Hakikat Kitabevi Publications No: 13

could not answer

Turkish version by
HÜSEYN HİLMİ IŞIK

Fourteenth Edition

Hakîkat Kitâbevi
Darüşşefeka Cad. 53/A P.K.: 35
34083 Fatih-ISTANBUL/TURKEY
Tel: 90.212.523 4556–532 5843 Fax: 90.212.523 3693
http://www.hakikatkitabevi.com
e-mail: info@hakikatkitabevi.com
JULY-2020

Ketabton.com

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

CONTENTS

Chapter No.	Essence of chapter	Page No.
1–	Preface	3
2–	Introduction to the first edition	7
3–	Dıyâ-ul-qulûb (Light of the hearts)	19
4–	Observations on the four books called Gospels	43
	a. The Gospel of Matthew	57
	b. The Gospel of Mark	59
	c. The Gospel of Luke	61
	d. The Gospel of John	63
5–	Contradictions and discrepancies among the four Gospels	66
6–	An observation of the Epistles	93
7–	An answer to the book **Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât**	97
8–	Qur'ân al-Kerîm and today's Gospels	132
9–	Trinity (Belief in three gods) and its falsity	180
10–	Proving the falsity of trinity by means of the statements of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'	197
11–	Priests' attacks on Islamic worships and refutations against them	238
12–	Answers to a priest's denigrations	278
13–	Allâhu ta'âlâ is one	346
14–	A discourse on knowledge	360
15–	A discourse on power	365
16–	Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was human. He is not to be worshipped	371
17–	Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is a prophet. He is not to be worshipped	375
18–	Concerning the four Gospels	380
19–	Judaism — The Taurah — Talmud	384
20–	Talmud	393
	Last words of one of our martyrs	401
	Translation of 147th letter	403
	Translation of 83rd letter	408
	Translation of 16th letter	412
	Translation of 153rd letter	417
	Translation of 154th letter	418
	The prayer to be said after namâz	419
	The belief of ahl as-Sunna	420

TYPESET AND PRINTED IN TURKEY BY:
İhlâs Gazetecilik A.Ş.
Merkez Mah. 29 Ekim Cad. İhlâs Plaza No: 11 A/41
34197 Yenibosna-İSTANBUL Tel: 90.212.454 3000

ISBN: 978-605-06630-0-6

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 1 —

PREFACE

May hamd[1] be to Allâhu ta'âlâ! May salutations and benedictions be unto our Prophet Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', the highest of Prophets, unto his pure **Âl,** and unto all of those who had the honour of being Companions **(As-hâb)** to him!

Every thousand years since Adam 'alaihis-salâm', the first human and the first Prophet, Allâhu ta'âlâ sent to mankind a new religion through a new Prophet with a **Sharî'a.** Through them He showed human beings the way of living in peace and comfort in this world and attaining endless felicity in the Hereafter. Those Prophets by whom a new religion was revealed are called **Rasûl.** The superior ones of Rasûls are called **Ulul'azm.** They are Âdam, Nûh (Noah), Ibrâhîm. Mûsâ (Moses), Îsâ (Jesus), and Muhammad 'alaihimus-salâtu was-salâm'

And now the world has three religions with heavenly books: Mûsawî (Judaism), Christianity, and Islam. Taurah was revealed to Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and Injil (the Bible) to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm.' Jews say that they have been following the religion revealed to Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm,' and Christians claim to be following that of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

Qur'ân al-kerîm was revealed to the last Prophet, our Prophet, Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'. Qur'ân al-kerîm has invalidated all the rules of other divine books; in other words, it has abrogated some of them and recollected others within itself. Today, all people have to obey Qur'ân al-kerîm. No country in the world today has any original copies of the Taurah or the Bible. These books were later defiled by human interpolation.

All Prophets, from Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' to the last Prophet Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', taught the same îmân, and stated the same principles for their **umma** to believe. Jews believe in Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and deny Îsâ and Muhammad 'alaihimus-salâm'. Christians believe in Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', too, but they do not believe in Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'. Muslims, on the other hand, believe in all Prophets. They know that Prophets have some superior qualities distinguishing them from other people.

The true religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was soon insidiously changed by his adversaries. A Jew named Paulus (of Tarsus), who said that he believed in Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and pretended to try to spread Îsâwî religion, annihilated the Injil, which had been revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ.

---

[1] Praise and gratitude.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Later the theory of trinity was inserted into the Îsâwî religion. An unreasonable and illogical doctrine, namely father-son-holy spirit, was thus established. There being no copies of the genuine Injil left now, some people scribbled books in the name of Gospel. The council of clergy that met in Nicea in A.D. 325 annulled fifty of the existing fifty-four so-called Gospels. Four Gospels remained: Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. Paul's lies and the theory of trinity propounded by Plato were given place in these Gospels. An apostle named Barnabas wrote a true account of what he had heard and seen from Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', but the Gospel of Barnabas was annihilated.

Constantine the Great, who was formerly a pagan, converted to Christianity in A.D. 313. He ordered that all the Gospels be compiled into one Gospel, but the Council sanctioned four Gospels. A number of ancient pagan elements were assimilated into them. He adopted the Christmas night as the beginning of the new year, and Christianity became the official religion. [It was written in the Injil of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and in the Gospel of Barnabas that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one.] Athanasius the Bishop of Alexandria was a trinitarian. A priest named Arius said that the four Gospels were wrong, that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one, and that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is not His son but His created slave and Prophet, but they would not listen to him. Instead, they excommunicated him. Arius propagated unitarianism, but did not live long. For many years Athanasians and Arians fought against each other. Later on, a number of councils came together and made new changes in the existing four Gospels.

In 446 [A.D. 1054], the Eastern church parted from the Roman church. Christians who were adherent to the Roman church were called Catholics, and adherents of the Eastern [Istanbul] church were called Orthodox.

In the sixteenth century the German priest Luther Martin [A.D. 1483-1546] revolted against the Pope, Leon X. In 923 [A.D. 1517] he founded the Protestant church. This same priest directed some abominable aggressions towards the Islamic religion. Luther Martin and Calvin changed Christianity all the more. Consequently, an unreasonable and implausible religion came into being.

The light shed on Europeans by the Andalusian Muslims commenced a renaissance movement in Europe. Upon learning positive science, many young scientists in Europe revolted against Christianity, which was now fraught with absurdities and illogical ideations. The attacks carried on against Christianity were not applicable against Islam. For, since the first day of its declaration, the Islamic religion has been preserving all its pristine purity. It contains no idea or information that would run counter to reason, logic or knowledge. Qur'ân al-kerîm has been preserved precisely as it was revealed, without even one diacritical dot having been changed.

In order to spread the Christian belief and christianize other

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

peoples, Europeans, led by the British, founded missionary organizations. The ecclesiastical and missionary organizations, which had now become the world's most powerful organizations economically, took to an activity beyond reason. In order to propagate Christianity throughout Islamic countries, they started an intensive hostility against Islam. They began to send thousands of books, brochures and magazines praising Christianity to all parts of Islamic countries. And now books, magazines and brochures teaching Christianity are unceasingly being distributed worldwide. Thus they are trying to blur minds and undermine beliefs.

The Islamic scholars have answered all the views, ideas and philosophical thoughts contrary to the Islamic faith. Meanwhile they have exposed the errors of defiled Christianity. They have declared that it is not permissible to follow the changed and invalidated books. They have explained that, for living in comfort and peace in this world and attaining endless bliss in the next world, it is necessary to be Muslim. Priests have not been able to refute the books of Islamic scholars. The books written by the Islamic scholars to refute strayed religions are numerous. Among them, the following are renowned for replying to Christians:

Tuhfat-ul-erîb, Arabic and Turkish; **Diyâ-ul-qulûb,** Turkish and English; **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq,** Arabic and Turkish; **Es-sirât-ul-mustaqîm,** Arabic; **Izâh-ul-marâm,** Turkish; **Mîzân-ul-mawâzîn,** Persian; **Irshâd-ul-hiyârâ,** Arabic; and **Er-redd-ul-djemîl,** Arabic and French.

Of these, **Diyâ-ul-qulûb,** written by Is-haq Efendi of Harput,[1] especially answers the wrongful writings and slanders written by Protestant priests against Islam. The book was first published in Istanbul in 1293 [A.D. 1876]. Simplifying the book, we published it in Turkish in 1987. Now we present the English edition. We used brackets for adding statements borrowed from a second book. As will be seen in various parts of the book, the priests could not answer the questions they were asked. We therefore considered the title **Could not Answer** appropriate for our book. The unscientific, unreasonable and immoral contents of today's existing copies of the Holy Bible are obvious. On the other hand, the writings of Islamic scholars, shedding light on reason, knowledge, science and civilization, teem in the world's libraries. Being unaware of this fact would therefore be no more than a flimsy pretext. Now, those who search for a religion other than the Islamic religion brought by Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' will not escape endless torment in the world to come. In our book, the meanings of âyat-i-kerîmas are explained in such terms as "It is purported that...", "It purports that...", "It is meant that...", etc. The meaning of these expressions is "According to the explanation of the scholars of Quranic interpretation (Tafsîr)... ." For, the meanings of âyat-i kerîmas were understood only by Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', who explained them to his As-hâb. The scholars

---

[1] Is-Haq Efendi of Harput passed away in 1309 [A.D. 1891].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

of Quranic interpretation distinguished these hadîth-i-sherîfs (explaining the âyat-i-kerîmas) from those hadîth-i-sherîfs concocted by munâfiqs, mulhids and zindiqs, who could not find hadîth-i-sherîfs to suit their purposes and so made their own interpretations of âyat-i-kerîmas within the principles of the science of Tafsîr. The interpretations of those religiously ignorant people who know Arabic but who are unaware of the science of Tafsîr are not to be called Tafsîr of the Qur'ân. For this reason, it is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf: **"He who interprets Qur'ân al-kerîm according to his own inferences will become a kâfir."**

May Allâhu ta'âlâ bestow on us all the fortune of obeying the master of this world and the next, Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'! May He protect us against believing the erroneous ideas and propagandas of missionaries, especially those heretics called **Jehovah's witnesses!** Âmîn.

Mîlâdî	Hijrî Shamsî	Hijrî Qamarî
2001	1380	1422

Publisher's Note:

Anyone who wishes to print this book in its original form or to translate it into any other language is granted beforehand our permission to do so; and people who undertake this beneficial feat are accredited to the benedictions that we in advance offer to Allâhu ta'âlâ in their name and also our best wishes of gratitude and we thank them very much. However, permission is subject to the condition that the paper used in printing be of a good quality and that the design of the text and setting be properly and neatly done without mistakes.

A Warning: Missionaries are striving to advertise Christianity; Jews are working to spread the concocted words of Jewish rabbis; Hakîkat Kitâbevi (Bookstore), in Istanbul, is struggling to publicize Islam; and freemasons are trying to annihilate religions. A person with wisdom, knowledge and conscience will identify and adopt the right one among these alternatives and will help to spread the wisest of these choices, for salvation of all humanity. Nothing, nor any other way, could be better or more valuable, inasmuch as one's aim is to serve humanity.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 2 —

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EDITION

Hamd and praise are merited by Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is wâjib-ul-wujûd (whose existence is absolutely necessary), and belong to Him alone. All the order and the beauties in the universe are the visible lights of the works of His power. His infinite knowledge and power appear on things depending on their various qualities. All existence is a drop of His ocean of knowledge and power. He is one; He does not have a companion (partner, likeness). He is **Samad**, that is, the being with whom all creatures will take refuge. He is free from being a father or son. It is purported in the twenty-third âyat of sûra Hashr: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ does not have a companion, a partner in being ilâh (God). He is the Ruler whose domain never ceases to exist. He is free from any deficiency. He is far from defects or powerlessness. He has secured Believers against the endless torment. He dominates over and preserves everything. He is capable of enforcing His decree.** [When man wants to do something, Allâhu ta'âlâ creates it if He, too, wills it to be so. He alone is the Creator. No one other than He can create anything. No one except He can be called Creator. He has shown the way to salvation that will provide men's living in peace and comfort in this world and the next and attaining endless felicity, and commanded them to live in this way. Greatness and highness belong to Him.] **Allâhu ta'âlâ is free from the polytheism and calumny of the polytheists."**

May salât and selâm be addressed with love via the blessed grave, which is a Paradise garden, of the Messenger of Allâhu ta'âlâ, Muhammad Mustafâ 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', who is the highly honoured Prophet of the latest time. For, that Sarwar 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' was sent with Qur'ân al-kerîm for saving humanity from the darkness of ignorance and establishing tawhîd and îmân. The sixty-fourth âyat of sûra Âl-i-'Imrân purports the following declaration: **"O My Habîb!**[1] **Say unto the**

[1] Most beloved one, darling.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Jews and Christians, who are ahl al-kitâb: Concede to the word which is common between us and you without any difference among the heavenly books and Prophets: 'We worship none but Allâhu ta'âlâ and we do not attribute any partner to Allâhu ta'âlâ.' " Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' was commanded to adapt himself to the genuine meaning of this divine call.

May selâm and benedictions be addressed via the blessed graves of his 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' Âl and As-hâb. Each of them is a star of hidâya guiding to the way of happiness and salvation approved by Allâhu ta'âlâ. They each sacrificed their lives and property for the spreading of the Islamic faith. They carried and taught the **Kalima-i-tawhîd** [the Arabic expression which reads 'Esh-hadu anlâ-ilâha il-l-Allah wa esh-hadu anna Muhammadan 'abduhu wa rasûluh,' and which purports, "I definitely believe and testify that Allâhu ta'âlâ exists and is one; and I definitely believe and testify that Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is His created slave and Messenger"] all over the world.

As anyone with reason will see, when the universe is observed with prudence, all the deeds and situations in this universe are in an order dependent upon unchangeable laws. A discreet person will conclude at once that a Khâliq (Creator), who is wâjib-ul-wujûd (necessary existence) and who establishes these laws and preserves them as they are, is necessary. Then, Jenâb-i Haqq (Allah) is the absolute Creator, Who is eternal in the past and eternal in the future, Who is the original beginning of everything, and how He is cannot be comprehended through mind. He has collected all sorts of perfection and superiority in Himself. He is Ahad, that is, He is One in His person, deeds and attributes. He does not have a likeness.

Allâhu ta'âlâ is one, He is azalî, abadî, and qadîm. He is far from any sort of change. Everything other than He in the world of beings becomes old, deteriorates, and changes in process of time. But Allâhu ta'âlâ is far, free from any kind of change. He never changes. As time will not change the expression "One plus one makes two", so the oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ does not change with the elapse of centuries of time.

Man, who has been distinguished from other creatures with such a gift as mind, has been cognizant of this fact since his creation on the earth. This fact has been explained in different ways by different religions and sects. However, since men's mental and intellectual capacities differ, each person searching for the Creator has imagined Him within his own nature,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

temperament, knowledge and cognitive capacity, and described Him according to his own understanding and temperament. For, man has likened what he cannot understand or know because of the incapability and shortcoming of his mind to the things he knows. Most of those who claim to have discovered the fact, have plunged into atrocities and aberrations such as magic, idolatry, and polytheism.

Since man, with his imperfect mind, cannot understand the absolute Creator; Allâhu ta'âlâ, the most merciful of the merciful, sent Prophets to every nation in every century. Thus He taught men the truth of the matter. The fortunate ones who believed were saved, and attained happiness in this world and in the Hereafter. The hapless, unlucky ones objected, denied, and remained in depression and frustration.

Each Prophet lived in a different country in a different period, and was sent to a nation with different customs and traditions. Every Prophet, while teaching the existence and oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ to people, stated some rules and worships that will bring about man's happiness in this world and the next. According to historians, approximately sixteen hundred and fifty years before the accepted birth date of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', Allâhu ta'âlâ sent Mûsâ (Moses) 'alaihis-salâm' as the Prophet. Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' taught the Sons of Israel the belief in the existence and oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ and some other principles of îmân, as they had been taught by the other Prophets preceding him, such as Âdam, Nûh (Noah), Idris, Ibrâhîm, Is-hâq, and Ya'qûb 'alaihimus-salâm', to their own tribes in their own times. Spreading the information pertaining to compulsory worships and principles of social relations far and near, he tried to make the Sons of Israel refrain from polytheism. After Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' the Sons of Israel (Benî Isrâîl) were afflicted with various disasters and tumults, because they deviated from the essentials of îmân. Upon this, Allâhu ta'âlâ sent Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as the Prophet to the Sons of Israel. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' spread and taught the tawhîd, which means the existence and oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and other principles of îmân, thus trying to bring the aberrant people back to the right course and reinforcing the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

After Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', his adherents deviated from the true faith taught by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', as the Sons of Israel had strayed from the right way before. Later, they wrote books called Gospels and pamphlets about Christianity daily. Various councils

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

held at different places made completely contradictory decisions. Thus, altogether different Christian sects appeared. They forsook the principle of tawhîd[1] and the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' thoroughly [and became polytheists and disbelievers]. Upon this Allâhu ta'âlâ sent Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', His most beloved, highest and last of the Prophets until the day of Judgement, unto the Earth.

Most of the religious commandments taught by Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' pertained to zâhirî [physical, perceptible] deeds, and most of the commandments of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' were on bâtinî matters of the heart (morals, ethics, etc.). Finally, bringing zâhirî and bâtinî together, Allâhu ta'âlâ revealed to Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' the most perfect, the most superior religion, Islam, and the divine book of this religion, **Qur'ân al-kerîm**. Allâhu ta'âlâ, sending the angel with wah'y to our exalted Prophet, declared to all mankind the most perfect religion, Islam, which is a comprehensive selection of the up-to-date zâhirî deeds commanded by the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and the bâtinî matters commanded by the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', in addition to numerous zâhirî and bâtınî essentials.

Tawhîd, that is, the principle of belief that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one, is not different in any of the heavenly religions; they are all based on the principle of tawhîd. The only difference betwen them is on the knowledge of rules and worships. No disagreement or controversy took place as to the principle of the existence and oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ until two hundred years after the ascension of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. All the hawârîs (apostles of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm') and their followers and the successors of their followers lived and died up to the principle of the unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ, which was stated clearly in the Injil. None of the three firstly written Gospels [Matthew, Mark, Luke] contained even one letter denoting to trinity, which means the creed of father-son-holy spirit, in (today's) Christianity. Then the fourth Gospel, which is ascribed to John, appeared in Greek. This Gospel exhibited some terms indicating trinity [three real beings], which was originally the Greek philosopher Plato's theory. At that time discussions and controversies on the two Greek philosophies, Rawâqiyyûn and Ishrâqiyyûn, were going on in the schools of Alexandria. **Rawâqiyyûn** (Stoicism) is a school of philosophy founded at Athens in 308 B.C. by the Greek Philosopher Zeno.

---

[1] Unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Ishrâqiyyûn (Pythagoreanism) is a school of philosophy founded by Pythagoras (in 6th. century B.C.). These philosophies will be dealt with later on. The fanatics of Plato wanted John's Gospel to become popular. However, in the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', no statement implying three gods – may Allah protect us against believing such a creed! – had been heard of, so the believers of the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' rejected and protested it vehemently. Thus the believers of the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' parted into two groups, which meant number of debates and fights between them. In A.D. 325, during the reign of Constantine I, the Nicene council abandoned tawhîd [the unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ], which was the essential principle of the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. With the oppression of Constantine, who was a Platonist, they adopted the creed of trinity, i.e. father-son-holy spirit. From that time on, the creed of trinity began to spread far and near. Real believers who believed in the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' were scattered. So Plato's philosophy reappeared and the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was given up. Real believers who believed in this religion hid themselves. Thus the dogma of trinity that took the place of the religion of tawhîd became more and more powerful, and the Nasârâ (Nazarenes) who believed in the unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ were dispersed here and there, excommunicated, killed, and finally annihilated by the trinitarian churches. Soon there was none of them left.

In 399 [A.D. 1054] the Patriarch of Istanbul, Michael Kirolarius, revolted against the unbearable oppression of the western church whose center was in Rome. He refused to accept the belief that the Pope in Rome was the caliph of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and the representative of St Peter, (an apostle accepted as the first Pope). He opposed the Roman church in some essential matters such as priests' living in isolation from the people.

Each of the ecclesiastical assemblies, which they called councils, made totally different decisions. They separated themselves from those who would not agree with their decisions. Thus seventy-two sects appeared. Nevertheless the Roman church abode by its course. In those years the European rulers were entirely ignorant and oblivious to all these events. They were practising all sorts of robbery and cruelty on their subjects who were no different from flocks of sheep. Lest anyone would stand against these robberies and cruelties, the rulers were exploiting the authority which priests had over the ignorant people. It was as if they (the kings) were under priests' authority.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Priests, in their turn, well aware of the rulers' ignorance, intensions and weaknesses, exploited their sovereignty to their own advantages. In appearance Europe was under the kings' sovereignty, but the only, and independent, domination belonged to priests. In fact, in the earlier years of Christianity, execution of priests' wishes and desires was dependent upon the Italian kings' sanction. Afterwards papal authority was augmented, to the extent that enthronement and dethronement of kings became possible only when priests wished so. The time's ignorant populace, being totally unaware, were crushed between their rulers' oppression and cruelty and priests' avarice and greed. They endured all sorts of torment and trouble. They kept silent patiently, (as if all those situations were Allah's commandments). Thus the darkness of ignorance and bigotry turned the whole continent into ruins and disrepairs.

In the meantime, Islamic countries were under administrations quite antonymous to those of the Christian Europe. Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Egypt, Turkistan had made material and spiritual progress in all areas under the Amawî (Umayyad) and Abbâsî (Abbasid) khalîfas. [At that time Muslims were in welfare both spiritually and materially.] Under the reign of Andalusian Amawî sultans, Muslims had improved Spain to greatness and to the peak of civilization. Great care was given to science, arts, trade, agriculture, and ethics. Spain, which had been a territory of savagery under the Gothic invasion, was now like a garden of Paradise with the Islamic administration. European businessmen and industrialists could never pay back the debt they owe to Islam. They ought to be thanking Muslims forever. For, the first spark of knowledge in Europe was thrown off from the Andalusian Muslims.

