and Heaven, hold back!’—meaning, restrain your water—‘and the water disappeared in the ground’—that is, the earth absorbed it. The water that came down from heaven became the oceans that are seen on earth today...” (Ibid., pp. 362–363).

This tradition affirms that the ark traveled across the entire globe and even alludes to some of the very Quranic passages we cited in support of a universal flood.

“Abu Ja’Tar (al-Tabari) says: (Noah) and his family became (muslims), where-upon God revealed to him that he would never bring another Flood to the earth” (Ibid., p. 367).

This cannot be speaking of a local flood since these types of floods are common even till this day. Yet, a universal flood has not occurred since.

“Ibn Ishaq, in turn, as we are told by Ibn Humayd-Salamah (- Ibn Ishaq), said... They said: Those who were with him in the boat were people who believed in him and followed him. However, they disappeared and perished, and no descendants of theirs survived. In this world today, the children of Adam are the direct offspring of Noah and of no other descendants of Adam, as God says: ‘And We made his offspring the survivors’ ” (Ibid., p. 368).

If it were merely a local flood, then this statement that only Noah’s seed survived and that we are all his descendants would simply be untrue. In fact, the belief that the flood was only local was a view held by the Persian Magians, a belief contested by Muslims:

“The Magians have no knowledge of the Flood. They say: Our rule continued uninterrupted since the age of Jayumart—who they say is identical with Adam. It was inherited by consecutive rulers to the time of Feroz b. Yazdjard b. Shahriyar. They (also) say: If (the story of the Flood) were sound, the pedigrees of the people would have been disrupted and their rule dissolved. Some of them acknowledge the Flood and assume that it took place in the clime of Babil, and nearby regions, whereas the descendants of Jayumart had their dwellings in the East, and the Flood did not reach them.

“Abu Ja’far (al-Tabari) says: The information given by God concerning the Flood contradicts their statement, and what He says is the truth: ‘Noah called upon Us—and surely, good are those who respond! We delivered him and his family from the great distress and made his offspring the survivors.’ God thus indicates that Noah’s offspring are the survivors, and nobody else...” (Ibid., p. 369).

Continuing a little further:

“According to Ibn Bashshar-Ibn ’Athmah-Sa’id b. Bashir-Qatadah-al-Hasan-Samurah b. Jundub- the Prophet, in connection with commenting on God’s word: ‘And We made his offspring the survivors’: Shem, Ham, and Japheth” (Ibid, p. 369).

Muhammad believed that only Noah and his immediate family survived the flood. This could only be so if the flood were indeed universal, wiping out all flesh.

“According to Bishr (b. Mu’adh)-Yazd (b. Zuray’)-Sa’id (b. Abi ’Arubah)-Qatadah, commenting on God’s word: ‘And We made his offspring the survivors,’ as follows: All human beings are the offspring of Noah” (Ibid, pp. 369–370).

And this final comment from Islam’s premiere Muslim commentator, Ibn Abbas:

“According to Ali b. Dawud-Abu Salih (’Abdallah b. Salih)-Mu’awiyah (b. Salih)-’Ali (b. Abi Talhah)-**Ibn Abbas commenting on God’s word:** ‘And We made offspring the survivors,’ as follows: **Only the offspring of Noah remains**” (Ibid, p. 370, all bold emphasis ours).

All these traditions taken from men such as Ibn Abbas, and even Muhammad himself, clearly refute the modern Islamic position that the Quran teaches a local flood.

A final argument needs to be addressed before concluding this study. Muslims often assert that the Holy Bible wrongly states that the ark landed on Mt. Ararat in present day Turkey (cf. [Gen. 8:4](#)). The Quran, on the other hand, correctly states that the ark landed on Mt. Judi (cf. [S. 11:44](#)).

First, it must be pointed out that the Bible does not say that the ark landed on Mt. Ararat, but rather in “the mountains of Ararat.” Biblical Ararat is ancient Urartu. Secondly, the notion of the ark landing on Mt. Judi was something well known before Islam. These points are conceded by both Christian and Muslim scholars:

The NIV Study Bible’s note on [Genesis 8:4](#) states:

“**mountains.** The word is plural **and refers to a range of mountains.** *Ararat.* The name is related to **Assyrian Urartu, which became an extensive and mountainous kingdom** (see [Jer 51:27](#); see also [Isa 37:38](#)), **including much of the territory north of Mesopotamia and east of modern Turkey.** The ark’s landfall was probably in southern Urartu” (bold emphasis ours).