The brilliant civilization that had appeared in Andalusia overflowed Andalusia and spread over Europe. Some talented Europeans noticed the civilization in Andalusia and translated the books of Islamic scholars into European languages. Owing to the books they translated, compiled and published, European people began to rise from their sleep of ignorance. Eventually, one Martin Luther of Germany came forward with a view to being the renovator, the restorer of Christianity. Luther opposed the majority of unreasonable ecclesiastical principles. [Martin Luther, a German priest, founded the Protestantism, a sect of Christianity. Christians adherent to the Pope are called Catholics. Luther was born in 888 [A.D. 1483], and died in 953 [A.D. 1546]. He wrote

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

numerous books. He was an adversary of the Pope and an unbridled enemy of Islam. Catholics and Protestants are still hostile to each other.] Then Calvin appeared. Joining Luther in his protestations, he disagreed with him in some matters. Luther and Calvin refused the ways of worship prescribed by the Roman church. They opposed the idea of the Pope's being a deputy of Peter and a successor of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. The followers of Luther and Calvin were called Protestants.

The Roman church had already lost one-third of its adherents with the separation of the Eastern Church; and now the appearing of Protestantism took away another third. This event exasperated the popes. They resorted to an atrocious measure: victory, using the military powers of the time's Catholic kings, by putting all the Protestants to the sword. Since belief and conscience can never be changed by force, this measure had the opposite effect. It caused Protestantism to spread in England and America. Upon this the Roman church took to the project of increasing their population by Christianizing believers of other religions and savage tribes. They established Catholic schools all over the world. In order to disseminate and propagate the name Catholic, they educated and trained extremely fanatical priests that they called **missionaries.** They sent them in groups to other countries such as America, Japan, China, Abyssinia (Ethiopia), and to Islamic countries. It was only some ignoramuses that missionaries were able to deceive by various promises and advantages in the countries they arrived in. In ignorant communities they provoked daughters against mothers, sons against fathers, and made them hostile against one another. They aroused various tumults and coups in the countries they were stationed. Eventually, governments and peoples being fed up with missionaries' mischief and instigation, they were deported from most of the countries they were located in. In some countries they were punished even more severely; they were executed. These missionaries, with the pretext of propagating Christianity, inflicted so much damage to humanity that they caused the whole world to hate Christianity. In fact, when a person reads the history books written about the unprecedented barbarous measures and persecutions practised by the Roman church with Catholic bigotry and materialistic desires, e.g. the inquisition massacres on St. Bartholomew's eve, his hair will stand on end with horror.

No sooner had the Catholic church started activity of training missionaries for spreading Catholicism than the Protestants took

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

action. Establishing societies at various places, they collected a wealth of capital. They sent books and missionaries teaching Protestantism to all parts of the world, [under direction of the Ministry of Colonies, which was established in England to annihilate Islam]. As is recorded in the book of expenses, which was published afterwards, the British Protestant society named the **Bible House,** which was founded in 1219 [A.D. 1804], had the Bible translated into two hundred different languages. The number of books published by this society by the end of 1287 [A.D. 1872] reached almost 70 million. This same society spent two hundred five thousand three hundred and thirteen (205,313) English golds for the propagation of Protestantism. [This society is still carying on its activities; establishing infirmaries, hospitals, lecture halls, libraries, schools, places of entertainment such as cinemas, sports institutions. They are spending extraordinary efforts to coax those who attend such places to becoming Protestants. Catholics are using the same methods. In addition, they are procuring employment for youngsters and giving food to the people in poor countries, thus alluring them to Christianity.] For all these activities (of missionaries), Europeans are not so blind as they were; they have already opened their eyes and realized how pernicious and how incendiary these missionaries are, after numerous experiences. Therefore, missionaries are not popular among Europeans. Missionaries send the books which they issue [in enormous numbers] to other countries free of charge, instead of publicising them among their own European compatriots. They have never had the courage to approach another European country, let alone spreading their religion there, unless that country is under the legislature of their own country. [Catholic missionaries are not allowed to spread Catholicism in Protestant countries, and Protestant missionaries are not allowed to spread Protestantism in Catholic countries.] The moment such an act is noticed, they are deported by the police. These missionaries are despised in all the European countries they go to.

Missionaries have been very successful in exploiting the tolerance which the Ottoman state has always shown to non-Muslim religions. For the last forty or fifty years, they infiltrated into countries under the protection of the Ottoman state. Establishing schools at various places and using the pretence of serving humanity by educating the people's children, they have deceived some illiterate people. Because ignorant people are not

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

fully aware of their religious commandments and duties in every country alike, and the wealth of the Protestant organization being specially enormous, they have rationed those who have accepted Protestantism to monthy and yearly salaries. In addition, through their embassies and consulates, they have helped those who have obeyed them and become Protestants to acquire distinguished positions at various bureaucratic echelons. They have successfully coaxed the Anatolian and Thracian Christian Ottoman subjects to become attached to them. However, because such people have been persuaded to such an attachment by means of gold and money, they have not given the benefits expected. Al-hamd-u-li-llâh (gratitude be to Allah), they have not been successful in deceiving [coaxing to Christianity] even one well-known Muslim.

In 1282 [A.D. 1866] missionaries, in order to deceive Muslims, published a Bible in Turkish in Istanbul and appended to it a statement in Turkish which meant (in English): "This book is the revised version of the former edition, which was translated by Ali Beg and published with the help of Turâbî Efendi." With this statement they divulged, so to speak, that they had managed to deceive some Muslims. We know the person who translated the Bible for a few hundred golds at that time. But it is not known whether he accepted Protestantism. Moreover, since no one is known by the name of Alî Beg and capable of doing this job, it is not unlikely at all that the name was a sham. For, if he had been a well-known person, his popular title would have been written. As for Turâbî Efendi; it is no surprise for this person living in Egypt and married to a Protestant girl to have done them a service such as this. But he was never seen to like or approve the Protestant rites. On the contrary, since he disclosed all their abominations, he cannot be believed to have changed his religion. Even if it had been so, Turâbî Efendi is not a person known by everybody; as a boy he was sent to England by the Egyptian government and learned English in a church school. And this in turn means that 'Turâbî Efendi inclined towards Protestantism before having learnt Islam.'

It is not possible for any Christian to give the example of a wise Muslim who knows Islam, who has been brought up with Islamic education, who has fully learned the real essence of Islam, who has tasted the spiritual flavour and smelled the sweet scent of kalima-i-tawhîd, and who has, after all, converted to Protestantism. If so, then it should be inquired whether the reason has been one of such things as money, protection, and rank. It is

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

very difficult, even impossible to persuade a person who expresses, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ does not have a partner or likeness. I believe that He is free from such defects,"** to believe in the dogma, *"Allah is one but three"* or *"Allah is three but one."* If a Muslim who knows the principles of îmân busies himself too much in philosophy, it may be possible for him to tend towards philosophers' course. But it is impossible for him to become a Christian. For this reason, the real protector of Islamic religion is Allâhu ta'âlâ, and the insidious and harmful activities of missionaries bear no threat to Muslims. In fact, such a thought is no more than a condescension on our part. However, priests stationed in our country, to carry out the task they were assigned by their superiors in their missionary organizations, began to write books misrepresenting Islam as being wrong and Christianity as a superior religion (the fact is quite the other way round) and distribute them free of charge. Always avoiding the truth, they have been trying to misrepresent aberration as the true way. It is fard-i-kifâya (Islamic command) for learned Muslims to refute missionaries' lies and slanders. Their real purpose is to arouse turmoil in the Islamic religion and to sow discord among kinsfolk such as wife and husband, parents and children, etc., as they have always done in every country. [For, these people think that today's Gospels are the words of Allah and say that they have been obeying the commandments given in them.] It is written in the thirty-fourth and thirty-fifth verses of the tenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that Îsâ alaihis-salâm said: (which is never true) "Think not that I am come to send peace on earth; I came not to send peace, but a sword." (Matt: 10-34, Authorized (King James) Version, 1978) "For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter in law against her mother in law." (ibid: 10-35) Following these words, missionary priests deceived ignorant people and incited them against the state. Their real purpose was, by means of these stratagems, to endanger the Islamic religion and its protector, the Ottoman Empire. Thus they threw the seeds of instigation and animosity among the Christian minority who had been leading a peaceful life under the mercy and protection of the Ottoman Empire. Since the time of the Ashâb-i-kirâm till now, no Islamic state interfered in the religious affairs of their non-Muslim subjects, nor did they ever hurt their religious sentiments. The Ottomans, especially, provided all sorts of help and facility regarding the religious practices of non-Muslims living

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

under their rule for six hundred years; let alone interfering in their religious services, Islam commands this help and justice. Our Prophet's commands in this respect are recorded in Islamic books, [See our other English publications.] It was under the guarantee of the Ottoman state, therefore, that no one, whatever his religion, would be abused or maltreated on account of his or her creed. Being a person's guest and at the same time slandering and stamping on his sacred beliefs, is an event unprecedented in the world annals. The important fact here is the false charges directed to Islam by Islam's enemies through destructive words, writings, books, [television broadcasts, video cassettes]. (So the thing to be done) is to call public attention to these lies and slanders, [to answer them], and to exhibit to the whole world the sophisms on which they based their publications under the cloak of truth. The Turkish book which I published with the title **Ṣems-ül-Hakîka** (the Sun of Truth) gives very beautiful answers to missionary aggressions directed to Islam. In that book of mine, a number of facts about Christianity are explained in detail, and a lot of questions are propounded. Nevertheless, Christian priests are still publishing new lying, fallacious books, as if they saw neither these questions nor the splendid book titled **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq,** which was written in Arabic by Rahmatullah Efendi, one of the great 'Ulamâ of India, and was later translated into Turkish. In these new books they are repeating the same old calumnies of theirs. They have not been able to answer even one of the questions we have directed to them in **Ṣems-ül-hakîka** and **Iz-hâr-ul-haq.**

It is stated as follows on the three hundred and ninetieth page of the Persian book **Maqâmât-i-akh-yâr:** "Fander, a Protestant priest, was very famous among Christians. The Protestant missionary organization sent Fander and some other selected priests to India. They were supposed to work for the propagation of Christianity. In 1270 [A.D. 1854], sometime in the (lunar) month of Rebî'ul-âkhir and on the eleventh of Rajab (another lunar month), debates umpired by some 'Ulamâ and other distinguished personage were held between this missionary group and Rahmatullah Efendi, the great 'âlim of Delhi. After long discussions, Fander and his colleagues were defeated and silenced completely. Four years later, when British forces invaded India [and subjected Muslims and men of religion and especially the Sultan to terrifying torments], Rahmatullah Efendi migrated to Mekka-i-mukarrama (the blessed city of Mecca). In 1295 [A.D.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

1878] this missionary body came to Istanbul and began propagating Christianity. The Grand Vizier Khayr-ud-dîn Pasha[1] invited Rahmatullah Efendi to Istanbul. When confronted with Rahmatullah Efendi, the missionaries were frightened. Being unable to answer the questions, they decided vanishing would be best. The Pasha generously awarded this great Islamic 'âlim. He requested him to write about how he had refuted and routed the Christians. So he began writing his Arabic book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq** on the sixteenth of Rajab and finished it by the end of Zi'lhijja, and went to Mekka. Khayr-ud-dîn Pasha had it translated into Turkish and had both of the books printed. They were translated into European languages, and printed and published in every country. British newspapers wrote, "If this book spreads, Christianity will be impaired badly." Sultan Abdulhamîd Khân 'rahmatullâhi 'aleyh', who was the Khalîfa (caliph) of all Muslims, invited him (Rahmatullah Efendi) again in 1304 [A.D. 1890], and treated him with veneration and hospitality. Rahmatullah Efendi passed away in Mekka-i-mukarrama in the month of Ramadhân in 1308 [1890].

With the help of Allâhu ta'âlâ we have now begun to write this Turkish book, which we name **Diyâ-ul-qulûb.** Yet, it should be known well that our purpose in writing this book is only to refute the books and brochures published against Islam by Protestant missionaries, thus performing our duty of resisting them. Our Christian citizens who want to preserve their religion and peace are also weary of these missionaries and agree with us in repelling their mischief.

Is-haq Efendi
of
HARPUT

[1] Khayr-ud-dîn Pasha passed away in 1307 [A.D. 1889].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 3 —
DIYÂ-UL-QULÛB
(LIGHT OF THE HEARTS)

Protestant priests say as follows in one of the booklets they published against Islam in Istanbul:

"The virtue and the superiority of Christianity is inferred from the fact that it is spreading very fast among people on account of its effects compatible with daily life and universal domination. Allâhu ta'âlâ has sent Christianity down to earth as a true religion superior to other religions. The abolitions, catastrophies, dissipations falling upon Jewry are all obvious punishments inflicted upon them by Allah as a result of their denying Christianity.

"If it is asserted that with the rising of Islam, Christianity was abrogated; it is questionable whether Islam is superior to Christianity in its liveliness, life-style, or in its capability of attracting people's hearts, or whether Christians were condemned with the same terrifying catastrophes with the rising of Islam as had been sent upon Jewry. Christianity spread for three hundred years, without any state power. Islam, on the other hand, was transformed from religion to state power before the Hegira. For this reason, it is a difficult task to make a sound comparison between Islam and Christianity as to the spiritual and incorporeal effects they have upon the human heart. However, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' *called people to religion for three years. Many people became his followers within this period. He chose the twelve apostles from among them. Sometime later he chose seventy more people in the name of 'Apostles of Gospel'. He sent them forth to guide people to the true path. Later he gathered a hundred and twenty more people. As reported by apostles, it is written clearly in St. Paul's epistles that Îsâ* 'alaihis-salâm', *within the forty days before his death, sent forth 500 Christian believers to call people to religion."*

This booklet, which they published in Istanbul, goes on as

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

follows: *"According to Arabic historians, such as Ibn Is-hâq,*[1] *Wâqidî,*[2] *Tabarî,*[3] *Ibni Sa'd,*[4] *etc., the first believers of Muhammad* 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' *are only hadrat Hadîja, his wife; Zayd bin Hârisa, his adopted son and slave; Alî bin Ebî Tâlib, his paternal uncle's son; Abû Bakr-i Siddîq, his faithful friend and companion in the cave; and a few slaves who had been generously benefited by this last one. Up to the time of hadrat 'Umar's conversion to Islam, i.e. the sixth year of Bi'that, the number of Muslim converts were fifty. In some other report there is a mention of forty to forty-five men and ten to eleven women. In fact, by the tenth year of Bi'that, the number of the second group of Muslims that migrated to Abyssinia because of the persecutions and hostile treatments inflicted by the Meccan polytheists, reached one hundred and one, eighty-three of which were men and eighteen were women.* (Bi'that means Hadrat Muhammad's 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wasallam' being designated as the Messenger of Allah.) *Wâqidî says in his book that the number of muhâjirs that took part in the holy war of Bedr, which was fought nineteen months after the Hegira, was eighty-three. Accordingly, within the period of thirteen years before the Hegira, believers of Muhammad* 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' *were only one hundred. It is written in history books, again, that the number of those who joined him during the Hegira was only seventy-three men and two women. These contrasts make clear which has more positive effect on the hearts: Islam or Christianity. For, if a comparison is made between the number of people who believed Îsâ* 'alaihis-salâm' *through mere preaching without any compulsion or enforcement and those who believed Muhammad* 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' *under the same conditions, it will be seen that, whereas one hundred and eighty people believed Muhammad* 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' *as a result of this thirteen years' invitation, Îsâ* 'alaihis-salâm' *had more than five hundred believers within a period of three years. Afterwards, there became differences between Islam and Christianity with respect to modes of spreading. The reasons for these differences were only the methods and media used. First of all, the umma of*

---

[1] Ibni Is-hâq passed away in 151 [A.D. 768], in Baghdad.

[2] Muhammad Wâqidî passed away in 207 [A.D. 822].

[3] Tabarî, (Abû Ja'far Muhammad bin Jerîr), passed away in 310 [A.D. 923], in Baghdad.

[4] Ibni Sa'd Muhammad Basrî passed away in 230 A.H.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' *were belligerent. Being victorious after wars, they improved and became widely known suddenly. Indeed, Islam did not spread owing to its powerful effect on the hearts, as was the case with Christianity. The early Christians, on the other hand, endured Persians' persecutions and torments for three hundred years. Although they confronted with various hindrances, their number expanded so rapidly that there were several million Christians already by A.D. 313, when Constantine I converted to Christianity. People defeated by Muslims were, outwardly, not forced to accept Islam. But through various discouragements they were deprived of their national customs and traditions. In addition to being subjected to various hostile treatments, they were prohibited from the occasions in which to perform their religious rites. They had no other way than bearing these impediments and oppressions. This came to mean that they were intangibly compelled to accept Islam. For example, more than four thousand churches are reported to have been demolished in the time of 'Umar-ul-Fârûq* 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. *It is no wonder that thousands of ignorant, worldly or unprotected people accepted Islam in order to acquire property or position in the chaos of those days. This spreading of Islam is like the appearing of universal conquerors such as Alexander the Great. The great conquests carried on by Muslims does not show that Qur'ân al-kerîm is a book sent by Allah. In fact, all these conquests and performances of Muslims were not appreciated by those Christians that were under their domination. On the other hand, Christians' call had a stronger effect on Persians. For, there cannot even be a smallest pagan society in Europe today. However, there are very many Christians in Muslim countries.*

"Having refused Christianity, Jewry was doomed to the wrath of Allâhu ta'âlâ. They were expatriated from their homelands and became an evil nation expelled from wherever they went. Did Christians undergo at minimum the same, let alone more, catastrophes as those of Jewry, for having refused Islam? Today there are some 150 million Muslims on the earth, whereas the number of Christians is over 300 million. A true religion sent by Allah will enjoin justice and reason. It will bestow the fortune of approaching Allâhu ta'âlâ by means of perfect belief and worship. This religion will elevate its believers to highest grades and guide them to material and spiritual peace. These are doubtless facts. If Christianity had been invalidated with the rising of Islam, Islamic countries would necessarily be superior to other countries in

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

respect of wealth and welfare. Now then, Islam's place of birth is Arabia, which was under Muslims' domination in the time of Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. *Later, in the time of the early caliphs, Muslims subdued and dominated many wealthy nations of the world. Nevertheless, the fortune that was obtained in a short time was lost again equally soon. Even today, the Arabs are in misery. Most Muslim countries are desolate, and their land is deprived of agriculture. Muslims living there are far from wealth, civilisation and improvement. They need Europe's help in knowledge and arts. In fact, when they need an engineer they bring one from Europe. The youth's navigational and military education and training is entrusted to Christian instructors. Weapons used by Muslim soldiers in wars, sheets of paper that scholars and secretaries write on, and most of the clothings worn and the things used by them, from the youngest to the oldest, are made in Europe. Can anyone deny the fact that they are brought from there? Even the arms used by Muslim soldiers are brought from Europe. On the other hand, Europe has improved and made progress with respect to population, education, state and wealth. They have built immaculate hospitals, orderly schools and orphanages. Now they are trying to promulgate Christianity by establishing hospitals in other countries and sending teachers and books. As for Muslims; why do they not spend any effort to call pagans and Christians to Islam, publish millions of translations of Qur'ân al-kerîm, or send forth scholars and messengers? If Islam's rising had abrogated and invalidated Christianity, would the state of affairs be as it is now?..."*

ANSWER: When the theories put forth in the booklets published by Christian missionaries are summarized; the hypothesis that Christianity is a true, validated religion superior to the Islamic religion has been based on the following few proofs: the rapid spreading of Christianity; the fact that the grave catastrophes that fell upon Jewry did not fall upon Christians; Islam's spreading by the sword, i.e. by fighting, v.s. Christianity's spreading by preaching, kindness, and feeling of mercy for people; Christians' outnumbering Muslims; Christian states' being powerful; Christians' being ahead of Muslims in industry, wealth and improvement; their trying to do good and paying special attention to this; the fact that there are no pagans in Europe while there are Christians and Jews all over Islamic countries.

In response to their first proof, *"The rapid spreading of Christianity"*, it will be enough to quote from Sale, a priest, a

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Christian historian, and a translator of Qur'ân al-kerîm. [George Sale died in 1149 (A.D. 1736). He was a British orientalist. He translated Qur'ân al-kerîm into English in 1734. In the introduction to his translation he gave detailed information about Islam. It was the first translation of Qur'ân al-kerîm in a European language.] In this translation, which was printed in 1266 [A.D. 1850], he states, "Before the Hegira (Hijra) the blessed city of Medina did not have a single home whence Muslims did not go out. That is, Islam had already entered every home in Medina. If a person asserts that *'Islam spread in other countries only by the sword'*, this will be a vain and ignorant accusation. For there is many a country whose people accepted Islam without even having heard the word sword. They became Muslims by hearing Qur'ân al-kerîm, whose rhetoric impresses the hearts."[1]

There are innumerous events exemplifying the fact that Islam did not spread with the force of the sword. For example. Abû Zer-i Ghifârî, his brother Unays, and their blessed mother Ummu Zer 'radiy-Allâhu 'anhum" were among the early Muslims. Later, upon Abû Zer-i Ghifârî's invitation, half of the Benî Ghifâr tribe became Muslims. By the tenth year of Bi'that, the number of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu 'anhum" who migrated to Abyssinia from Mekka was 101, eighty-three men and eighteen women. These excluded a large number of Sahâbîs who remained in Mekka-i-mukarrama (the blessed city of Mekka). In the meantime, twenty Christians from Najran became Muslims. Dimâd-i-Ezdî became a Believer before the tenth year of Bi'that. Tufayl Ibn Amr 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' became a Muslim together with his parents and all the people of his tribe before the Hijra. In Medina-i munawwara (the blessed city of Medina), the Benî Sahl tribe were honoured with Islam before the Hijra, owing to the benefic preaches of Mus'ab bin Umayr 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh'. The inhabitants of Medina-i-munawwara became Believers before the Hijra with the exception of Amr bin Thâbit 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh", who became a Believer after the Holy War of Uhud. Even the bedouins living in the villages near Nejd and Yemen became Muslims. After the Hijra Buraydat-ul-Eslemî 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' and seventy other people came and became Muslims altogether. Najâshî, the Abyssinian emperor, became a Believer before the Hijra. [Abyssinian emperors are called Najâshî (Negus). The

---

[1] Please see the book **Why Did They Become Muslims?,** available from Hakîkat Kitâbevi, Fâtih, Istanbul, Turkey.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

name of the Negus contemporary with Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wasallam’ was As-hâma. He was a Christian and then became a Muslim.] Also Abû Hind, Temîm, and Na’îm became Muslims together with their relatives, and four other respectable persons sent presents bearing the meaning that they believed Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam’ and then became Muslims. Before the Holy War of Bedr, in Medina and in its neighbourhood there were already several thousand people who had become Muslims by listening to the merciful, compassionate preaches of our master, Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam’, who is the most beloved one of Allâhu ta’âlâ, and hearing Qur’ân al-kerîm, which has been admitted by all the Arabic rhetoricians and which has always filled people with feelings of submission and admiration. The number of people who believed Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ during the period of his invitation was, according to Biblical estimation, only one hundred and two. The number of people having the honour of joining the religion of Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ upon seeing the extraordinary events that took place after the execution of hadrat Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’, which is the belief held by Christians, reached only five hundred. [The absolute truth is that Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ was neither executed nor crucified. Allâhu ta’âlâ elevated him alive to the heavens.]

It is written in **Qisâs-i Enbiyâ**[1] that the number of Muslim soldiers who conquered Mekka-i-mukarrama in the eighth year of the Hijra was twelve thousand, that more than thirty thousand Muslims from Medina joined the Holy War of Tabuk in the ninth year of the Hijra, and that (the Prophet’s) farewell hajj was performed with more than a hundred thousand Muslims in the tenth year of the Hijra.

It is recorded in all books that the number of the As-hâb-i-kirâm ‘radiy-Allâhu ’anhum ajma’în’ who had had the honour of believing Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam’ before his honouring the hereafter with his blessed presence reached hundred and twenty-four thousand (124,000). After Rasûlullah’s ‘sall-Allâhu ’alaihi wa sallam’ honouring the next world with his blessed presence, the event of Museylemet-ul-kezzâb took place. Abû Bakr as-Siddîq ‘radiy-Allâhu ’anh’, who was the first Khalîfa, sent more than 12,000 Islamic soldiers against Museylemet-ul-kezzâb. In this Holy War more than nine hundred hâfidh al-

[1] Ahmed Cevdet Pasha, the editor of Qisâs-i Enbiyâ, passed away in 1312 [A.D. 1894].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Qur'ân reached the rank of martyrdom. How many Muslims, men and women, should there have been under the command of a caliph who sent twelve thousand soldiers to Medina, which is a distance of several stages of travel? Which spread wider and faster, Christianity, or Islam? Owners of wisdom should draw their own conclusions!

Three or four years after the passing of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam', 'Umar-ul-Fârûq 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh', the second Khalîfa, sent forth an army of forty thousand Muslims and conquered the whole of Iran up to India; Asia Minor up to Konya; and Syria, Palestine and Egypt. Most of the people living in these places saw the justice and beautiful morality in the Islamic religion and thus were honoured with becoming Muslims. Very few remained in their former wrong religions such as Christianity, Judaism and magi. Thus, as unanimously stated by historians, the number of Muslims living in Islamic countries reached twenty or thirty million in such a very short time as ten years. On the other hand, as is asserted by Christian missionaries, Constantine I accepted Christianity three hundred years after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. With his help and reinforcement, the number of Christians reached only six million. The comparison between the number of Muslims reaching thirty million in ten years and the number of Christians reaching six million in three hundred years elucidates which religion spread more rapidly.

Their assertion that *"Islam spread only by the sword, by fighting"* is equally unfounded. For, when 'Umar-ul-Fârûq 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' conquered a place, he would give its inhabitants the freedom to accept Islam or to remain Christians and pay the tax called jizya. So they would choose the way they liked. The highest rate of jizya they paid was no more than a few pounds when compared with today's money; having to give such a small amount of tax could not compel those who were rich to renegade from their religion. The property, the chastity and the religious freedom of those who paid the jizya were like those of Muslims, and all were treated equally and with justice. Giving a few pounds of jizya yearly was in return for the protection of their property, chastity and rights; is it possible to find a few people that will renegade from their fathers' and grandfathers' religion in order not to pay this amount?

[It is said as follows in the (Turkish) book **Herkese Lâzım Olan Îmân** (Îmân That is Necessary for Everyone): The history professor Shiblî Nu'manî, the chief of India's **Nadwat-ul-'ulamâ**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

assembly and the author of the well-known book, **Al-Intiqâd,** died in 1332 (A.D. 1914). His book **Al-Fârûq,** in Urdu, was translated into Persian by General Esedullah Khan's mother, (who was at the same time) the sister of the Afghan ruler Nâdir Shah, and (the translation) was printed in Lahor city in 1352 (A.D. 1933) with Nâdir Shah's command. It is written in its hundred and eightieth page: "Abû Ubayda bin Jerrah, the commander-in-chief of the Islamic army that routed the great armies of the Byzantine Greek Kaiser Heraclius,[1] when he conquered a city, would have someone shout out the Khalîfa 'Umar's commands to the Byzantine people. When he conquered the Humus city in Syria, he said, 'O thou Byzantine people! By Allah's help, obeying the command of our Khalîfa 'Umar, we have taken this city, too. You are all free in your trade, work, and worship. No one shall touch your property, lives, or chastity. Islam's justice shall be practised equally on you, all your rights shall be observed. We shall protect you, as we protect Muslims, against the enemy coming from without. In return for this service of ours, we ask you to pay jizya once a year, as we receive zakât and 'ushr from Muslims. Allâhu ta'âlâ commands us to serve you and to take jizya from you'. [The rate of jizya is forty grams of silver from the poor, eighty grams from those of moderate means, and hundred and sixty grams from the rich, or the amount of property or grain equal in value. Women, children, invalids, the destitute, old people, men of religious service are not liable to jizya.] The Byzantine Greeks of Humus delivered their jizya willingly to Habîb bin Muslim, the superintendent of Bayt-ul-mâl. When the intelligence came that the Byzantine Greek Emperor Heraclius was recruiting soldiers throughout his country and making preparations for a huge crusading campaign against Antioch, it was decided that the army in Humus must join the forces in Yermuk. Abû Ubayda 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' had his officials announce his following statements: 'O thou Christians! I promised to serve you, to protect you. And in return for this I collected jizya from you. But now I have been commanded by the Khalîfa to go and help my brethren that will be performing Holy War against Heraclius. I will not be able to abide by my promise to you. Therefore, take your jizya back from the Bayt-ul-mâl, all of you! Your names and how much you each have given are registered in our book.' The same thing happened in most cities of Syria. Upon seeing this justice, this mercy in

---

[1] Heraclius died in 20 [A.D. 641].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Muslims, Christians were delighted for having been saved from the cruelty and oppression of the Byzantine emperors that they had been suffering for years. They wept with joy. Most of them became Muslims willingly. They volunteered to spy upon Byzantine armies for Muslim armies. Thus Abû Ubayda was informed daily with all the novements of Heraclius' armies. In the grand Yermuk campaign, these Byzantine spies were of much help. The establishment and spreading of Islamic states was never based on aggression or killing. The greatest and the most essential power maintaining and enlivening these states was the power of îmân, justice, rectitude and self-sacrifice."]

Russians have been taking one gold yearly for every individual Muslim, from the smallest children to the oldest people alike, in Kazan, Uzbekistan, Crimea, Daghistan and Turkistan, which they have been invading for a hundred years. With all this and, in addition, various kinds of torments and oppressions such as compulsory military service, prohibition from speaking Turkish in schools and coersion to learn Russian, how many Muslims in Russia have become Christians throughout all these years? In fact, as a result of the peace agreement made after the Crimean War, the Christians that had remained in the Ottoman land were allowed to migrate to Russia and the Muslims being in Russia could go to the Ottoman territory. Thus, more than two million Muslims migrated from Russia to the Ottoman country. On the other hand, though the Russians offered to pay 20 roubles as the travelling expense for each Christian to migrate to their side, the Christians that were used to living in comfort and ease under the Ottoman government could not be taken in by Russia's promise; they did not barter away Islam's bestowments of rights and freedom for going there.

The statement, *"Hadrat 'Umar* 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' *had four thousand churches demolished,"* is an apparent slander against all the historical facts. According to Christian historians, when 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' conquered Jerusalem, the Christians suggested that he could choose any of their churches as a temple for themselves (Muslims). 'Umar refused this offer vehemently. He performed his first prayer of namâz outside, instead of in a church. He had the site called Haykal-i-muqaddas [the site of Bayt-i-muqaddas], which had been a rubbish heap for a long time, cleaned, and had a beautiful mosque built there.

The course of action that Muslims are obligated to follow in their dealings with Christians and Jews is prescribed in the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

following letter which Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam' himself wrote in a manner to address to all Muslims in general:

"This Letter has been written to inform of the promise that Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam', the son of Abdullah, has given to all Christians. Janâb-i Haqq has given the good news that He has sent him as His compassion; he has warned people of the wrath of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and He has given him the task of safekeeping the deposit entrusted to mankind. This Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam' has had this letter recorded in order to document the promise he has given to all non-Muslims. If anyone acts contrary to this promise, whether he be a sultan or else, he will have rebelled against Janâb-i-Haqq and made fun of His religion, and will therefore deserve His condemnation. If a Christian priest or tourist is fasting with the intention of worship in a mountain, in a valley, in a desert, in a verdure, in a low place or in the sand. I, on behalf of myself, my friends and acquaintances and all my nation, have revoked all sorts of obligation from them. They are under my protection. I have forgiven them all sorts of taxes they have had to pay as a requirement of the agreements we made with other Christians. They may not pay jizya or kharadj, or they may give as much as they wish. Do not force or oppress them. Do not depose their religious leaders. Do not evict them from their temples. Do not prevent them from travelling. Do not demolish any part of their monasteries or churches. Do not confiscate things from their churches or use them in Muslims' mosques. Whoever does not obey this will have rebelled against the command of Allah and His Messenger and will therefore be sinful. Do not take such taxes as jizya and gharâmat from those people who do not do trade but are always busy over worshipping, no matter where they are. I will preserve their debts on sea or land, in the east or in the west. They are under my protection. I have given them immunity. Do not take kharadj or 'ushr [tithe] for the crops of those who live in mountains and are busy with worships. Do not allot a share for the Bayt-ul-mâl [the State Treasury] out of their crops. For, their agriculture is intended merely for subsistence, not for making profit. When you need men for Jihâd (Holy War), do not resort to them. If it is necessary to take jizya [income tax] (from them), do not take more than twelve dirhams yearly, however rich they may be and however much property they may have. They are not to be taxed with troubles or burdens. If there should be an argument with them, they shall be treated only with pity,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

kindness, and compassion. Always protect them under your wings of mercy and compassion. Wherever they are, do not maltreat Christian women married to Muslim men. Do not prevent them from going to their church and doing the worships prescribed by their religion. Whoever disobeys or acts contrary to this commandment of Allâhu ta'âlâ will have revolted against the commands of Janâb-i-Haqq and His Prophet 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam'. They shall be helped to repair their churches. This agreement shall be valid and shall remain unchanged till the end of the world and no one shall be allowed to act contrary to it."

This agreement was written down by Alî 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' in the Masjîd-i-sa'âdat in Medina on the third day of the month of Muharram in the second year of the Hijra. The signatures appended are:

Muhammad bin Abdullah Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam'.

Abû Bakr bin Ebî-Kuhâfa
'Umar bin Hattâb
'Uthmân bin Affân
Alî bin Ebî Tâlib
Abû Hurayra
Abdullah bin Mes'ûd
Abbâs bin 'Abd-al-muttalib
Fadl bin Abbâs
Zubayr bin Awwâm
Talha bin Ubaydullah
Sa'd bin Mu'âz
Sa'd bin Ubâda
Thâbit bin Qays
Zayd bin Thâbit
Hâris bin Thâbit
Abdullah bin 'Umar
Ammar bin Yâsir
'radiy-Allâhu 'anhum ajma'în'.

[As is seen, our exalted Prophet 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam' commands that people of other religions should be treated with utmost mercy and kindness and Christians' churches should not be harmed or demolished.]

Now we are writing the **immunity** granted by 'Umar 'radiy-

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Allâhu 'anh' to the people of Jerusalem.

"This letter is the letter of immunity given by Abdullah 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh', the Emîr of Muslims, to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and has been written so as to comprehend their existence, their lives, churches, children, the invalid ones as well as the healthy ones, and all other peoples; as follows:

"Muslims shall not intrude into their churches, burn or destroy their churches, demolish any part of their churches, appropriate even a tiniest piece of their property, or use any sort of enforcement to make them change their religion or modes of worship or convert to Islam. No Muslim shall give them the smallest harm. If they want to leave their hometown by their own accord, their lives, property and chastity shall be protected till they have reached their destination. If they want to stay here they shall be in total security. Only they shall pay the jizya [income tax] which is incumbent upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem. If some of the people of Jerusalem and Byzantines want to leave here together with their families and portable property and evacuate their churches and other places of worship, their lives, churches, travel expenses and possessions shall be protected till they reach their destination. The aliens shall not be taxed at all till harvest, no matter whether they stay here or go away.

The commands of Allâhu 'azîmush-shân and Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam' and the promises given by all Islamic Khalîfas and all Muslims are as is written in this letter."

Signatures:

Muslims' Khalîfa 'Umar bin Hattâb

Witnesses:

Khâlid bin Welîd

'Abd ar-Rahmân bin Awf

'Amr ibn il-'Âs

Muâwiya bin Ebî Sufyân:

'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' attended the siege of Jerusalem with his blessed presence. Christians accepted to pay the jizya and went under the protection of Muslims. [They handed the keys of Jerusalem to 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' himself.] Thus they were free from the heavy taxations, persecutions, torments, oppressions and cruelties of their own state, Byzantium. Soon they saw the justice and mercy in Muslims, whom they were looking on as their enemies. They realized that Islam was a religion commanding

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

goodness and beauty and guiding people to happiness pertaining to this world and the next. Without the least compulsion or threatening, they accepted Islam in large groups which were mostly the size of a quarter of a town. You can now estimate the multitude of people who became Muslims in all other places.

In ten years' time Islam spread far and wide and the number of Muslims reached millions; this was never done by force or with the threat of sword. On the contrary, it is based on such facts as Islam's inherent characteristics of justice and respect for human rights, the revelation of Qur'ân al-kerîm as the greatest miracle of Allâhu ta'âlâ, with its superiority to the other heavenly books.

It is written in the sixty-seventh page of the third volume of Tabarî's[1] history, "During the caliphate of 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' Musannâ bin Hârisa 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh', one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, was sent onto Iran as the commander-in-chief of an Islamic army. When he came to the place called Buwayd where he was to fight against the Iranian army, the Muslim army was small in number and weak in weaponry. For, many Muslim soldiers had been martyred in the previous wars. The Iranian army was numerous and had elephants with them. Musannâ 'radiy-Allâhu 'anh' went to the Christians living in the neighborhood and asked for help. They accepted to help willingly. In fact, one of them, a youngster named Hâmûs, said, 'Show me the commander of the Iranian army.' When they showed him Mihrân the Iranian commander, he attacked him and shot an arrow at him. The arrow went into Mihrân's abdomen and jutted out of his back and he fell dead. The Iranian army scattered." As is seen in this example, because Christians living in that period were never treated with hostility or coercion by Muslims, they never hated Muslims. Let alone hate, they were pleased with Muslims. They helped Muslims without a monthly salary or any sort of allotted payment, and even sacrificed their lives in doing so. More often than not Christians joined Muslims in their wars against other Christians, their co-religionists. This type of event took place in many wars between the Ottoman Empire and the Byzantium Empire. Those who study history know this fact well.

Another claim put forward by Protestants in order to prove that Christianity is superior to Islam is as follows: *"When Christanity arose, Jewry took the field against it and persecuted*

---

[1] Muhammad Tabarî passed away in Baghdad in 310 [A.D. 923].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

those who accepted the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm.' For this reason, terrible calamities fell upon Jewry. They were despised, abased, and deprived of the gratification of making up a nation. Christians who attacked Muslims after the arising of Islam did not undergo such great disasters."

This assertion of theirs is thoroughly contrary to facts. It was not only after the rising of Christianity that disasters fell upon Jewry. As it is written in Ahd-i-Atîk (the Old Testament), and in history books, various calamities fell upon Jewry daily before the prophethood of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm,' too. From the time of Yûsuf 'alaihis-salâm' up to the time of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm,' they remained captives of the Egyptian pagan gypsies, who inflicted all sorts of insults on them till Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' rescued them from the oppressions of gypsies. In the times of Dâwud and Suleimân 'alaihimus-salâm' they underwent various kinds of nuisance and chaos, which once again scattered them and caused them many an affliction. For example, Nabukodonosor II, an Assyrian ruler, captured Qudus-i-sherîf (Jerusalem). He perpetrated a great genocide there. He massacred thousands of Jews. He captivated the surviving Jews and some of the Prophets appointed to the Sons of Israel and took them to Babylon. In fact, during those tumults all the copies of the Taurah were torn to pieces and not even one copy was left. Everyone knows about the sorts of distresses that Jewry suffered in the hands of Assyrians and the multitude of Jews slaughtered during Maccabee revolts. [(Judas) Maccabeus is the name of the Jewish military leader who revolted against the paganizing policy of Antiochus IV 'Epiphanes', the Seleucid king. He defeated Antiochus' army and captured Jerusalem, but later lost it again. He obtained, however, religious freedom for Jewry. Numbers of Jews were put to the sword during these wars.] Eventually, seventy years before Christ, the well-known Roman general Pompey captured Palestine and took it under his control. All these disasters that fell upon Jewry were because they denied Prophets and murdered most of them. It is written clearly in history books that these disasters preceded the prophethood of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm.'

When the Roman Emperor Titus entered Jerusalem seventy years after the ascent of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to heaven, he burned Jerusalem and massacred all the Jews; those who want to know its reasons should have recourse to history books. The disgraceful and miserable situations that they fell into after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' were only local, not universal. The rulers of some fortresses such

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

as Khayber, which were situated between Medîna-i-munawwara and Damascus, were Jews, e.g. Qa'b bin Eshref, Merhab, and Ismâ'îl [Samuel], in the time of our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam'. When they acted with hostility and treachery towards our Master Rasûlullah, the last and the highest Prophet, the wrath of Allâhu ta'âlâ fell upon them. The sixty-first âyat of the sûra of Baqara purports, **"They have been given humility and poverty."** As is declared in this âyat-i-kerîma, they were scattered completely. They could never establish a formal state.

When Allâhu ta'âlâ sends a new religion, are the believers of wrong religions to be sent some great disasters? If it were the case, within the several thousand years during which the Sons of Israel lived up to the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm,' magians who were much weaker but more numerous, should have been destroyed with successive disasters. However, the peoples of China, India, Turkistan and America continue to be as they have been. [Contrary to Protestants' assertions, they have not been sent any kind of catastrophe.]

Another proof Protestants put forth to prove the rectitude of Christianity is that *'the number of Christians is greater.'* This statement is not much of a proof, either. Although the statistical data published in Europe indicate that the Christian population is larger, these data are inconsistent. The statistics concerning the number of Christians differ by millions. For, at that time no research was done as to what religions the people living in various parts of Asia and Africa belonged to. The so-called statisticians registered the populations of these places by guesswork, which was merely based on a dimensional comparison of those places. In fact, it is written in a geography book translated by Sayyid Rufâa of Egypt and printed in Egypt that the estimated population living on earth are nine hundred million; half of this number are magians, of which fifty per cent are pagans; the remaining half are Muslims, Christians and Jews, each making up one-third of the whole half. This calculation is merely a guesswork and cannot be admitted as a proof. Besides, even if we were to take for granted that Christians formed the majority, this would not show that Christianity were the true religion. For, if quantitative advantage were to be admitted as a testament to the trueness of a religion, magi and idolatry would necessarily be true religions. Magians and pagans outnumber the Christians on the earth today.

Within a period of three hundred years after the ascent of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to heaven, Jews massacred Nazarenes a number of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

times. They burned or tore to pieces the books and pamphlets Nazarenes held sacred. They persecuted the Nazarenes under their domination, increasing their insults every day. According to the proof put forward by Christians, —which they have based on the assumption that the number of Christians is larger—, Christianity must be wrong and idolatry true.