Muhammad Asad in his *The Message of the Qur’an*, makes the following comments in regards to Mt. Judi:

“This mountain, **known in ancient Syriac as Qardu**, is situated in the region of Lake Van, almost twenty-five miles north-east of the town Jazirat Ibn Umar, capital of the modern Syrian district of Al-Jazirah. It **owes its fame to the Mesopotamian tradition which identifies it**, and not Mt. Ararat, with the mountains on which Noah’s ark rested... This localization of the ark’s resting place ... is certainly based on Babylonian tradition’ (*Encyclopedia of Islam* I, 1059). We should, however, remember that the designation Ararat (**the Assyrian Urartu**) **at one time included the whole area to the south of Lake Van**, in which Jabal Judi is situated: **this might explain the Biblical statement that ‘the ark rested ... upon the mountains of Ararat’ (Genesis viii, 4).**” (Asad, *The Message of the Qur’an* [Dar alAndalus Limited; 3 Library Ramp, Gibraltar, 1984], p.320, f. 66 bold emphasis ours).

The fact that the Quranic statement that the ark had come to rest at Mt. Judi was a well known tradition during Muhammad’s time, and was therefore nothing new, is also admitted by A. Yusuf Ali himself:

“Let us get a little idea of the geography of the place. The letters J, B and K are philologically interchangeable, and Judi, Gudi, Kudi are sounds that can pass into each other. There is no doubt that the name is connected with the name ‘Kurd,’ in which the letter *r* is a later interpolation, for the oldest Sumerian records name a people called Kuti or Gutu as holding the middle Tigris region not later than 2000 B.C. (see E. B., Kurdistan). That region comprises the modern Turkish district of Bohtan, in which Jabal Judi is situated (near the frontiers of modern Turkey, modern Iraq, and modern Syria), and the town of Jazirat ibn ’Umar, (on the present Turco-Syrian frontier), and it extends into Iraq and Persia. The great mountain mass of the Ararat plateau dominates this district. The mountain system ’is unique in the Old World in containing great sheets of water that are bitter lakes without outlets, Lake Van and Lake Urumiya being chief’ (E. B., Asia). Such would be the very region of a stupendous Deluge if the usual scanty rainfall were to be changed into a very heavy downpour. A glacier damming of Lake Van in the Ice Age would produce the same result. **The region has many local traditions connected with Noah and the Flood.** The Biblical legend of Mount Ararat being the resting place of Noah’s Ark is hardly plausible, seeing that the highest peak of Ararat is over 16,000 feet high. If it means one of the lower peaks of the Ararat system, it agrees with Muslim tradition about Mount Judi (or Gudi), **and this is in accordance with the oldest and best local traditions. These traditions are accepted by Josephus, by the Nestorian Christians, and indeed by all the Eastern Christians and Jews, and they are the best in touch with local traditions.** See (Viscount) J. Bryce, ‘*Transcaucasia and Ararat*,’ 4th ed., 1896, p. 216” (Ali, *The Holy Qur’an*, f. 1539, p. 525).

Besides Ali’s blunder on the Holy Bible teaching that the ark landed at Mount Ararat as opposed to “the mountains of Ararat,” his statements are noteworthy in establishing the origin for the Quran’s Mt. Judi story. Ali establishes the case that this tradition precedes Muhammad’s birth by centuries, going back to at least the time of Christ. Hence, the Qur’an really provides nothing new since most of its stories were already known by the locals of Arabia.

## Conclusion

In our study, we have taken into account certain Quranic references that seem to strongly imply that Noah’s flood was a universal event. We have also seen how Muslims such as Ibn Abbas, as well as Muhammad, believed in a universal flood. Taking all these factors into account, we are left to conclude that the assertions of modern Muslim apologists that the Quran teaches a local flood is one devoid of evidence, and are inconsistent with the facts given within the Quran and the earliest historians of Islam.

For further articles by Sam Shamoun, see the Answering Islam home page [www.answering-islam.org](http://www.answering-islam.org)