Another proof that Protestants put forth in their claim that Christianity is superior to Islam is that *"Christians are more advanced in science and technology."*

This question should be studied cautiously, too. The scientific, technological and industrial improvements in Europe began only three hundred years ago. Until 900 [A.D. 1494], Europeans led a life of savagery, ignorance and squalor; this is an obvious fact known publicly. While Europeans were in this state, Muslims living in Asia, Iraq, Hedjaz, Egypt and Andalusia [Spain] at that time had reached the zenith of the time's technology and industries. In fact, the bases for the laws valid in today's Europe are books that were written by Islamic scholars and were found in libraries in Spain and Egypt. It is written in history books that even Sylvestre II, who was the Pope of his time, acquired knowledge from Muslim professors. Roman numerals, which Europeans had been using, were not convenient for mathematical computations which were the bases for all sciences. When they saw that such processes were easily done with Arabic numerals during their education in Muslim schools, they began to use these numerals. This was one of the reasons for their scientific progress. When all these facts are known, it will be seen what effects they have had on religious and scientific improvements; and this, in its turn, will prove to the advantage of Muslims, not Christians. For, none of the existing four Gospels contains such media of civilization as international law, art, trade, or agriculture. On the contrary, these things are prohibited vehemently. Islam, by contrast, commands knowledge, art, trade, agriculture, and justice. Because all Islamic states are administered with these essential principles, Islamic countries have always been the only civilized and the most prosperous countries in the world. [Aspiring to attain the riches in Islamic countries, Christians organized the crusading expeditions that came one after another like waves. The real purpose of crusades was to plunder Islamic countries of their riches, in addition to spreading Christianity.] In our century, however. Muslims and Christians are in a state counter to the commandments of their religions. Its reason, when

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

searched for, will be found in the fact that neither Muslims nor Christians are good at doing the commandments of their religions. That is, the reason is not fulfilling religious requirements. In fact, a European philosopher states as follows in one of the booklets he has published: *"The fact that Islamic religion is the true religion and Christianity is not, is proved by their worldly effects. As Muslims slackened in doing their religious duties, that is, in obeying Islam, they weakened and remained behind in knowledge and science. As for Christians; the more they deserted their religion and the farther away they got from it, the stronger they became and the more progress they made in knowledge and science. The direction followed by Christian states lately is quite the opposite of the direction shown by their holy book, the Bible."*

Another Protestant assertion forwarded in order to prove the trueness of Christianity is that *"There are not any pagans in Europe, but there are Jews and Christians in countries under Islamic domination."* They interpret this state as an outcome of the influential power in Christianity. This assertion of theirs prove the stupendous degree of justice in Islam, rather than proving the trueness of Christianity. For, a person, of whatever religion, had the same rights throughout Islamic countries and was equal with a Muslim according to (Islamic) laws. Non-Muslims were quite comfortable under the protection of the Islamic state. They were not meddled with in their religious matters or prevented from doing their worships. They could freely busy with whatever art or trade they liked. On the other hand, in many European countries, none of the Christian sectarians had security of life, property or residence in an environment under the control of any other sectarian group, be it a Protestant group. Armenians and Byzantine Greeks lived in all parts of Islamic countries, but they did not settle in any European country. In places where Byzantine Greeks live, e.g. Greece and Mediterranean islands, there are no more than a couple of Armenian, Catholic or Protestant families. [Byzantine Greeks are Orthodox.] In such countries as France, Italy, and Spain, which are Catholic, it is impossible for Protestant priests to build schools, churches or monasteries, or to publish a book against Catholicism, which is the accepted sect in these countries. So is the case with Catholic priests in places with Protestant and Byzantine Greek inhabitants. In no Islamic country has there been an event like the massacre of St. Bartholomew or the cruelties of inquisition. [The massacre of St.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Bartholomew is the carnage of sixty thousand Protestants living in Paris and in its neighborhood, on account of their creed, with the orders of King Charles IX and Queen Catherina on the twenty-fourth day of August, which was St. Bartholomew's Day, in 980 (A.D. 1572).] Nor has history recorded such a bloody and horrible event as the crusading expeditions on the part of any Islamic nation. In each crusading expedition, hundreds of thousands of innocent people were slaughtered in such wild manners as cannot be conceived or imagined; among those people were Muslims, Protestants, Jews, and even relations of the Catholic murderers, who killed them because of some past enmity. During the crusades, which continued for some two hundred and fifty years, Europe went to rack and ruin. It is impossible to detail the savageries and inquisitions which the bigoted crusaders dared to do in the name of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', who had given the advice, "If you get slapped on one cheek, offer your other cheek, too," and in the very country where he had lived. It is written in history books how millions of Europeans and Asians were slain unjustly and how so many countries were barbarously devastated throughout the continuance of the crusades. Everybody knows about the distresses still suffered by the helpless Jews in Walacia, Moldavia and Odyssey and the persecutions, oppressions and torments Muslims living in countries under the domination of British and Russian Christians are being subjected to.

Now, turn your attention to those Christians living in comfort, welfare, luxury, freedom and peace in Islamic countries, and then decide for Allah's sake whether it is Christianity or Islam that will justfully observe the rights and peace of those under its protection and will render service to humanity and civilization.

Another deed causing consternation and derision is their attempt to prove Christian superiority over Islam by indicating the fact that *"Europe is more advanced in knowledge, industry, wealth, prosperity, and in the multitude of its public institutions such as schools and hospitals."* Until the Middle Ages, Europe had full adherence to Christianity and obeyed the existing Gospels; therefore they were in a miserable and abject state. There existed none of the signs of civilization such as scientific and industrial progress, building hospitals and schools, which they point out as proofs; and the relics of Roman civilization had already perished. Europeans, acting upon the Gospels, especially the twelfth chapter of the Gospel of Luke, disignored art, trade and agriculture, ate whatever they happened to find and sat

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

wherever they came upon, like birds in the sky; so the European continent was thoroughly in darkness, ignorance, savagery, and bigotry. They were totally unaware of such things as hospitals, schools and charitable institutions. Qur'ân al-kerîm, by comparison, puts due emphasis on worldly affairs, orders knowledge, art, trade and agriculture, and warns against dangers. The ninth âyat of Zumer sûra purports: **"Can the cognizant and the incognizant ever be the same? Certainly the cognizant is more valuable."** The twenty-ninth âyat of Nisâ sûra purports: **"O thou who have îmân; do not take each other's property illegally. That is, do not take away things from each other by such means as usury, gambling, theft and usurpation, which are prohibited by Islam. This exchange of things must be done only by both sides' consent, i.e. trade."** The meaning of the two hundred and seventy-fifth âyat of Baqara sûra is: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ has made buying and selling halâl and interest harâm."** The thirty-sixth âyat of Nisâ sûra purports: **"Worship Allâhu ta'âlâ. Do not attribute any partner to Him. Do favours to your parents** [by words and actions], **to your relations** [by visiting them], **to orphans** [by pleasing them somehow], **to the poor** [by alms], **to your relations who are your neighbors at the same time** [by mercy and compassion], **to your next-door neighbors** [by goodness and by protecting them against harm], **to your friends and acquaintances** [by observing their rights and being friendly], **to your visitors or guests** [by offering them food and drink], **to your slaves and servants** [by buying them new clothes and being kind to them]." Through many such âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs, Allâhu ta'âlâ and Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam', command knowledge, art, and trade. In addition, they command to do kindness to parents, to relations, to orphans, to the weak, to the destitute, to neighbors, to travellers, and to servants, to observe their rights, and not to disobey laws. While the grandfathers of today's Europeans were unaware of all these media of civilization, there were well-arranged schools, madrasas, charitable homes for the poor and the destitute, cook-houses, inns, public baths and many other charitable institutions all over Islamic countries. In addition, Muslims had established private aid organizations, pious foundations **(waqf)** for the maintenance and financing of these charitable institutions. [There were even pious foundations for the indemnity of losses caused by slaves and servants and for the purging of things that would cause disease.] Art was very popular all over Islamic countries. Europeans did not know what an alarm

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

clock was, when Muslims' Khalîfa Hârûn-un-Rashîd presented an alarm clock to the French King Charlemagne. Pope Sylvestre[1] received education in the Andalusion Islamic schools. Chanso, the Spanish king, had recourse to Muslim doctors for the disease he had caught, dropsy, [which Europeans could not cure in those days], and soon recovered. Various âyat-i-kerîmas of Qur'ân al-kerîm repeatedly refer to helping the poor, the destitute, and travellers. Therefore, it has become an important traditional duty among Muslims to help the poor, the weak, and travellers. Even in a small Muslim village of a few families, no visitor [even if he is a non-Muslim] has been left to himself. In fact, in places under Islamic domination the same custom settled among the non-Muslims owing to their living with Muslims. In Europe, on the other hand, quite a number of people are still dying of hunger despite the whole multitude of wealthy people, hospitals, and charitable homes for the poor. Three to four hundred thousand poor people living in England, and about the same number in Germany, being tired of the trouble they have had finding food, have migrated to America, India, and other countries.

[According to a news article that appeared in the (Turkish) newspaper called Türkiye on 3 February 1988, it is informed by the French newspaper **Figaro** that 2.5 million people in France live in full destitution, and 1.5 million of this number sleep in the streets without any known addresses. According to the same newspaper, there are ten million old people over the age of sixty in France. Two and a half million of these people do not have a known home. They end up in misery and loneliness. Of these old people, 7 % of women and 14 % of men commit suicide. The number of suicides is five hundred thousand. Joseph Wresinsky, a priest and the president of ATD, an institution established to help such wretched and lonely people in France, says, "There are 2.5 million people too poor to meet their immeditate needs in France today. There is no source to help them. Europe, whose daily topic of conversation is human rights, should look for solutions not only for economical and military problems but also for misery, which will escalate to huge numbers in a few years' time. A nation-wide activity is incumbent to rescue French people from this misery." Even a priest avows these facts.] If knowledge, technology and civilization are to prove the trueness of a religion,

---

[1] Sylvestre died in 1003 [A.D. 1594].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

they should be strong documents for Islam, rather than for Christianity. [For, Muslims made progress when they acted upon Islam, and they made no progress and even dispersed when they slackened in this obedience and began to imitate Christians.]

Nor can a nation's wealth be an evidence strong enough to prove the trueness of the religion its people believe in. As a matter of fact, Rothschild, once the richest person in the world, is one of the Jews who Protestants claim have undergone various calamities because of not believing in Christianity. Lord Israîilî, an English deputy, is both a Jew and one of the richest people on the earth. It can be predicted by now that the European gold markets will be obtained by Jews. In accordance with the Christian argument, the Jewish religion is superior to the Christian religion. And this in turn shows that all those poor Christians who live in various parts of Europe and all over Russia and who are unaware of art, trade and wealth have been holding a wrong belief. According to the so-called claim of Christians, the correctness of any religion must be dependent on the wealth and fortune of its believers, which will not support the Christians' objection to Islam, [on the contrary, it will rebut it].

European schools are of two types:

The first type of schools are under ecclesiastical control, and the second type are controlled by the public, i.e. by governments. In schools under clerical authority, only tenets of Christian creed are taught. Therefore national assemblies are discussing the matter of releasing these schools from the disposal of priests. It is believed that in the near future the training of Christian children will be transferred from clerical administration to public and governmental administration. None of the schools administered and controlled by the public, by governments in Europe, teach religious knowledge; science and mathematics are taught in these schools. For this reason, the majority of young European graduates of these schools are against Christianity. The number of these graduates increases every day, and they establish societies and publish newspapers and periodicals in which to declare to the whole world that Christianity is aberration. It is doubtless that one day these schools, which the so-called priest points out as an evidence in his endeavour to prove the correctness of Christianity, will cause Christianity to collapse.

There have been some Muslim states that have collapsed and even ceased to exist because of the absence of an administration that would treat knowledge more seriously and hold it higher

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

than anything else. Furthermore, the innumerous schools and madrasas and their subservient pious foundations and kitchens that exist in Islamic countries today must be observed with common sense. When the deeds of trust of the pious foundations of only the madrasas in Istanbul are studied, it will be seen that these pious foundations (waqfs) undertook the salaries of the professors (muderris), the doorkeepers and other personnel of each madrasa, the pay of the students and even the carpets they sat on when studying. I wonder if there is so much motivation, so much facility in any European school? If it should be questioned why today's schools and madrasas do not have their original brilliance and order, there cannot be found anything that has to do with religion among its causes. We see, with regret, that these pious foundations which had been established for goodness and charity, have been deprived of worthy administration since they fell into the hands of incompetent, hypocritical and religiously ignorant people. Nevertheless, the students educated in the madrasas not only study science and mathematics like European students, but they also study such religious sciences as 'ilm-i-kelâm, 'ilm-i-fiqh, and 'ilm-i-tafsîr. Therefore, there are not any enemies of religion among these students like in Europe. For, inprovement in science will add clarity to the realization of the trueness of religious commandments. That is, the more scientific knowledge a person learns, the more powerful will his faith in Islam become. In Christianity the case is quite the opposite. A person cannot be a full Christian unless he is so asinine and so ignorant as to take for granted the doctrine of trinity, which means, "Three make one, and one is three," and which is the basis of the Christian faith.

As for the Protestant priest's question, *"While Christians send forth missionaries and various books in order to spread Christianity everywhere, why don't Muslims endeavour to call pagans and Christians to Islam? Why don't they send forth translations of Qur'ân al-kerîm or scholars to various places in order to call to Islam?"*, fulfilment of this very important religious service is Muslims' duty, as we have said above. In the time of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam', much emphasis was placed on this duty, and this state went on for years. Islam's spreading over nearly half of the earth was due to the emphasis it has placed on justice, beautiful morality, knowledge, and science. Later, as deviated holders of bid'a came to the fore, the duty of emr-i-ma'rûf, that is, recommending goodness, which is Islam's

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

most important command, loosened. There was not any effort to spread Islam over the world. The duty of calling people to Islam was neglected with such considerations as *"Islam has already spread over many countries throughout all these years. From now on, let those who have reason and discernment find the way to happiness and salvation themselves. Islam is as obvious as the sun."* These considerations were supported with the untenable reasoning that *"If a jeweller has a genuine brillant diamond, he need not take it from one shop to another in order to find a customer. But if the ware is a false one, he will have to go from door to door and tell such lies as will deceive the ignorant, such as. 'Buy this very precious ware. It is hard to come by,' in order to get rid of it."* They should be reminded that, though it is unnecessary to look for a customer for the diamond, it is certainly a must to offer it to the customer, to advertise it. When the customer knows about the diamond, he will certainly want to buy it. A diamond which is not shown or advertised will not get a customer.

Our final words to the Protestant priest are as follows: The books of a religion or sect must be studied well. No religion or sect can be criticized by sheer obduracy or only with ideas that one assumes to be true within the purview of one's restricted knowledge. Islamic religion has a special branch of knowledge called **'Ilm-i-kelâm,** which teaches the principles of îmân, protects them (against interpolation, etc.), and removes doubts (by powerful argumentation). In the centuries when Islam was flourishing and spreading far and wide, there were profound scholars in the knowledge of Kelâm. These scholars wrote a great number of valuable books in order to counteract the refutations directed towards the Islamic religion and to eliminate the doubts aroused by such attacks. They sent forth their books to all countries. They proved the trueness, the genuineness of Islam by using mental evidences alongside traditional evidences such as âyat-i-kerîmas, hadîth-i-sherîfs, and the documentary statements of religious authorities. They answered not only Jews and Christians, but also imitators of Greek philosophy and those deviated parvenus who fabricated false religious principles and practices called bid'a in the name of religion. For, according to the Islamic religion, Allâhu ta'âlâ does not command His born slaves anything against common sense. [But comprehending the hidden divine causes and uses in the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ requires common sense ('aql-i-selîm). Statements that some

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

ignorant idiots passing for sages, philosophers or scientists make out of their sensuous desires or emotions, have nothing to do with true knowledge or science. People of common sense will take no heed of their corrupt words and writings. Thus they will have no effect other than misleading a few idiots like themselves. Islam contains many facts beyond the capacity of mind, but nothing contrary to mind. Grades of mind and its interpretation are given in the Arabic book **Tarîq-un-nejât** and in Turkish **Se'âdet-i Ebediyye**.][1] Giving reasonable information about Islamic religion requires a minute study and an accurate comprehension of renowned books of 'ilm-i-kelâm, such as **Maktûbât,** by hadrat Imâm-i-Rabbânî, and **Sherh-i-mawâqif** and **Sherh-i-maqâsid.** Such statements as "Paul said so," "Such and such Gospel writes so," "This matter is a divine mystery and should be believed as such," which Christians utter instead of giving convincing proofs, will testify no matter. With such statements it will be difficult to explain the truths in Islamic knowledge, even to those Christians wise enough, let alone to us. We shall explicate this later on.

[1] Se'âdet-i Ebediyye (Endless Bliss) was partly translated and published in fascicles in English.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 4 —

OBSERVATIONS ON THE FOUR BOOKS CALLED GOSPELS

Protestant priests argue as follows in one of the pamphlets they have published: *"Muslims, unaware of the history of Gospels, assert that the Gospels kept by Christians are not genuine and that Christians defiled and changed the Bible in order to conceal the verses testifying the prophethood of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'. They will be answered as follows: scholars such as Imâm-i-Bukhârî, Shah Weliyy-ullah Dehlewî, Fakkhr-ud-dîn-i-Râdhî, Sayyid Ahmad, an Indian scholar, and others declare that the Gospels used today are the same as those that were used before the time of hadrat Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam', and so they are not changed. Several very old copies of the Bible existing in some well-known European libraries bear witness to the truth of our claim. Therefore, if Muslims have any proofs to corroborate their assertions that the Bible was interpolated, be it in the Gospels they have or in the versions that were translated to various languages before 'Asr-i-sa'âdat (the time of our Prophet* 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam' *and his four rightly-guided Khalîfas), we challenge that Muslims disclose all such proofs."*

It is a pleasure for us Muslims to take up this challenge of theirs and put forward all the proofs they want, one by one.

As is known, the Holy Bible, the basis of Christian creed, is of two divisions: **Old Testament,** and **New Testament.** The division called **Old Testament** consists of chapters said to have been taken from the heavenly book Taurah and episodes ascribed to some Israelite Prophets. The **New Testament** consists of the four Gospels and some epistles and pamphlets claimed to have been sent forth by some apostle, e.g. Paul. It is admitted by Christians also that the books of Old Testament were defiled. Those who would like to get detailed information in this respect may have recourse to the book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq,** by Rahmatullah Efendi 'rahmatullâh-i-aleyh'. We shall not give detailed information

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

concerning the Old Testament here. [Jews augmented the persecutions and torments they had been practising over the Nazarenes. In addition to these persecutions and murders, they calumniated Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and his blessed mother, hadrat Maryam (Miriam, Mary), so much so that they went so far as to call that exalted Prophet an illegitimate child and his blessed mother a fornicator. In order to prove that the Holy Book of Taurah, which was revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ, did not contain such abominable, detestable slanders, the Nazarenes translated the Taurah to Latin. In the final part of our book, detailed information will be given about the inner nature of the Jewish religion and the slanders and enmities that Jewry has done to Muslims and Christians, i.e. in the chapter headlined **Judaism, the Taurah, the Talmud.**]

Strauss, a Protestant historian, [Strauss, (David Friedrich), is a German historian. He died in 1291 [A.D. 1874]. He published such works as The Life of Christ, Instruction on Christianity, The New Life of Jesus Christ] states as follows: "During the early years of expansion of Christianity the Christians made a Greek translation of the Old Testament, which had already been interpolated a number of times by Jewry. The Jews protested, with the pretext that the translation did not agree with the Israelite books that they had then. In order to find such answers as would rebut the Jews, the Christians made some new additions to the Greek version of the Old Testament. For example, several names which were supposed to be the names of Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' ancestors were inserted into the Zebûr (Psalter, Book of Psalms in the Old Testament, the heavenly Book revealed to Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm'). The section on Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' entering Hell was placed in the book of Jeremiah. The Jews, upon seeing these interpolations, clamoured, "These things do not exist in our book." The Christians answered, "You cheaters have no fear of Allah! You dare to change the holy books," and attacked the Jews. Later, these quarrels between the Christians and the Jews intensified. The Christian priests began to doubt and falter. Thus the Christians were fractured into a number of groups. The disagreements caused many wars among them. Three hundred and twenty-five years after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' three hundred and nineteen priests came together at the Nicene council with the command of Constantine the Great, the Byzantine Greek Emperor. They started a collective deliberation and consultation on the copies of the **Holy Bible,** each of which contained a

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

number of uncertainties and inconsistencies. In this council, those who believed in the divinity of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' were in the ascendant. Adding some translations from the Israelite books, they reshaped the **Holy Bible.** They decided that all copies, other than the one they had just sanctioned, were doubtful. This decision was stated in the introduction which Jerome wrote for this new version. [Jerome, Saint, is called Irûnimus by the Arabs. He stayed in Istanbul for three years. He went to Rome in 382. He became the Pope's secretary. He translated the Holy Bible to Latin. His day is celebrated on September 30th. His translation became the church's official Bible]. In 364 another council, called Lodisia, was convened. This council, after sanctioning the books of the Old Testament, also sanctioned the authenticity and dependability of the Book of Esther, which had been repudiated in the Nicene council, and the six epistles that were attributed to the Apostles. These six epistles are the epistle of Jacob, the two epistles of Peter, the second and the third epistles of John, the epistle of Judah, and the epistle written to the Hebrews by Paul. They publicized the authenticity of these books and epistles. John's Book of Revelations (the Apocalypse) was not sanctioned in either of the councils convened in 325 and 364; so it remained doubtful. Later, in 397, a council of hundred and twenty-six members was convened in Carthage. This council sanctioned the authenticity of a few of the books that had been found dubious or false, and so rejected, by the previous two councils. These books are Tobit (Apocrypha), Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, Maccabees, and John's book of Revelations. After the sanctioning of these books by the Carthaginian council, all those books that had been said to be doubtful became acceptable to all Christians. This state lasted for a period of twelve hundred years. With the emergence of Protestantism, grave hesitations arose concerning the books Tobit, Baruch, Judith, Song (of Solomon), Ecclesiastes (Ecclesiasticus), I Maccabees, and II Maccabees. The Protestants claimed that these books, accepted by the earlier Christians, were to be rejected as uncanonical. They repudiated some chapters of Esther, and sanctioned some others. They proved these repudiations and sanctionings through various evidences. One of these evidences was that the originals of these books, which were in Hebrew and Caledonian (Celtic) languages, did not exist then. The historian priest Vivibius writes in the twenty-second chapter of the fourth volume of his book that all the books mentioned above, particularly II Maccabees, were changed."

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Protestants themselves admitted the fact that the councils, that is, the clerical assemblies, who had been looked on as inspired with the Holy Spirit and whose decisions had been considered the basis of Christianity by all Christians for twelve hundred years, had been agreeing in error and aberration. Nevertheless, they accepted many of the quite unreasonable and inadmissible decisions of those councils. Thus they took an unprecedented course that was based on contradictory principles. What a surprising event it would be for millions of discreet Christians to look on a religion whose essense is covered with doubts and uncertainties as a means of happiness and salvation, alluring the hearts towards itself; one would bite one's finger with astonishment.

Christians obtain the principles of belief both from the Old Testament and from the New Testament. These books are not free from doubts and hesitations. Neither of them has been proven to have survived to our time through a sound document. In other words, they have not been transmitted through a series of true people from Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to our time. As is known, a book's authenticity and heavenliness, that is, its admittance as a book revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ depends on an authoritative declaration such as, "This book has been written (revealed) through Prophet so and so and is free from being changed or defiled and has reached us by being transmitted through sound documents and true people." Unless this is firmly documented to people with common sense, doubts and hesitations concerning the book in question will not go away. For, a book that is attributed to a person considered to be endowed with divine revelations will not prove by itself the fact that it has been arranged by that person himself. Nor will a few Christian groups' claims, based on sheer bigotry and zeal, suffice to prove the book's validity. Christian priests do not have any documents to prove the soundness of their Holy Bible, except that they attribute it to one of the past Prophets or Apostles. These claims of theirs are not a proof persuasive enough to lay down the principles of belief [îmân] or to remove doubts as to their authenticity. No one who is wise enough would feel safe and peaceful if his religion, which would guide him to comfort and peace in this world and save him from torment and take him to eternal felicity in the next world, were based on precarious essentials. As a matter of fact, Christians deny and reject most of the books in the Old Testament and more than seventy of the New Testament books

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

which tell about hadrat Îsâ and hadrat Maryam (Mary) or events in their time and which partly exist still today, and they call them 'fictitious lies'." There is detailed knowledge in this respect in the book **Idh-âh-ul-haqq.**

Christian priests, the early ones and the modern ones alike, unanimously state that Matthew's Gospel was in Hebrew. Later, during their factious fractioning into sects, Christians lost that original version. The existing version of Matthew's Gospel today is a translation of the original Hebrew version, the translator being anonymous. Even Jerome, an outstanding Christian priest, concedes that its translator has remained anonymous so far.

Thomas Ward, a Catholic, says in an article of his, "Some early Christian scholars had suspicion about the authenticity of the last chapter of Mark's Gospel, some about a few verses of the twenty-second chapter of Luke's Gospel, and some others about the first two chapters of Luke's Gospel. The version of the Bible possessed by the Marcion group of Christians does not contain these two chapters." Norton[1] states about Mark's Gospel as follows in the seventieth page of his book, which was published in Boston in 1253 [A.D. 1837): "This Gospel contains paragraphs that need scrutiny, e.g. the part from the ninth verse to the end of the sixteenth chapter." Norton says that though the text does not have any signs to arouse doubt, the so-called verses were inserted in its interpretation, and gives a series of evidences to prove it, and then states: "When we study the habits of the scribes, who copied from the books, we see that they tried to insert their own ideas into the texts rather than trying to understand and write the paragraphs. When this fact is known, it will be understood why the paragraphs in the Bible are doubtful."

The Gospel attributed to John does not have a sound

---

[1] **NORTON, Andrews,** American Biblical scholar and educator. He was born in 1201 [A.D. 1786]. He died on September 18, 1853. He graduated from Harvard in 1804, and after studying theology was a tutor in Bowdoin College in 1809. He returned to Harvard, in 1811, as a mathematical tutor there; and became, in 1813, librarian of the university and lecturer on Biblical criticism and interpretation. From 1819 to 1830 he was Dexter professor of Sacred literature. He was among the most eminent exponents of **unitarianism** [which rejected trinity and upheld the belief in the Unity of Allah], equally strong in his protests against Calvinism and the naturalistic theology represented by Theodore Parker. He published *A Statement of Reasons for not Believing the Doctrins of Trinitarians (1833)."* [Encyclopedia Americana, Volume: 20, p. 464].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

document of transmission, either. Like Mark's Gospel, it contains ambiguous and contradictory paragraphs that need scrutiny. For example:

First, this Gospel does not contain any evidence to prove that John wrote what he had seen. A judgement will remain valid unless it is proven to the contrary.

Second, it is stated in the twenty-fourth verse of the twenty-first chapter of John, "This is the disciple [John] which testifieth of these things, and wrote these things: and we know that his testimony is true." (John: 21-24) As is seen, this statement about John belongs to the scribe that wrote John's Gospel. In this verse John is mentioned with the third person (absent) pronoun 'his', and the scribe who wrote (fabricated) the book mentions himself with the pronoun 'we', which signifies the author. This comes to mean that the author of John's Gospel is someone other than John. The author claims to have knowledge of the trueness of John's testimony. In conclusion, the man that wrote this Gospel obtained possession of some of John's epistles and wrote this book after rendering some excisions and additions.

Third, in the second century of the Christian era, when controversies and objections as to the authenticity of John's Gospel appeared, Iranaeus, a pupil of Polycarpe who was a disciple of John, was still alive. Why did he not answer the objectors by proving the authenticity of the Gospel he had transmitted by documents? If his transmission (the Gospel of John taught by him) had been true, he would have cried out and said, "My transmission is true." The predication that "the matter of authenticity should not have been discussed between Polycarpe and his pupil Iranaeus" would be far from factual. Would it have been logically possible for Iranaeus not to have learned anything about the authenticity of the Gospel they were reading by at least asking, "Is this Gospel John's?", while asking and learning about many useless matters from his master? His having forgotten would be an even weaker probability. For Iranaeus is well-known for full cognizance of his master's way and habits and his strong memory to keep well what he learned. Eusebius (of Caesaria), in the two hundred and nineteenth page of the twentieth chapter of the fifth book of his history, which was published in 1263 [A.D. 1847], quotes Iranaeus' statements about the languages in which John's Gospel was transmitted, as follows: "As a bestowment of Allâhu ta'âlâ, I heard and memorized these words. I did not write them down. This has been my habit since long ago. Thus I have

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

been saying and reciting what I learned." As is seen, the Gospel was denied even in the second century and such denials could not be answered by proving its authenticity. Celsus, a Christian scholar, cried out in the second Christian century that "Christians changed their Bible in a manner as to defile its meaning three to five times or even more." Faustus, an outstanding Manichaen scholar, said in the fourth Christian century, "Changes were made in Biblical books. It is true. The Old Testament was not compiled by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' or by the Apostles. It was represented in the name of evangelists or their colleagues with a view to gaining popularity. Books containing many errors and paradoxes were published and thus Christians were hurt."

Fourth, Herald, a Catholic, citing from an editor named Estadlen in the two hundred and fiftieth page of the seventh volume of his book published in 1844, states that he does not doubt the fact that John's Gospel was written by one of the pupils of the Alexandrian school.

Fifth, Bretschneider says that John's Gospel, or John's epistles, does not belong to John as a whole, and that it may have been written by an anonymous scribe in the second century, [Bretschneider (1776-1848) was a German Protestant theologist who wrote a book to criticize the Bible].

Sixth, Cirdinius said that "John's Gospel had twenty chapters. Later the twenty-first chapter was added by the church of Ephesus."

Seventh, this Gospel of John, together with all its contents, was rejected by the group of Alogience in the second Christian century.

Eighth, eleven verses at the beginning of the eighth chapter of John's Gospel have been rejected by all Christian men of knowledge.

Ninth, during the compilation of the four Gospels, many erroneous transmissions without any documents were inserted into them. These transmissions do not even have any documents to testify the authenticity of the existing four Gospels. Thomas Hartwell states in the second chapter of the fourth volume of his interpretation published in 1237 [A.D. 1822], "The information reaching us concerning the times of edition of the Gospels is insufficient and inconclusive. It gives us no help as to the dependability of the Gospels. The early Christian men of religion continued to write wrong transmissions that they accepted and

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

took for granted. Their successors, because of the respect they felt for them, unanimously accepted their writings without even considering whether they were true or not. Thus, all these careless and superficial transmissions passed from one scribe to another, from one version to another, and reached our time. And now, after so many centuries, it is very difficult to purify the Gospels of wrong tranmissions." He says in the same volume, "The first Gospel, i.e. Matthew's Gospel, was edited in the thirty-seventh, thirty-eighth, forty-first, forty-seventh, sixty-first, sixty-second, sixty-third, sixty-fourth or sixty-fifth years of the Christian era, and the second Gospel, i.e. the Gospel of Mark, was edited in the fifty-sixth year of the Christian era or in some year before the sixty-fifth year. According to a more dependable view, it was edited in the sixtieth or sixty-third year. The third Gospel, the Gospel of Luke, was edited in the fifty-third, sixty-third or sixty-fourth years of the Christian era, and the Gospel of John in the sixty-eighth, sixty-ninth, seventieth or ninety-eighth years." There is no document or proof to testify that the epistle to the Hebrews and the second epistle of Peter and the second and third epistles of John and the epistle of Jacob and the epistle of Judah and the Revelation of John were transmitted by the Apostles. Their soundness was doubtful until the year 365. Some of their parts were rejected as erroneous by Christian religious scholars preceding that time. In fact, the versions translated into the Syrian language do not contain those parts. All the Arab churches rejected the soundness [authenticity] of the second epistle of Peter, the second and third epistles of John, the epistle of Judah and the Revelation of John. Horn, a Biblical scholar, says in the two hundred and sixth and two hundred and seventh pages of the second book of his interpretation, "Peter's epistle, Judah's epistle, the second and the third epistles and the Revelation of John, the nine verses from the second verse to the eleventh verse of the eighth chapter of the Gospel of John and the seventh verse of the fifth chapter of the first book of John never existed in the Syriac copies of the Bible." This means to say that the translator, who wrote the Syriac version, knew that the sections we have just mentioned could not be documents for an authentic religious principle, and did not translate these parts which he noticed during translation. Ward, a Catholic, in the thirty-seventh page of his book published in 1841, quotes Rogers, a Protestant, as saying, "Because the Hebrew epistle contradicted the creed taught in the epistle of Jacob, in the second and third epistles of John and in his

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Revelation, the ecclesiastical authorities excised these epistles from the Holy Bible." Dactrice states that, till the time of Josneys not every book was accepted as authentic, and insists that the epistle of Jacob, the epistle of Judah, the second epistle of Peter, the second and third epistles of John did not contain information compiled and written by the Apostles. He adds that, "The Hebrew epistle was rejected until a certain time, and the second and third epistles of Peter, the Revelation of John and the epistle of Judah were not accepted as authentic by the Syrian and Arabian churches; yet we take them for granted, that is, we accept them as authentic."

Dr. Nathaniel Lardner, a Christian Biblical scholar, states in the hundred and seventy-fifth page of the fourth book of his interpretation, "The book of Revelations of John was not accepted as authentic by Serl and his contemporary Orshilim, that is, by the church of Jerusalem. The index of the book 'Canon', written by Serl, does not even contain the name of this book." He gives more detailed information in the three hundred and twenty-third page, and writes, "The Revelation of John does not exist in the Syrian translations of the early Gospels. They do not contain any marginal notes written on them by such editors as Webar Hiberios or Jacob. Also, Waybidiscou did not include the second epistle of Peter, the second and third epistles of John, the Revelation of John or the epistle of Judas in his index of books. The Syrians are of the same opinion."

Herald, a Catholic, says in the two hundred and sixth page of the seventh volume of his book: "As Raus states in the hundred and sixtieth page of his book, most of the notables of the Protestant church do not accept the authenticity of John's Revelations." Prof. Rabwald states, "John's Gospel and John's epistles and Revelations cannot have been written by the same person," and proves this by strong documentation. Vivisbius, quoting from Webunisicheen in the twenty-fifth chapter of the seventh volume of his 'History', says that the early priests tried to excise the Revelations of John from the Holy Bible, and adds: "This book of Revelations is thoroughly nonsensical. It is quite wrong to attribute it to John, who was one of the Apostles. It is ignorance and being unaware of the facts. The person who wrote it was neither an apostle nor a follower of the Messiah, nor was he a pious person. Perhaps this book of Revelations was written by a Roman named Sern Tehsin (Cerinhac) and was attributed to John." Further on he says, "But I do not have the capacity to

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

excise this book, i.e. John's Revelations, from the Holy Bible. For thousands of our Christian brothers revere this John. I confirm that the person who wrote this book had inspirations. But I do not admit that he was the Apostle John, who was the brother of James, an apostle, and the son of Zebedee and the author of the Gospel of John. It is inferrable from his words and manners that he was not an apostle. Nor is the person who wrote the book of Revelations the same John mentioned in the Book of Acts, which tells about the The Acts of The Apostles. For he never went to the country of Isaiah. The person who wrote that Gospel was another John, who was an inhabitant of Isaiah. Again, as is inferred from the paragraphs and expressions in the Gospel of John, in the epistles and in the Revelations, John, who is the editor of John's Gospel and the epistles, is not the same John who compiled the Book of Revelations. For the paragraphs in the Gospel and in the epistles are well arranged and have a smooth language in Greek. They do not contain erroneous expressions. The case is not so with the discourse in the Book of Revelations; it is written in a queer, unusual style unwonted in Greek. John the Apostle does not mention his name overtly in his Gospel and epistles; he writes of himself as 'the speaker' or in the third person singular. He directly gets into the matter under question without giving lengthy information of himself. As for the author of Revelations; he uses quite a different style. For example, the first verse of the first chapter of John's Revelations reads as follows: 'The Revelation of Jesus Christ, which God gave unto him, to shew unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass and he sent and signified it by his angel unto his servant John:' (Rev: 1-1) The ninth verse reads as follows: 'I, John, who also am your brother, and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ, ...' (Rev: 1-9) The eighth verse of the twenty-second chapter reads as follows: 'And I John saw these things, and heard them. ...' (Rev: 22-8) As is seen, these verses, unlike the style followed by the Apostles, mention the speaker's name clearly. If it is suggested that unlike his past habit, he (John) might have mentioned his name clearly here in order to make his people know about him, the following answer is appropriate: If his purpose had been so, he should have written the nickname and title belonging to him. For example, he should have used such expressions as, 'I am John, the brother of James and the son of Zebedee and the beloved disciple of the Messiah.' Avoiding mentioning his own qualification and differentiating himself from

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

other people, he used such expressions as 'your brother', 'who saw these things,' etc. Our purpose here is not to make fun of reasonable people, but to clarify the distinction between the styles of expression and writing of the two people." Here we end our quotation from Vivisbius.

Again, it is written in the third chapter of the third book of the history of Eusebius, "The first epistle of Peter is authentic. But his second epistle cannot be from the Holy Bible. Paul's fourteen epistles are real. But some people excised his epistles to the Hebrew's from the Holy Bible." Eusebius states in the twenty-fifth chapter of his same book that there is disagreement on the epistle of Jacob, the epistle of Judas, the second epistle of Peter, and the second and third epistles of John, and that their real authors are unknown. Eusebius says in the twenty-fifth chapter of the sixth book of this same history, "Airgin's account of the epistle to the Hebrews is as follows: This epistle, which is very popular among the Christians, was written by some Gulnaht in Shab-i-Rûm. Some people said that it was translated by Luke." Irenaeus (140-220), an early theologian, Polinius, one of the dignitaries in 220, and Pontius, in 251, rejected the epistle to the Hebrews entirely. Tortilin Bersper of Carthage, one of the dignitaries of A.D. 200, says: "The Hebrew epistle belongs to Barnabas." Kis Bertsper Rûm, one of the notables of 212, says: "The epistles of Paul are virtually thirteen; the fourteenth, the Hebrew epistle, is not one of them." Saey Pern Bashb of Carthage, in 248, did not even mention the name of this epistle. The Syrian church has not accepted, so far, the authenticity of the second epistle of Peter and the second and third epistles of John. Aiscalcen, a notable Christian, says: "The person who wrote the second epistle of Peter wasted his time by doing so." It is written as follows in the Biblical History published in 1266 [A.D. 1850]: "A writer named Critius says that the epistle of Judas belongs to John, who was the fifteenth usquf (priest) of Jerusalem during the reign of Aydernick." [Usquf: a ranking clergy responsible for reading the Bible.] Airgin, an early writer who interpreted the Gospel of John, says in the fifth book of this interpretation of his: "Paul did not write epistles to every church; and the epistles he wrote to some churches consisted of a few lines." As is inferred from this statement of Airgin's, none of the epistles said to be Paul's belongs to him; all of them belong to some other writer, but are attributed to him. The second chapter of the epistle that Paul wrote to Galatians contains the following statements, from the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

eleventh verse to the sixteenth verse: “But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed.” “For before that certain came from James, he did eat with the Gentiles; but when they were come, he withdrew and separated himself, fearing them which were of the circumcision.” “And the other Jews dissembled likewise with him; insomuch that Barnabas also was carried away with their dissimulation.” “But when I saw that they walked not uprightly according to the truth of the gospel, I said unto Peter before them all, If thou, being a Jew, livest after the manner of Gentiles, and not as do the Jews, why compellest thou the Gentiles to live as do the Jews?” “We who are Jews by nature, and not sinners of the Gentiles,” “Knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ, even we have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law; for by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.” (Galatians: 2-11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16)

Because the initial part of these statements contradicts the final part, one of the parts, (that is, either the beginning part or the final part), must have been added afterwards. For, although Paul writes in the beginning of his epistle [eleventh verse] how he scolded Peter in Antioch, the guilt he blamed him for was his eating with other people, i.e. pagans, which was against Jewish customs. [Supposing it were not an insolence for him to direct the insults we have mentioned above towards such a person as Peter, who had been inspired by the Holy Spirit and served the Messiah.] In fact, his scolding him was based on the following reasoning: “A Jew as you are, you slight the commandments of your religion like pagans. How can you have the face to call them to (follow) the Jewish canon?” But after this (reasoning) Paul changes his course and begins to explain the futility of the canonical commandments. In the third chapter, after long discourse on the needlessness of worships, he says that he has entirely adapted himself to the canonical laws of Mûsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’. As a matter of fact, the seventeenth to the twenty-sixth verses of the twenty-first chapter of the Book of Acts read as follows: “And when we were come to Jerusalem, the brethren received us gladly.” “And the day following Paul went in with us unto James; and all the elders were present.” “And when he had saluted them, he declared particularly what things God had wrought among the Gentiles by his ministry.” “And when they heard it, they grorified the Lord, and said unto him, Thou seest,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

brother, how many thousands of Jews there are which believe; and they are all zealous of the law;" "And they are informed of these, that thou teachest all the Jews which are among the Gentiles to forsake Moses, saying that they ought not to circumcise their children, neither to walk after the customs." "What is it therefore? the multitude must needs come together: for they will hear that thou art come." "Do therefore this that we say to thee: We have four men which have a vow on them;" "Them take, and purify thyself with them, and be at charges with them, that they may shave their heads: and all may know that those things, whereof they were informed concerning thee, are nothing; but that thou thyself also walkest orderly, and keepest the law." "As touching the Gentiles which believe, we have written and concluded that they observe no such thing, save only that they keep themselves from things offered to idols, and from blood, and from strangled, and from fornication." "Then Paul took the men, and the next day purifying himself with them entered into the temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them." (The Acts: 21-17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26)

As seen, Paul, who kept saying that "The body will not be clean by (following) the canon. Though accursed for us, the Messiah has saved us from the commandments of the canon," follows the old people's advice, adapts himself to the canon by cleaning himself and enters the temple.

Three verses from Paul's epistle tell us a few subtle facts about the mysteries of Christianity:

First: It was rumoured among the Jews believing the Messiah that Paul was saying, "Circumcision is unnecessary." This comes to mean that the Jews, who had believed Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' on condition that they would not desist from the canon of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', did not approve the changing of the canonical laws of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm.'

Second: At that time it was not considered important whether the canonical laws would continue to exist. The person, who was one of the apostles of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', said, "The people must be gathered together whatever the cost;" hence it is inferred that his real purpose was to bring the people together in their own religion by using all sorts of methods. This suggestion, which an apostle of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had the courage to make to Paul only in order to bring the people together, betrays the basis on which Christianity was founded.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Third: Papias, who was the bishop of Hirapulius towards the middle of the second Christian century, referred to two short treatises pertaining to the words and acts of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. One of them is a treatise by Mark, who was the interpreter of the Apostle Peter, the other is Matthew's treatise, a compilation of Hebrew commandments and rules. Papias stated that the treatise belonging to Mark was very short, inadequate, not written in chronological order, consisting of some stories and traditions. This signifies that, in the middle of the second century, Matthew and Mark had a treatise each; Papias saw them and wrote about them, describing them and pointing out the differences between them.

As for the Gospels of Matthew and Mark existing today; they are quite alike, both being detailed in such a manner as if they were copied from each other. It is apparent that these are not the versions seen by Papias and that those versions were later enlarged by additions.

On the other hand, Papias never mentioned the Gospels of Luke and John. Papias, who was in Hirapulius and, naturally, met John's disciples and learned some facts from them, did not even say a single word about the Gospel of John. This fact shows that the Gospel of John was written some time afterwards.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

The ninth verse of the ninth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew reads as follows: "And as Jesus passed forth from thence, he saw a man, named Matthew, sitting at the receipt of custom: and he saith unto him, Follow me. And he arose, and followed him." (Matt: 9-9) Now, please pay close attention to this point: if Matthew himself wrote these statements, why did he use the name Matthew in the third person instead of speaking as Matthew himself? [If the author of this Gospel had been Matthew himself, he would have said, "As I was sitting at the customs place, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' passed by. When he saw me he told me to follow him, to walk behind him. So I stood up and followed him, walked behind him."]

In the Gospel of Matthew, every speech quoted from Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is so long that it is impossible to say any one of them at one sitting, at one time. In fact, the advice and the directions that he gave to the apostles in the tenth chapter, his continuous words in the fifth, sixth and seventh chapters, his scolding of the Persians in the twenty-third chapter, his continuous exemplifications in the eighth chapter are absolutely not short enough to occur within one sitting. A proof of this is that these same speeches and exemplifications of his are divided into various sittings in the other Gospels. This means to say that the author of this Gospel is not Matthew, the customs officer, the faithful companion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

In the Gospel of Matthew, miracles (mu'jiza) of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' such as his curing the poor people who were blind, leprous or paralyzed, his feeding large numbers of poor people, are mentioned at two different places each. The Gospels of Mark and Luke, on the other hand, mention each of these events at one place. Hence, the author of the Gospel attributed to Matthew probably consulted two sources when writing the book and saw the same event in both sources. Then, perhaps, thinking the two events were different, he wrote them as such in his book.

It is written in the fifth verse of the tenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that hadrat Îsâ commanded his messengers,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

i.e. the Apostles, not to go to [call] the Gentiles [to their religion] and not to enter the city of Samaria. Further ahead it is said that he cured a pagan captain's servant and Canaanite woman's daughter.

On the one hand, the sixth verse of the seventh chapter says, "Give not that which is holy unto the dogs, neither cast ye your pearls before swine, ..." (Matt: 7-6) The nineteenth verse of the twenty-eighth chapter, on the other hand, enjoins, "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" (ibid: 28-19)

While the fifth verse of the tenth chapter prohibits, "..., Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Sa-mar'i-tans enter ye not:" (ibid: 10-5), the fourteenth verse of the twenty-fourth chapter commands, "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations; and then shall the end come." (ibid: 24-14) [This and the preceeding verses are completely contradictory of each other.]

Countless contradictions and oppositions of this sort are repeated in this Gospel. These additions leave no doubt as to the fact that the Gospel of Matthew was interpolated. Some important episodes contained by the other Gospels do not exist in the Gospel of Matthew. For example, the episodes such as the selection of seventy pupils by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', his ascension in the Mala-i-hawâriyyûn, his coming to Jerusalem twice for celebrating the Bayram (Holy Day), and Luazer's resurrection from his grave do not exist in this Gospel. Therefore, it is doubtful that the Gospel of Matthew was written by Matthew the Apostle.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

THE GOSPEL OF MARK

All historians agree that Mark was not one of the Apostles. Perhaps he was an interpreter to the Apostle Peter.

Papias states, "Mark was an interpreter to Peter. Mark wrote the words and acts of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as correctly as he could recollect them. But he did not write the words and acts of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in a regular order. For he had not heard them from Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', nor had he ever been with him. As I have said, Mark was only a friend of Peter's. In order to have a book containing his conversations with Peter and the words of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', he related the events in a haphazard way, choosing the right time and the appropriate gathering for each event he was to tell about. For this reason, Mark should not be blamed for having written some parts of his book in a manner as if he had learned them from his master, Peter. For Mark did not consider it important to write what he had heard without forgetting or changing any parts."

The early Christian scholars wrote explanations to the Gospel of Mark daily. Iren, one of them, states: "After the deaths of Peter and Paul, Mark wrote what he had memorized before." Calman of Alexandria says: "As Peter was in Rome yet, Peter's pupils asked Mark to write his Gospel. He did so. Peter heard of the writing of the book. But he did not say whether he should write it or not." Eusebius, a historian, says: "Upon hearing of this, Peter was pleased about this effort of his pupils. He ordered that it be read in the church." Nevertheless, the Gospel of Mark appears to be an imitation of the Gospel of Matthew, rather than the epistles of Peter. Accordingly, the book that Papias says was written by Mark must be another one, other than the existing second Gospel. The seventeenth and eighteenth verses of the sixth chapter of the Gospel of Mark read: "For Herod himself had sent forth and laid hold upon John,[1] and bound him in prison for He-ro'di-as' sake, his brother Philip's wife: for he had married her." (Mark: 6-17) "For John had said unto Herod, It is not lawful for

---

[1] Christians call this exalted Prophet John the Baptist.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

thee to have thy brother's wife." (ibid: 6-18) This is completely wrong. For the name of Herodias' husband is given clearly as Hirius, not as Philippus, in the fifth chapter of the eighteenth book of the history of Eusebius. This error exists in the Gospel of Matthew, too. In fact, the translators who wrote the Arabic version which was edited in 1821 [1237 hijri] and 1844 changed this verse by having excised the word 'Philippus' from the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, though it exists in the translations done in other years.

Again, the two statements in the twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth verses of the second chapter of the Gospel of Mark bear the following meaning: "Hadrat Îsâ said unto his pupils: Haven't you ever read about how Dâwûd (David) and those who were with him, when they were hungry and in need, entered the home of God and he and also those who were with him ate the sacred bread, which was not permissible for anyone except the rabbis to eat, in the days of Abiathar, the head rabbis?" These statements are wrong, erroneous for two reasons:

First, at that time hadrat Dâwûd was alone. No one was with him. *Second*, in those days the head of rabbis was not Abiatar, but perhaps his father, Ahimlik. [Members of the Congregation of Seventies that administer the Jews' affairs are called Rabbi. Their preachers are called Scribes.]

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

THE GOSPEL OF LUKE

It is a certain fact that Luke was not one of the Apostles. It is written in the beginning of the Gospel of Luke: "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us," "Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word;" "It seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent The-oph'i-lus," "That thou mightest know the certainty of those things, wherein thou hast been instructed." (Luke: 1-1, 2, 3, 4)

This paragraph has several denotations:

First; Luke wrote this Gospel as many other people contemporary with him wrote Gospels. *Second;* Luke points out the fact that there is no Gospel written by the Apostles themselves. For he distinguishes the Gospel writers from those who have seen with their own eyes, with the expression "Even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eyewitnesses, and ministers of the word; ..."

Third; he does not claim to be a disciple of one of the Apostles. For in his time there were numerous publications, articles and epistles attributed to each of the Apostles; he did not hope that such a documentation, i.e. claiming to be a pupil of one of the Apostles, would cause others to trust his book. Perhaps he thought it a more dependable document to point out that he had observed every fact in its original source and learned everything by personal scrutiny. One point should be noted: recently it has become a customary practice on the part of the Protestant clergy to replace the criticised expressions with some other appropriate expressions, each time a Gospel is reprinted. In fact, with permission, registered with the date 1371 and number 572, given by the (Turkish) Ministry of Education, the British and American Bible companies transformed this paragraph, too. By substituting the expression "As I know all the facts to the most minute details....," with "having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first...," they adapted the meaning to their own goals. But the French versions and the versions printed in Germany retain the meaning we have translated above.

In giving the genealogy of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', the twenty-seventh verse of the third chapter of the Gospel of Luke writes as follows: "Which was the son of Jo-an'na, which was the son of Re'sa, which was the son of Zo-rob'a-bel, which was the son of sa-

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

la'thi'el, which was the son of Ne'ri," (Luke: 3-27) There are three errors here:

First; the children of Zo-rob'a-bel are written clearly in the nineteenth verse of the third chapter of I Chronicles of the Old Testament. There is no one by the name of Re'sa there. This writing of his contradicts Matthew's writing, too.

Second: Zo-rob'a-bel is the son of Pe-dai'ah. He is not the son of Sa-la'thi el. He is the son of Sa-la'thi-el's brother.

Third; Sa-la'thi-el is the son of Jech-o-ni'as, not the son of Ne'ri. Matthew writes so, too.[1]

Again, the thirty-sixth verse of the third chapter of the Gospel of Luke reads, "... Sa'la," (Luke: 3-35) "Which was the son of Ca-i'nan, which was the son of Ar-phax'ad," (ibid: 3-36) which is wrong, too. For Sa'la is not the grandson of Ar-phax'ad; he is his son. This fact is stated in the first chapter of I Chronicles (nineteenth verse) and in the eleventh chapter of Genesis [in its tenth, eleventh and twelfth verses].

Also, the first and second verses of the second chapter of the Gospel of Luke, "And it came to pass in those days, that there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed." "(And this taxing was first made when Cy-re'nius was governor of Syria,)" (Luke: 2-1, 2) are wrong. The Romans never dominated the whole world; how could they have issued a firman concerning a worldwide taxing? In fact, the Protestant priests, in order to dodge this question as usual, changed these statements in the Istanbul-1886 edition of the New Testament and wrote it as, "In those days a firman concerning the registering of the whole world was issued by the Kaiser Augustus." On the other hand, in the Turkish version issued by the British society in Paris in 1243 [A.D. 1827], this passage is written as, "In those days it befell so that a firman concerning a census of the world was issued by the Cæsar Augustus." "And Joseph also went up from Galilee, out of the city of Nazareth, into Judea, unto the city of David, which is called Bethlehem; .." "To be taxed with Mary his espoused wife, ..." (Luke: 2-2, 3, 4) Afterwards, when scrutinies on the passage about the taxing began, it was seen that neither the historians contemporary with Luke nor those a short while before him said anything concerning the taxation. As for Cy-re'ni-us; he became the governor of Syria fifteen years after the birth of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; it is an obvious fact, therefore, that the so-called taxing could not have taken place in his time, supposing after all the doubtful taxing did take place.

---

[1] Matt: 1-12

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

THE GOSPEL OF JOHN

As for the Gospel of John; as is known, till the emergence of the fourth Gospel which is attributed to John, the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was based on the principle of unity, no different from the canonical laws of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in its fundamentals. For it is the Gospel of John that first mentioned the word 'trinity' and which misled the believers of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' by inserting the doctrine of trinity (believing three Gods) into their belief. For this reason, it is extremely important to search into the facts about the Gospel of John. Various quotations from the books of early Christian men of religion about the Gospel of John have been given above.

This book does not belong to John the son of Zebedee. It was written by an anonymous author after the second century. Contemporary European orientalist historians have proved this fact by various evidences.

First evidence: It is written as follows at the beginning of the Gospel of John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (John: 1-1) These words are of the subtle matters of the knowledge of Word and do not exist in any of the other Gospels. If these words had been heard from Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', they would exist in the other Gospels, too. Hence, the author is not John the apostle but another person, who must have studied the Platonic philosophy of three hypostases in Roman and Alexandrian schools. As a matter of fact, this will be explicated below.

Second evidence: The writings about the adulteress, from the first verse to the eleventh in the eighth chapter of the Gospel of John, are repudiated by all Christian churches, who say that those writings are not Biblical. This means to say that the author compiled a number of Gospels he came across, adding many other things he happened to find here and there; or someone after him added these verses. According to the first case, the author wrote a compilation without distinguishing between the true and the untrue. So the compilation he wrote consists of unacceptable things. According to the second case, it must be admitted that this Gospel was interpolated. In either case, it is of doubtful origin

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and does not deserve trust.

Third evidence: Some examples, occurances and miracles narrated in the other Gospels do not exist in this Gospel, which in its turn contains a number of things non-existent in the others. Episodes such as Luazer's coming back to life, the water's changing into wine, his (Jesus) confiding his beloved disciple and his mother to each other, exist only in the Gospel of John and not in the others. Later on we shall give detailed information in this respect.

Fourth evidence: Of the early Christians, neither Papias nor Justinien mentioned seeing this Gospel. Justinien, especially, who admitted that the author of the Gospel of John was not John himself, did not say anything about this Gospel.

Fifth evidence: The way of expression in the narration of the events compiled in the other three Gospels is quite contrary to the style of discourse used in the Gospel of John. For example, in the other three Gospels Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', like a tutor who wants to train the people, disapproves the hypocritical behavior of the Pharesees. He commands to purify the heart, to approach Allâhu ta'âlâ, to love people, to form beautiful habits, and prohibits inclinations contrary to the sharî'a of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' (Mosaic laws). His teachings and advice to the people are quite clear, natural, and comprehensible to anyone. Although these three Gospels contradict one another in some of their narratives, they are apparently based on common sources in those that agree with one another. The Gospel of John, on the other hand, is quite dissimilar and uses an altogether different style both in its discourse and concerning the moral and habitual conduct of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. In this Gospel, hadrat Îsâ is represented as a person who has knowledge of Greek philosophy and whose elegant and eloquent language expresses his personal nobility rather than such values as the fear of Allahu ta'âlâ and beautiful morality. And the way of expression chosen is not the Messianic style common to the public but the lexical and syntactical dialect peculiar to Alexandrian schools. His statements, though thoroughly clear and plain in the other three Gospels, are ambiguous in this Gospel. It is full of well-organized iterations mostly with important double meanings and arranged in a singular way. The style used in John arouses one's feelings of denial and hatred instead of alluring one's heart. If this Gospel had appeared all of a sudden, recently, after having remained concealed somewhere, no one would believe it was written by one of the Apostles. Because it has been known for centuries,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Christians cannot realize these oddities.

Sixth evidence: More mistakes are noticed in this Gospel. For instance, the fifty-first verse of the first chapter of the Gospel of John reads as follows: "And he saith unto him, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Hereafter ye shall see heaven open, and the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of man." (John: 1-51) In actual fact, these words of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' took place after his baptism in the water of Erden and the descension of the Holy Spirit; after that no one saw the opening of the heaven or the descension of angels unto Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

The thirteenth verse of the third chapter of this Gospel states, "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." (John: 3-13) This verse is wrong in several respects:

First; the part interpreted with the phrase 'even'[1] was added afterwards. Thus the verse was changed. For the beginning part of the verse purported that "No one other than who descended from heaven has ascended to heaven"; but the author of the Gospel or one of its editors inserted an explanatory phrase in order to point out that mankind, i.e. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', is meant by this verse. Careful observation will show at once that this phrase is an addition. For when we separate the initial part of the verse from this explanatory phrase, its correct meaning, "No one other than the angels who descended from heaven has ascended to heaven," will become clear. On the other hand, if it is insinuated that "It is mankind who descended from heaven," the fact that hadrat Îsâ did not descend from heaven but was conceived by hadrat Maryam (Mary) through the Holy Spirit [the Archangel Jabrâîl 'alaihis-salâm'] will have been disavowed. Moreover, it will be necessary to reject that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was on earth and not in heaven as he said, "...Son of man which is in heaven...". Furthermore, it is impossible for Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to have uttered both expressions, i.e. "he that came down from heaven" and "which is in heaven", at the same moment.

Second; the initial part of the verse is wrong, too. For it is stated in the twenty-fourth verse of the fifth chapter of Genesis and in the eleventh and twelfth verses of the second chapter of Kings II that Ahnûh (E'noch) and Ilyâ (E-li'sha) 'alaihimus-salâm' also ascended to heaven. There can be no doubt as to the fact that this verse has been interpolated.

---

[1] In Biblical English, 'even' means 'that is'.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 5 —

CONTRADICTIONS AND DISCREPANCIES AMONG THE FOUR GOSPELS

The errors, contradictions and interpolations seen in the existing Gospels are uncountably numerous. Many of them are explained in the book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq.** Also, there is extensive and detailed information in this respect in books that were written and are still being written and published by a number of German orientalists such as Joizer, Davis, Miel, Kepler, Maçe, Bred Schneider, Griesbach Huge, Lesinag, Herder, Straus, Haus, Tobian, Thyl, Carl Butter, and many others. Here we shall only mention a few of them.

There is a great difference between the Gospels of Matthew and Luke concerning the ancestors of Îsâ 'sall-allâhu alâ Nebiyyinâ wa alaihi wa sallam'.

In the Gospel of Matthew, the following names are written as the ancestors of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm': "Ibrahim (Abraham), Is-haq (Isaac), Ya'qûb (Jacob), Yahûdâ (Judas), Fâris (Pha'res), Hazron (Es'rom), Irâm (A'ram), Aminadab (A-min'a-dab), Nahshon (Na-as'son), Salmon (Sal'mon), Buaz (Bo'oz), Obid (O'bed), Yesse (Jesse), Dâwûd (David), Suleymân (Solomon), Rehobeam (Ro-bo'am), Abiya (A-bi'a), Asâ (Asa), Yehashafat (Jos'a-phat), Yorâm (Joram), Uzziyâ (O-zi'as), Yotam (Jo'a-tham), Ahaz (A'chaz), Hazkiyâ (Ez-e-ki'as), Manassa (Manas'ses), Amon (A'mon), Yoshiâ (Jo-si'as), Yaqonyâ (Jech-o-ni'as), Shaltoil (Sa-la'thi-el),[1] Zarubâbel (Zo-rob'a-bel), Abihûd (A-bi'ud), Alyâkim (E-li'a-kim), Azor (Azor), Sâdok (Sa'doc), Ahim (A'chim), Elliud (E-li'ud), Eliazar (E-le-a'zar), Mattan (Mat'than), Ya'qûb (Jacob), Yûsuf (Joseph) (Maryam's husband)." (Matt.: 1-1 thr. 16)

On the other hand, in the twenty-third and later verses of the third chapter of the Gospel of Luke the following names are written: "Târûh (Tha'ra), Ibrâhîm (Abraham), Is-haq (Isaac),

[1] Here, again, like in the Gospel of Luke, sala'thi-el is represented as the father of Zo-rob'a-bel, which is wrong.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Ya'qûb (Jacob), Yahûdâ (Juda), Fâris (Pha'res), Hasron (Es'rom), Arâm (A'ram), Aminadab (A-min'adab), Nahshon (Na-as'son), Salmon (Sal'mon), Buaz (Bo'oz), Obid (O'bed), Yesse (Jesse), Dâwûd (David), Nâtân (Nathan), Mattatha (Mat'ta-tha), Mînân (Me-nan), Milya (Me'le-a), Alyakîm (E-li'a-kim), Yonan (Jo'nan), Yûsuf (Joseph), Yahûdâ (Juda), Sem'ûn (Simeon), Lâvî (Levi), Met-thâd (Mat'that), Yorîm (Jo'rim), Eliazâr (E-li-e'zer), Yushâ (Jo'se), Eyr (Er), Almodam (El-mo'dam), Kosam (Co'sam), Addi (Ad'di), Melkî (Mel'chi), Neyrî (Ne'ri), Shaltoil (Sa-la'thi-el), Zerubâbel (Zo-rob'a-bel), Risa (Rhe'sa), Yuhannâ (Jo-an'na), Yahûdâ (Juda), Yûsuf (Joseph), Shemî (Sem'e-i), Mattathiya (Mat-ta-thi'as), Mahat (Ma'ath), Nâdjay (Nag'ge), Heslî (Es'li), Nahum (Na'um), Amos (Amos), Metasiya (Mat-ta-thi'as), Yûsuf (Joseph), Yannâ (Jan'na), Melkî (Mel'chi), Lâvî (Levi), Met-that (Mat'that), Heli (He'li), Yûsuf (Joseph) (Maryam's husband)." (Luke: 3-23 thr. 34)

1 — According to Matthew, Yûsuf (who is said to be the father of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm) is the son of Ya'qûb. According to Luke, he is the son of Helî. Matthew is a person close to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. And Luke is a disciple of Peter's. They are supposed to be the people to study and observe a person close to them, and yet they seem to fall short of making investigation wholesome enough to write correctly the name of a person who they say was the grandfather of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; now, who on earth will trust or believe their other narratives?

2 — According to Matthew, Suleymân 'alaihis-salâm' is the son of Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm'. And according to Luke the son of Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm' is Nâtân, not Suleymân 'alaihis-salâm'.

3 — Matthew says that Shaltoil is the son of Yaqunyâ. But Luke says he is the son of Neyrî. In Matthew, the name of Zerubâbel's son is Abihûd, whereas in Luke it is Risâ. What is equally startling is that in the nineteenth verse of the third chapter of the Akhbâr-i-eyyâm Safar-i-ûlâ, that is, of the First Chronicles, the names of Ze-rub'ba-bel's sons are written as Me-shul'lam and Han-a-ni'ah.[1] There is no mention of A-bi'ud or Rhe'sa there.

4 — According to the seventeenth verse of the first chapter of Matthew, the grandfathers attributed to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' from Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' to Yûsuf-u-Najjâr (Joseph the Carpenter), make up forty-two generations. The names given above,

[1] I Chr: 3-19

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

nevertheless, count only forty. According to Luke's account, on the other hand, the number reaches fifty-five.

From the time when the Gospels first appeared to our time, Christian scholars have remained in utter perplexity as to this question. Some of them made such untenable explanations as would not be admitted by anyone with common sense. For this reason, scholars such as Eckharn, Keiser, Haisee, Ghabuth, Wither, Fursen, etc. admitted the fact by saying that "These Gospels contain lots of contradictions pertaining to meaning." This is the truth of the matter. For inconsistencies and errors are not only in this matter but also in all the other matters.

Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' came to this world without a father. Nevertheless, while Jews persistently calumniate him by calling him an illegitimate child [May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so!], Christians attribute a paternal case history to him and accept Yûsuf as his father, though he is not his father; this is a consternating ignorance and a paradoxical state. In Qur'ân al-kerîm, the âyats concerning Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' use such terms as "Îsâ ibn Maryam," which means "Îsâ the son of Maryam." It is declared clearly in the Qur'ân al-kerîm that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' did not have a father.

5 — It is written as follows in the twenty-second and twenty-third verses of the first chapter of Matthew: "Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying," (Matt: 1-22) "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Em-man'u-el, which being interpreted is, God with us." (ibid: 1-23) According to Christian priests, by the word 'Prophet', Îshâyâ (Isaiah) 'alaihi-salâm' is meant. As an evidence for this, they put forward the fourteenth verse of the seventh chapter of the Book of Isaiah, which reads, "Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign; Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Im-man'u-el." (Is: 7-14) Rahmatullah Efendi explains this matter in detail in his book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq.** He states that their inference is wrong for three reasons:

First; the word which the translators of the Gospel and the translator of the Book of Isaiah translated as **azrâ** (=virgin) is **'ilmatun,** which is the feminine gender of the word **'ilm** (=knowledge). According to Jewish scholars the meaning of this word is **young woman.** They say that this term is also used to mean **married woman,** whether virginal or not, in the thirtieth chapter of the Sifr-ul-emthâl (Proverbs of Solomon). In the three

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Greek versions of the Book of Isaiah translated by persons named Ikola, Thedusien, and Semiks, this term is interpreted as (young woman). These translations, according to Christian clergy, are quite old; it is narrated that the first was translated in 129, the second in 175, and the third in 200. All these translations, especially the Thedusien, were warmly accepted by the early Christians. Therefore, according to Jewish scholars and the interpretations of these three translators, the expression used by Matthew is apparently wrong. Fery, in his discourse on the Hebrew lexicon in a book of his which is popular and accepted among Protestant priests, says that this word, i.e. (Azrâ), means (young woman). They (Protestants) say that according to this explanation the two meanings are common in this word. Yet the native speakers of the language, i.e. the Jews, in response to this interpretation of the priests, state that firstly Matthew's expression is wrong and secondly translating the word as **Azrâ** (=virginal woman), which runs counter to the early translations of the Jewish interpretations, requires sound proofs. The priest who wrote the book **Mîzân-ul-haqq** says in his book **Hall-ul-eshkal** that the meaning of the word is certainly Azrâ; he is wrong. The two evidences we have mentioned above would suffice to refute him.

Second; the twentieth verse of the first chapter of Matthew reads as follows: "But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost." (Matt: 1-20) And the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses say: "Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord had bidden him, and took unto him his wife:" (Matt: 1-24) "And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name JESUS." (ibid: 1-25)

The first chapter of Luke, on the other hand, states that the angel was seen by hadrat Maryam herself. According to the thirty-first verse of the same chapter, the angel said to hadrat Maryam: "And, behold, thou shalt conceive in thy womb, and bring forth a son, and shalt call his name JESUS." (Luke: 1-31)

While Matthew states that the angel appeared to Joseph in his dream, Luke says that hadrat Maryam saw the angel in person.

Furthermore, it is written as follows in the twenty-third verse of the first chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: "Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and shall call his

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

name Em-man'u-el, ..." (Matt: 1-23) This is, at the same time, the fourteenth verse of the seventh chapter of the Book of Isaiah. It is wrong, because Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' never said that his name was Em-man'u-el.

Third; the following episode prevents the naming of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as Em-man'u-el: When Râsîn (Rezin, or Rasun), the Aramean ruler, and Fâqâh (Pekah), the Israelite ruler, brought their armies together in Jerusalem in order to fight the Judah ruler, Âhâz bin Yûsân was alarmed by their alliance. Jenâb-i Haqq inspired Isaiah 'alaihis-salâm' to calm Âhâz. So he gave Âhâz the good news: "O thou Âhâz! Don't be afraid! They cannot beat you. Their sovereignties will soon be destroyed and perish." He also stated its harbinger as follows: "A young woman shall become pregnant and have a son. Before this boy distinguishes between good and bad the empires of these two monarchs shall become annihilated." Fâqâh's sovereignty was destroyed exactly twenty-one years after this news. Then this boy must have been born before the annihilation of Fâqâh's sovereignty. On the other hand the birth of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' took place seven hundred and twenty-one years after the annihilation of Fâqâh's country. Therefore, people of the book fell into disagreement as to the authenticity of the narrative. Some Christian clergy and Bens [Dr. George Benson], a doctor of history, stated that by 'young woman' Isaiah 'alaihis-salâm' meant his own spouse and told the story accordingly. This explanation seems to be the most acceptable and the most plausible.

6 — It is narrated in the second chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that Yûsuf-u-Nejjâr (Joseph the Carpenter), for fear of Hirodes (Herod), took Maryam and Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and went to Egypt. And the fifteenth verse of the second chapter reads as follows: "And was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son." (Matt: 2-15) The Prophet meant here is Yûshâ' (Hosea). Thus the author of the Gospel of Matthew refers to the first verse of the eleventh chapter of the Book of Yûshâ (Hosea) in the Old Testament. This is wrong, because this verse has nothing to do with Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. The correct form of the verse exists in the Arabic translation printed in 1226 [A.D. 1811], and reads as follows: "I loved Israel since his childhood and invited his children from Egypt." This verse is a sign of the favour Allâhu ta'âlâ conferred upon the Israelites in the time of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. The author of Matthew changed

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

this verse in the Old Testament by replacing the plural form 'children' with the singular 'son' (ibn) and using the first person singular pronoun (my) instead of the third person (his). Following his example, the author of the Arabic version published in 1260 [A.D. 1844] made [intentional] changes, [thus changing the meaning altogether]. However, when the verses following it are read, the reason for this change becomes clear. As a matter of fact the next verse, the second verse of the eleventh chapter of the Book of Hosea, purports: "As they called them, so they went from them: they sacrificed unto Ba'al-im[1], ..." (Hos: 11-2). This cannot be the case with hadrat Îsâ, nor with the Jews contemporary with Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' or even with the Jews that lived five hundred years before the birth of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. For it is written clearly in history that five hundred and thirty-six years before the birth of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', that is, after their salvation from slavery in Babel, Jews desisted from worshipping idols and turned away from idols in penitence. It is a recorded fact that after that time they kept off idols.

7 — It is written in the nineteenth and following verses of the second chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, "But when Herod was dead, behold, an angel of the Lord appeareth in a dream to Joseph in Egypt," "Saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel: ..." "And he arose, and took the young child and his mother, and came into the land of Israel." "... he turned aside into the parts of Galilee:" "And he came and dwelt in a city called Nazareth: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, He shall be called a Nazarene." (Mat: 2-19 thr. 23) This is wrong, too. None of the books of Prophets contains a word of this sort. Jews reject this word and say that it is a lie, a slander. [In fact, Jews hold the belief that no Prophet lived in the region of Galilee, let alone Nazareth. As it is narrated clearly in the fifty-second verse of the seventh chapter of John, "They answered and said unto him, Art thou also of Galilee? Search, and look: for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet." (John: 7-52) This verse of John's contradicts the verse of Matthew we have mentioned above.] If the Christian priests have other information in this respect, they ought to declare it.

8 — As is written at the beginning of the fourth chapter of Matthew; the devil wanted to test Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. He was

---

[1] Idols worshipped by the peoople of the time of Ilyâ (Elijah) 'alaihis-salâm'.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

taken to the desert by the Spirit. Fasting for forty days and nights, he became hungry. Then the devil took Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to the blessed city and made him mount the dome of the temple, and said, "If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: ... He shall give his angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, ..." (Matt: 4-6) Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' answered the devil: "Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God." (ibid: 4-7) Then he took him into the mountains and said: "All these things will I give thee, if thou wilt fall down and worship me." (ibid: 4-9) Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said to the devil: "Get thee hence, Satan: for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve." (ibid: 4-10)

It is written in the twelfth and later verses of the first chapter of Mark: "And immediately the spirit driveth him into the wilderness." "And he was there in the wilderness for forty days, tempted of Satan: he was with the wild beasts; and the angels ministered unto him." (Mark: 1-12, 13) No remark is made here as to the manner of the devil's testing or the forty days' fasting by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

9 — The sixth and seventh verses of the twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew purports: "Now when Jesus was in Bethany, in the house of Simon the leper," "There came unto him a woman having an alabaster box of very precious ointment, and poured it on his head, as he sat at meat." (Matt: 26-6, 7)

The third verse of the fourteenth chapter of Mark reads: "And being in Bethany in the house of Simon the leper, as he sat at meat, there came a woman having an alabaster box of ointment of spikenard very precious; and she brake the box, and poured it on his head." (Mark: 14-3)

As it is purported in the thirty-sixth and later verses of the seventh chapter of the Gospel of Luke, "And one of the Pharisees desired him that he would eat with him. And he went into the Pharisee's house and sat down to meat." "And, behold, a woman in the city, which was a sinner, when she knew that Jesus sat at meat in the Pharisee's house, brought an alabaster box of ointment," "And stood at his feet behind him weeping, and began to wash his feet with tears, and did wipe them with the hairs of her head, and kissed his feet, and anointed them with the ointment." (Luke: 7-36, 37, 38) "And he said unto her, Thy sins are forgiven." (ibid: 7-48)

On the other hand, the same episode is narrated as follows in the twelfth chapter of the Gospel of John: "Then Jesus six days

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

before the passover came to Bethany, where Lazarus was which had been dead, whom he raised from the dead." "There they made him a supper; and Martha served: ..." "Then took Mary a pound of ointment of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus, and wiped his feet with her hair: ..." (John: 12-1, 2, 3) [As it is seen, the same one episode is narrated differently in the four Gospels.]

10 — It is written in the nineteenth, twentieth and twenty-first verses of the first chapter of John: "... when the Jews sent priests and Levites from Jerusalem to ask him, Who art thou?" "And he confessed, and denied not; but confessed, I am not the Christ." "And they asked him, What then? Art thou E-li'as? And he saith, I am not. Art thou that prophet? And he answered, No." (John: 1-19, 20, 21)

On the other hand, according to the fourteenth verse of the eleventh chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' stated about Yahyâ (E'li'as) in front of the people: "And if ye will receive it, this is E-li'as, which was for to come." (Matt: 11-14) And again Matthew writes in the tenth, eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth verses of the seventeenth chapter: "And his disciples asked him, saying, Why then say the scribes that E-li'as must first come?" "And Jesus answered and said unto them, E-li'as truly shall first come, and restore all things." "But I say unto you, That E-li'as is come already, and they knew him not, but have done unto him whatsoever they listed. Likewise shall also the Son of man suffer of them." "Then the disciples understood that he spake unto them of John the Baptist." (Matt: 17-10, 11, 12, 13) As is understood from this final passage, Yahyâ (John the Baptist) is the promised, expected E-li'as. According to the Gospels of John and Matthew, the statements of Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' contradict those of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. [For in the Gospel of John, Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' declares that he is not E-li'as. One of the reasons why Jews did not accept Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was because they had been expecting the coming of E-li'as before him. The contradiction here is as obvious as the sun.]

11 — In the first chapter of the Gospel of Luke, the angel who gives the good news of hadrat Yahyâ to Zakariyya (Zachariah), or Zach-a-ri'as) 'alaihis-salâm' recounts the qualities of Yahyâ, and says in the seventeenth verse: "And he shall go before him in the spirit and power of E-li'as, to turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the disobedient to the wisdom of the just; ..." (Luke: 1-17) This verse runs counter to the verses of Matthew narrated

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

above, For it would be paradoxical for Yahyâ both to be E-li'as himself and to have virtues and merits common with E-li'as.

12 — The twenty-fourth, twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth verses of the fourth chapter of Luke state: "And he said, Verily I say unto you, ..." "... many widows were in Israel in the days of E-li'as, when the heaven was shut up three years and six months, when famine was throughout all the land;" "But none of them was E-li'as sent, save unto Sa-rep'ta, a city of Si'don, unto a woman that was a widow." (Luke: 4-24, 25, 26) Since this event did not take place in the time of Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm', this narrative is obviously contrary to the narrative of Matthew. [For it is stated in the Gospel of Matthew that Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' lived in the time of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and that he was E-li'as. On the other hand, contrary to the narrative in the Gospel of Luke, the event of the sky remaining closed three years and six months did not take place in the time of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' or Yahyâ (John the Baptist), who is represented as E-li'as.]

13 — The fifty-third and fifty-fourth verses of the ninth chapter of Luke purport: "And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem." "And when his disciples James and John saw this, they said, Lord, wilt thou that we command fire to come down from heaven, and consume them, even as E-li'as did?" (Luke: 9-53, 54) Hence, even the apostles of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' knew that E-li'as had lived before them and that Yahyâ was not E-li'as. This narrative contradicts the narrative of Matthew, too.

14 — It is written in the first, second and third verses of the twenty-first chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' sent forth two apostles of his to a nearby village and ordered them to bring back with them a donkey tied there and its foal. The other Gospels do not mention the donkey and refer only to the foal.

15 — The sixth verse of the first chapter of Mark writes that Yahyâ ate locusts and wild honey. The eighteenth verse of the eleventh chapter of Matthew, on the other hand, says that Yahyâ did not eat or drink anything. [Their statements are quite opposite to each other.]

16 — The thirteenth to seventeenth verses of the third chapter of Matthew narrate that "Then cometh Jesus from Galilee to Jordan unto John, to be baptized of him." "But John forbad him, saying, I have need to be baptized of thee, and cometh thou to me?" "And Jesus answering said unto him, Suffer it to be so now:

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

for thus it becometh us to fulfill all righteousness. Then he suffered him." "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water: and, lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him:" "And lo a voice from heaven, saying, This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased." (Matt: 3-13, 14, 15, 16, 17) Again, the second and third verses of the eleventh chapter of Matthew state that "Now when John had heard in the prison the works of Christ, he sent two of his disciples," "And said unto him, Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?" (Matt: 11-2, 3)

Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' remained imprisoned in the dungeon until he was killed there. Baptism of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' by Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' was before his imprisonment. According to Matthew, Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' knew of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' before the baptism. [In the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth verses of the third chapter, as we have quoted above, Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' asks Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to baptize him and says, "I need to be baptized by you." and yet in the eleventh chapter it is narrated that when Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' was in the dungeon he did not know Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was the Messiah and that "he sent his disciples to find out who he was." But the actual fact is that Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' remained in the dungeon and was martyred there by Herod. This fact is stated also by Matthew in the fourteenth chapter. Accordingly, the verses on this subject in the third chapter and those in the eleventh chapter belie each other.]

17 — On the other hand this episode is narrated in an altogether different way in the Gospel of John. The thirty-second and thirty-third verses of the first chapter state that "And John bare record, saying, I saw the Spirit descending from heaven like a dove, and it abode upon him." "And I knew him not: but he that sent me to baptize with water, the same said unto me, Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him, the same is he which baptizeth with the Holy Ghost." (John: 1-32, 33) According to this narrative, Yahyâ did not know Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' before. He learned of him when the Spirit descended on him. This narrative is contrary to the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth verses of the first chapter of Matthew, which we have cited above.

18 — In the thirty-first verse of the fifth chapter of the Gospel of John, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' says: "If I bear witness of myself, my witness is not true." (John: 5-31) Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', again, says in

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

the eleventh verse of the third chapter: "... We speak that we do know, and testify that we have seen; ..." (John: 3-11) These two statements are absolutely irreconcilable.

19 — In the twenty-seventh verse of the tenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew he says: "What I tell you in darkness, that speak ye in light: and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the housetops." (Matt: 10-27) And in the third verse of the twelfth chapter of Luke he says: "Therefore whatsoever ye have spoken in darkness shall be heard in the light; and that which ye have spoken in the ear in closets shall be proclaimed upon the housetops." (Luke: 12-3) As is seen, the statement was derived from the same one source but was changed afterwards.

20 — It is stated in the twenty-first and later verses of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that "And as they did eat, he said, Verily I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me." "And they were exceeding sorrowful, and began every one of them to say unto him, Lord, is it I?" "And he answered and said, He that dippeth his hand with me in the dish, the same shall betray me." (Matt: 26-21, 22, 23) "Then Judas, which betrayed him, answered and said, Master is it I? He said unto him, Thou hast said." (ibid: 26-25)

The twenty-first and later verses of the thirteenth chapter of the Gospel of John say: "When Jesus had thus said, he was troubled in spirit, and testified, and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, that one of you shall betray me." "Then the disciples looked one on another, doubting of whom he spake." "Now there was leaning on Jesus' bosom one of his disciples, whom Jesus loved." "Simon Peter therefore beckoned to him, that he should ask who it should be of whom he spake." "He then lying on Jesus' breast saith unto him, Lord, who is it?" "Jesus answered, He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon." (John: 13-21 thr. 26) The difference between the two narratives is apparent.

21 — The twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew, while narrating how the Jews caught and imprisoned hadrat Îsâ, writes as follows beginning in the forty-eighth verse: "Now he that betrayed him gave him a sign, saying, Whomsoever I shall kiss, that same is he: hold him fast." "And forthwith he came to Jesus, and said, Hail, master; and kissed him." "And Jesus said unto him, Friend, wherefore art thou come? Then came they, and laid hands on Jesus, and took him." (Matt: 26-48, 49, 50)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

The third and later verses of the eighteenth chapter of John narrate that "Judas then, having received a band of men and officers from the chief priests and Pharisees, cometh thither with lanterns and torches and weapons." "Jesus therefore, knowing all things that should come upon him, went forth, and said unto them, Whom seek ye?" "They answered him, Jesus of Nazareth. Jesus saith unto them, I am he. And Judas also, which betrayed him, stood with them." "As soon then as he had said unto them, I am he, they went backward, and fell to the ground." "Then asked he them again, Whom seek ye? And they said, Jesus of Nazareth." "Jesus answered, I have told you that I am he: if therefore ye seek me, let these go their way:" (John: 18-3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) Contradiction between the two narratives is manifest.

22 — There are many opposite narratives as to Peter's denial of knowing Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in the Gospels. The sixty-ninth and later verses of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew state that "Now Peter sat without in the palace: and a damsel came unto him, saying, Thou also was with Jesus of Galilee." "But he denied before them all, saying, I know not what thou sayest." "And when he was gone out into the porch, another maid saw him, and said unto them that were there, This fellow was also with Jesus of Nazareth." "And again he denied with an oath, I do not know the man." "And after a while came unto him they that stood by, and said to Peter, Surely thou art one of them; for thy speech betrayeth thee." "Then began he to curse and to swear, saying, I know not the man. And immediately the cock crew." "And Peter remembered the word of Jesus, which said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice. And he went out, and wept bitterly." (Matt: 26-69 thr. 75)

On the other hand, it is narrated as follows between the sixty-sixth and seventy-second verses of the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark: "And as Peter was beneath in the palace, there cometh one of the maids of the high priest:" "And when she saw Peter warming himself, she looked upon him, and said, And thou also wast with Jesus of Nazareth." "But he denied, saying, I know not, neither understand I what thou sayest. And he went out into the porch; and the cock crew." "And a maid saw him again, and began to say to them that stood by, This is one of them." "And he denied it again. And a little after, they that stood by said again to Peter, Surely thou art one of them: for thou art a Galilæan, and thy speech agreeth thereto." "But he began to curse and to swear, saying, I know not this man whom ye speak." "And the second

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

time the cock crew. And Peter called to mind the word that Jesus said unto him, Before the cock crow twice, thou shalt deny me thrice. And when he thought thereon, he wept." (Mark: 14-66 thr. 72)

The fifty-fifth and later verses of the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel of Luke narrate that "And when they had kindled a fire in the midst of the hall, and were set down together, Peter sat down among them." "But a certain maid beheld him as he sat by the fire, and earnestly looked upon him, and said, This man was also with him." "And he denied him, saying, Woman, I know him not." "And after a while another saw him, and said, Thou art also of them, And Peter said, Man, I am not." "And about the space of one hour after another confidently affirmed, saying, Of a truth this fellow also was with him: for he is a Galilæan." "And Peter said, Man, I know not what thou sayest. And immediately, while he yet spake, the cock crew." "And the Lord turned, and looked upon Peter. And Peter remembered the word of the Lord, how he had said unto him, Before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice." "And Peter went out, and wept bitterly." (Luke: 22-55 thr. 62)

The twenty-fifth and later verses of the eighteenth chapter of the Gospel of John write that "And Simon Peter stood and warmed himself. They said therefore unto him, Art not thou also one of his disciples? He denied it, and said, I am not." "One of the servants of the high priest, being his kinsman whose ear Peter cut off, saith, Did not I see thee in the garden with him?" "Peter then denied again: and immediately the cock crew." (John: 18-25, 26, 27) These kinds of contradictions in these four narratives are palpable to men of reason.

23 — In the thirty-sixth verse of the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel of Luke, hadrat Îsâ, on the day he would be caught, says to the Apostles: "... But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment, and buy one." (Luke: 22-36) In the thirty-eighth verse the Apostles say to hadrat Îsâ: "... Lord, behold, here are two swords. ..." (ibid: 22-38) And hadrat Îsâ says to them: "... It is enough." (ibid) In the forty-ninth, fiftieth, fifty-first and fifty-second verses: "When they which were about him saw what would follow, they said unto him, Lord, shall we smite with the sword?" "And one of them smote the servant of the high priest, and cut off his right ear." "And Jesus answered and said, Suffer ye that far. And touched his ear, and healed him." (ibid: 22-49, 50, 51)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Nevertheless, the other three Gospels do not contain the events of buying swords and curing the excised ear.

24 — It is narrated as follows in the fifty-first and later verses of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: "And, behold, one of them which were with Jesus stretched out his hand, and drew his sword, and struck a servant of the high priest's, and smote off his ear." "Then said Jesus unto him, Put up again thy sword into his place: for all they that take the sword shall perish with the sword." "Thinkest thou that I cannot now pray to my Father, and he shall presently give me more than twelve regions of angels?" "But how then shall the scriptures be fulfilled, that thus it must be?" (Matt: 26-51, 52, 53, 54) The other Gospels, on the other hand, do not contain anything concerning these spiritual soldiers, angels.

25 — In the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke, as Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was being taken away for crucifixion, they had a person named Simon of Cy-re'ne carry the cross, [Matt: 27-32; Mark: 15-21; Luke: 23-26]. But John says, in the seventeenth verse of the nineteenth chapter, that Jesus carried the cross himself.

26 — According to the writings of Matthew and Mark, two of the malefactors who were to be hanged with Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' kept railing on him. In the Gospel of Luke, though, "One of them railed, but the other rebuked the former and asked Jesus to remember him in his kingdom." [Luke: 23-39, 40, 41, 42, 43.]

27 — The writings about the resurrection of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' are contradictory in the four Gospels. Lest the reader should weary of a detailed account, we shall give a summary of the contradictory verses in each of the Gospels for advisory purposes:

In the fifty-seventh and later verses of the twenty-seventh chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: "When the eve was come, there was a rich man of Ar-i-ma-thæa, named Joseph, who also himself was Jesus' disciple:" "He went to Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus. Then Pilate commanded the body to be delivered." "And when Joseph had taken the body, he wrapped it in a clean linen cloth." "And laid it in his own new tomb, which had been hewn out in the rock: and he rolled a great stone to the door of the sepulchre, and departed." "And there was Mary Magdalene, and the other Mary, sitting over against the sepulchre." "Now the next day,[1] that followed the day of the preparation, the chief

[1] Saturday. The day of preparation means the day before the sabbath.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

priests and Pharisees came together unto Pilate," "Saying, Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while he was yet alive, After three days I will rise again." "Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest his disciples come by night, and steal him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: so the last error shall be worse than the first." "Pilate said unto them, Ye have a watch: go your way, make it as sure as you can." "So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, and setting a watch." (Matt: 27-57 to 66) "In the end of the sabbath, as it began to dawn toward the first day of the week, came Mary Magdalene and the other Mary to see the sepulchre." "And, behold, there was a great earthquake: for the angel of the Lord descended from heaven, and came and rolled back the stone from the door, and sat upon it." "His countenance was like lightning, and his raiment white as snow:" "And for fear of him the keepers did shake, and became as dead men." "And the angel answered and said unto the women. Fear not ye: for I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified." "He is not here: for he is risen, as he said. Come, see the place where the Lord lay." "And go quickly, and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead; and behold, he goeth before you into Galilee; there shall ye see him: lo, I have told you." "And they departed quickly from the sepulchre with fear and great joy; and did run to bring his disciples word." "And as they went to tell his disciples, behold, Jesus met them, saying, All hail. And they came and held him by the feet, and worshipped him." "Then said Jesus unto them, Be not afraid: go tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, and there shall they see me." "Now when they were going, behold, some of the watch came into the city, and shewed unto the chief priests all the things that were done." "And when they were assembled with the elders, and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers," "Saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole him away while we slept." "And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and secure you." "So they took the money, and did as they were taught: and this saying is commonly reported among the Jews until this day." "Then the eleven disciples went away into Galilee, into a mountain where Jesus had appointed them." "And when they saw him, they worshipped him: but some doubted." "And Jesus came and spake unto them, saying, All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth." "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:" "Teaching

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: ..." (Matt: 28-1 to 20)

On the other hand, it is narrated as follows in the forty-second and later verses of the fifteenth chapter and in the sixteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark: "And now when the even was come, because it was the preparation,[1] that is, the day before the sabbath," "Joseph of Ar-i-ma-thæa, an honourable councellor, which also waited for the kingdom of God, came, and went in boldly into Pilate, and craved the body of Jesus." (Mark: 15-42, 43) "... he[2] gave the body to Joseph." "And he bought fine linen, and took him down, and wrapped him in the linen, and laid him in a sepulchre which was hewn out of a rock, and rolled a stone unto the door of the sepulchre." "And Mary Magdalene and Mary the mother of Joses beheld where he was laid." (ibid: 15-45, 46, 47) "And when the sabbath was past, Mary Magdalene, and Mary the mother of James, and Sa-lo' me, had bought sweet spices, that they might come and anoint him." "And very early in the morning the first day of the week, they came unto the sepulchre at the rising of the sun." "And they said among themselves, Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the sepulchre?" "And when they looked, they saw that the stone was rolled away: for it was very great." "And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man sitting on the right side, clothed in a long white garment; and they were affrighted." "And he saith unto them, Be not affrighted: Ye seek Jesus of Nazareth, which was crucified: he is risen; he is not here: behold the place where they laid him." "But go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he said unto you." "And they went out quickly, and fled from the sepulchre; for they trembled and were amazed: neither said they any thing to any man; for they were afraid." "Now when Jesus was risen early the first day of the week, he appeared first to Mary Magdalene, out of whom he had cast seven devils." "And she went and told those that had been with him, as they mourned and wept." "And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not." "After he appeared in another form unto two of them, as they walked, and went into the country." "And they went and told it unto the residue: neither believed they them." "Afterward he appeared unto the eleven as they sat at meat, and

[1] Friday, the so-called day of crucifixion.

[2] Pilate

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen him after he was risen." "And he said unto them, Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature." "He who believes and is baptized shall be saved; ..." (ibid: 16-1 to 16) "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God." (ibid: 16-19)

In the fiftieth and later verses of the twenty-third chapter and in the twenty-fourth chapter of the Gospel of Luke: "And, behold, there was a man named Joseph, a counsellor; and he was a good man, and a just:" "(The same had not consented to the counsel and deed of them;) he was of Ar-i-ma-thæa, a city of the Jews: who also himself waited for the kingdom of God." "This man went unto Pilate, and begged the body of Jesus." "And he took it down, and wrapped it in linen, and laid it in a sepulchre that was hewn in stone, wherein never man before was laid." "And that day was the preparation, and the sabbath drew on." "And the women also, which came with him from Galilee, followed after, and beheld the sepulchre, and how his body was laid." "And they returned, and prepared spices and ointments; and rested the sabbath day according to the commandment." (Luke: 23-50 to 56) "Now upon the first day of the week, very early in the morning, they came unto the sepulchre, bringing the spices which they had prepared, and certain others with them." "And they found the stone rolled away from the sepulchre." "And they entered in, and found not the body of the Lord Jesus." "And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold, two men stood by them in shining garments:" "And as they were afraid, and bowed down their faces to the earth, they said unto them, Why seek ye the living among the dead?" "He is not here, but is risen: remember how he spake unto you when he was yet in Galilee," (ibid: 24-1 to 6) "And returned from the sepulchre, and told all these things unto the eleven, and to all the rest." "It was Mary Magdalene, and Jo-an'na, and Mary the mother of James, and other women that were with them, which told these things unto the apostles." "And their words seemed to them as idle tales, and they believed them not." "Then arose Peter, and ran unto the sepulchre; and stooping down, he beheld the linen clothes laid by themselves, and departed, wondering in himself at that which was come to pass." "And, behold, two of them went that same day to a village called Em-ma'us, which was from Jerusalem about threescore furlongs." "And they talked

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

together of all these things which had happened." "And it came to pass, that, while they communed together and reasoned, Jesus himself drew near, and went with them." "But their eyes were holden that they should not know him." "And he said unto them, What manner of communications are these that ye have one to another, as ye walk, and are sad?" "And the one of them, whose name was Cle'o-pas, answering said unto him, Art thou only a stranger in Jerusalem, and hast not known the things which are come to pass there in these days?" "And he said unto them, What things? And they said unto him, Concerning Jesus of Nazareth, which was a prophet mighty in deed and word before God and all the people:" "And how the chief priests and our rulers delivered him to be condemned to death, and have crucified him." "But we trusted that it had been he which should have redeemed Israel: and beside all this, to day is the third day since these things were done." "Yea, and certain women also of our company made us astonished, which were early at the sepulchre;" "And when they found not his body, they came, saying, that they had also seen a vision of angels, which said that he was alive." "And certain of us which were with us went to the sepulchre, and found it even so as the women had said: but him they saw not." "Then he said unto them, O fools, and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets have spoken: Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter his glory?" "And beginning at Moses and all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself." "And they drew nigh unto the village, whither they went: and he made as though he would have gone further." "But they constrained him, saying, Abide with us: for it is toward evening, and the day is far spent. And he went in to tarry with them." "And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them." "And their eyes were opened, and they knew him; and he vanished out of their sight." "And they said to one another, Did not our heart burn within us, while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the scriptures?" "And they rose up the same hour and returned to Jerusalem, and found the eleven gathered together, and them that were with them," "Saying, The Lord is risen indeed, and hath appeared to Simon." "And they told what things were done in the way, and how he was known of them in breaking of bread." "And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood in the midst of them, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." "But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

that they had seen a spirit." "And he said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts?" "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is myself: handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have." "And when he had thus spoken, he shewed them his hands and his feet." "And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat?" "And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb." "And he took it and did eat before them." (Luke: 24-9 to 43) [The intervening verses omitted here recount the admonitions and advice which Jesus gives them.] "And he led them out as far as to Bethany, and he lifted up his hands, and blessed them." "And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he was parted from them, and carried up into heaven." (ibid: 24-50, 51)

On the other hand, in the thirty-first and later verses of the nineteenth chapter and also in the later chapters of the Gospel of John: "The Jews therefore, because it was the preparation, that the bodies should not remain upon the cross on the sabbath day, (for that sabbath day was an high day,) besought Pilate that their legs might be broken, and that it might be taken away." "Then came the soldiers, and brake the legs of the first, and of the other which was crucified with him." "But when they came to Jesus, and saw that he was dead already, they brake not his legs:" "But one of the soldiers with a spear pierced his side, and forthwith came there out blood and water." (John: 19-31, 32, 33, 34) "And after this Joseph of Ar-i-ma-thæ'a, being a disciple of Jesus, but secretly for fear of the Jews, besought Pilate that he might take away the body of Jesus: and Pilate gave him leave. He came therefore, and took the body of Jesus." "And there came also Nic-o-de'mus, which at the first came to Jesus by night, and brought a mixture of myrrh and aloes, about an hundred pound weight." "Then took they the body of Jesus, and wound it in linen clothes with the spices, as the manner of the Jews to bury." "Now in the place where he was crucified, there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein was never man yet laid." "There laid they Jesus therefore because of the Jews' preparation day;[1] for the sepulchre was nigh at hand." (ibid: 19-38 to 42) "The first day of the week cometh Mary Magdalene early, when it was yet dark, unto the sepulchre, and seeth the stone taken away from the sepulchre." "Then she runneth, and cometh to Simon Peter, and

[1] Friday.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

to the other disciple, whom Jesus loved, and saith unto them, They have taken away the Lord out of the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him." "Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre, and we know not where they have laid him." "Peter therefore went forth, and that other disciple, and came to the sepulchre." "And he stooping down, and looking in, saw the linen clothes lying: yet went he not in." "Then cometh Simon Peter following him, and went into the sepulchre, and seeth the linen clothes lie," "And the napkin, that was about his head, not lying with the linen clothes, but wrapped together in a place by itself." "Then went in also that other disciple, which came first to the sepulchre, and he saw, and believed." "For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead." "Then the disciples went away again unto their own home." "But Mary stood without at the sepulchre weeping: and as she wept, she stooped down, and looked into the sepulchre," "And seeth two angels in white sitting, the one at the head, and the other at the feet, where the body of Jesus had lain." "And they say unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? She saith unto them, Because they have taken away my Lord, and I know not where they have laid him." "And when she had thus said, she turned herself back, and saw Jesus standing, and knew not that it was Jesus." "Jesus saith unto her, Woman, why weepest thou? Whom seekest thou? She, supposing him to be the gardener, saith unto him, Sir, if thou have borne him hence, tell me where thou hast laid him, and I will take him away." "Jesus saith unto her, Mary. She turned herself, and saith unto him, Rab-bo'ni, which is to say, Master." "Jesus saith unto her, Touch me not; for I am not yet ascended to my Father; but go to my brethren, and say unto them, I ascend unto my Father, and your Father; and to my God, and your God." "Mary Magdalene came and told the disciples that she had seen the Lord, and that he had spoken these things unto her." "Then the same day at evening, being the first day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." "... he showed unto them his hands and his side. Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord." "Then said Jesus to them again, Peace be unto you: as my Father hath sent me, so send I you." "And when he had said this, he breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost:" "Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

ye retain, they are retained." "But Thomas, one of the twelve, called Did'y-mus, was not with them when Jesus came." "The other disciples therefore said unto him, We have seen the Lord. But he said unto them, Except I shall see in his hands the print of the nails, and put my finger into the print of the nails, and thrust my hand into his side, I will not believe." "And after eight days again his disciples were within, and Thomas with them: then came Jesus, the doors being shut, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." "Then saith he to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing." (John: 20-1 to 29) (The first, second, and third verses of the twenty-first chapter narrate how some of the disciples went out fishing on a boat in the Taberiyeh (Ti-be'ri-as, or Tiberias, the sea of Galilee) and how they did not catch any fish that night. Then the fourth verse goes on as follows:) "But when the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore: but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus." "Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat? They answered him, No." "And he saith unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes." "Therefore that disciple whom Jesus loved saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter heard that it was the Lord, he girt his fisher's coat unto him, (for he was naked,) and did cast himself into the sea." "And the other disciples came in a little ship; ... dragging the net with fishes." "As soon then as they were come to land, they saw a fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread." "Jesus saith unto them, Bring of the fish which ye have now caught." "Simon Peter went up, and drew the net to land full of great fishes, and hundred and fifty and three: and for all there were so many, yet was not the net broken." (John: 21-4 to 11)

These are four different narratives. They differ from one another very much. These four Gospels, which form the basis for the Christian creed, are full of such contradictory narratives. A little attention will suffice to see how one narrative is the opposite of another. Furthermore, more often than not, a matter narrated by one of them does not exist in the others. The contradictions and differences in the Gospels are not only on the resurrection of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' but also on all the other matters alike. There are very few events narrated in all of them. For instance, such events as the manner of the birth of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; Herod's

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

having the children killed; the arrival of priests from the east; Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' going to Egypt in his childhood; the Nazarenes' refusing Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; his curing a (military) captain's ailing servant, resuscitating a judge's dead daughter, enjoining on his Apostles to buy swords; his various admonitions and exemplifications; his invocation on the cross, "O my God; o my God! Why hast thou forsaken me? (=Eli, eli, lama sabaktanî)"; his carrying his own cross; guards' waiting on his tomb; his resurrecting from among the dead and showing himself to his Apostles in various guises; and many others, exist only in one or two of them, while the others do not contain them.

The fourth Gospel, John's Gospel, is altogether different from the other three Gospels in manner and style. Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' insulting his mother and turning the water into wine, narrated in the second chapter; his talking with a woman by a well, in the fourth chapter; his curing a patient who had been bedridden for thirty-eight years near the pool of Bethlehem, in the fifth chapter; the dispute he had with the Jews on the Messiah's own flesh and blood, in the sixth chapter [the fifty-second and later verses]; his trial of an adulteress and the conversations he had with the Jews on the origin and genealogy of the Messiah, in the eighth chapter; his curing a blind man's eyes with the mud he made with his spittle and put on his eyes and sending him for a bath in the pool of Siloam and the Pharisees' various attempts and their disputes with Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', in the ninth chapter; the Jews' beginning to stone Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and the conversations he had with them concerning his divinity, in the tenth chapter; his resuscitating Luazer (Lazarus), in the eleventh chapter; the anointing of Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' feet, in the twelfth chapter; his talking with Philip and Judah, in the fourteenth chapter; the curious supplication of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', in the seventeenth chapter; the following events narrated in the nineteenth chapter: the epitaph hung upon his chest when he was crucified was written in Hebrew, Latin and Greek and as Mary, his mother, and Mary, his mother's sister (his maternal aunt) and the wife of Aeklaviya (Cle'o-phas), and Mary Magdalene stood by his cross, Jesus saw his mother with his most beloved disciple and said to his mother: "... Woman, behold thy son." "Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother, ..." in the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh verses; a spear was thrust into his flank when he was on the cross; the cross was erected in a yard; Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' resurrected from his tomb and said to Mary Magdalene; "Do not touch me, I have not been to my father

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

yet"; he showed himself to his Apostles at different places three times; and many other similar narratives do not exist in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

Quite a number of the matters existing in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark and Luke do not exist in the Gospel of John. An example of this is **'Ishâ-i-Rabbânî,** (the Eucharist), which is one of the sacraments of Christian religion. It exists in the three Gospels, but not in John. ['Ishâ-i-Rabbânî refers to the last supper. It symbolizes a belief based on the following event: As is narrated in the twenty-sixth verse of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, in the twenty-second and later verses of the fourteenth chapter of Mark, in the nineteenth verse of the twenty-second chapter of Luke, "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body." "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it;" "For this is my blood of the new testament, ..." (Matt: 26-26, 27, 28)[1] So it has been held as a belief that when priests in churches breathe a certain prayer on a piece of bread it will become Jesus's flesh, when they break the loaf of bread to pieces Jesus will have been sacrificed, when they breathe a prayer on some wine in a container it will become Jesus's blood, and those who eat the morsels of bread after dipping them in the wine will be united with God. This matter will be explained in the ninth chapter of our book.]

As for the Gospel of Matthew; such events as Peter's walking on water towards Jesus, a fish holding a coin in its mouth, the dream of Pilate's wife, the resurrection of all saints with the resurrection of Jesus, the posting of guards before Jesus's tomb exist only in the Gospel of Matthew, and not in the others.

The four Gospels not only contradict one another in number of matters, but also each Gospel contains various inconsistent matters. This can be exemplified as follows:

1 — In the Gospel of Matthew, when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' sent forth the twelve Apostles on their first religious mission, he prohibited them from going to the cities of pagans and Samaritans and meeting them [Matthew: 10-5]. In his preaching on the mountain, he prohibited his disciples from giving sacred things to the dogs and throwing their Gospels to the swine [Matthew: 7-6]. The same Gospel of Matthew commands something quite

---

[1] There is an additional remark in Luke: "... this do in remembrance of me." (Luke: 22-19)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

contrary to this commandment: In the eighth and twenty-first chapters, it is commanded that the pagans be called to Christianity instead of the Jews and the Jews are complained about for their infidelity. In the fourteenth and other verses of the twenty-fourth chapter, it is professed that the end of the world shall not come before the Bible has been communicated and taught to all tribes and peoples on earth. In the twenty-eighth and other chapters, the Apostles are ordered to admit others to Christianity through a single baptism and without any discrimination.

2 — There is contradiction between the verses concerning the military captain who came to Jesus [the fifth and later verses of the eighth chapter] and the twenty-second and later verses of the fifteenth chapter, in which the story of a woman is narrated. For Jesus helps the pagan captain's ailing servant in the eighth chapter. On the other hand, though the Canaanite woman dealt with in the fifteenth chapter is not a pagan, Jesus first refuses her openly, then helps her as an exceptional gift upon the woman's earnest supplication.

3 — It is written at the beginning of the seventh chapter of John that "After these things Jesus walked in Galilee: for he would not walk in Jewry, because the Jews sought to kill him." "Now the Jews' feast of Tabernacles was at hand." "His brethren therefore said unto him, Depart hence, and go into Judaea, that thy disciples also may see the works that thou doest." "For there is no man that doeth any thing in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou do these things, shew thyself to the world." "For neither did his brethren believe in him." "Then Jesus said unto them, My time is not yet come: but your time is alway ready." "The world cannot hate you; but me it hateth, because I testify of it, that the works thereof are evil." "Go ye up yet unto this feast; for my time is not yet full come." "When he had said these words unto them, he abode still in Galilee." "But when his brethren were gone up, then went he also up unto the feast, not openly, but as it were in secret." (John: 7-1 to 10) If it should be said that the Gospel of John was not altered, how can this imputation of mendacity which it makes on Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' be explained? [For it says that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' first said he would not go to the place of the feast and then went there secretly, which would be mendacious. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' could never have such a blemish.]

4 — The Gospel of Matthew narrates Judas's suicide as follows

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

in the third and later verses of its twenty-seventh chapter: “Then Judas, which had betrayed him, when he saw that he was condemned, repented himself, and brought again the thirty pieces of silver to the chief priests and elders,” “Saying, I have sinned in that I have betrayed the innocent blood. And they said, What is that to us? see thou to that.” “And he cast down the pieces of silver in the temple, and departed, and went and hanged himself.” “And the chief priests took the silver pieces, and said, It is not lawful for to put them into the treasury, because it is the price of blood.” “And they took counsel, and bought with them the potter’s field, to bury strangers in.” “Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day.” (Matt: 27-3 to 8)

But Luke narrates from Peter in the eighteenth verse of the first chapter of his Book of Acts (of the Apostles), and says: “Now this man purchased a field with the reward of iniquity; and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out.” “And it was known unto all the dwellers at Jerusalem; inasmuch as that field is called in their proper tongue, A-cel’da-ma, that is to say, The field of blood.” These two narratives are contradictory in two respects:

First; according to Matthew’s narrative, Judas repented and returned the silvers he had taken, and the priests bought a field with it. And according to Luke’s narrative, he (Judas) bought the field himself.

Second; according to Matthew’s narrative, Judas committed suicide by hanging himself. According to Luke’s narrative, he fell headlong and his abdomen split.

5 — It is written in the second verse of the second chapter of the first epistle of John, “And he is the propitiation for our sins: and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world.” (1 John: 2-2) This comes to mean that only Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ is impeccable and he is the redeemer of all the sinful people.

On the other hand, the eighteenth verse of the twenty-first chapter of Proverbs purports: “The wicked shall be a ransom for the righteous, and the transgressor for the upright.” (Prov: 21-18) Accordingly, the sinner will be sacrificed for the innocent and the hypocrite will be sacrificed for the righteous. [This passage contradicts John’s writing.]

6 — It is written in the eighteenth and nineteenth verses of the seventh chapter of the Hebrews: “For there is verily a disannulling of the commandment going before for the weakness

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and unprofitableness thereof." "For the law made nothing perfect, ..." (Heb: 7-18, 19) And in the seventh verse of the eighth chapter, "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then should no place have been sought for the second." (Heb: 8-7) Nonetheless, Jesus says in the seventeenth verse of the fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." (Mat: 5-17)

7 — Jesus says unto Peter in the eighteenth and nineteenth verses of the sixteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: "And I say unto thee, That thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church; and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." (Matt: 16-18, 19) However, it is written in the same chapter, beginning in the twenty-first verse: "From that time forth began Jesus to shew unto his disciples, how that he must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the elders and chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and be raised again the third day." "Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee." "But he turned, and said unto Peter, Get thee behind me, Satan: thou art an offence unto me: for thou savourest not the things that be of God, but those that be of men." (ibid: 16-21, 22, 23) Again, in the thirty-fourth verse of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, it is reported that Jesus predicted about Peter that "... before the cock crow, thou shalt deny me thrice." (ibid: 26-34), and in the thirty-fifth verse that Peter swore that he would not deny him. It is reported in the sixty-ninth through seventy-fifth verses of the twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew that Peter forgot this promise of his and denied three times, with swearings and curses, that he knew Jesus. Accordingly, in the sixteenth chapter of Matthew, Jesus praises Peter, adding that Allâhu ta'âlâ shall forgive whomever he forgives. In the twentieth chapter, however, he dismisses him and calls him 'Satan'; and in the twenty-sixth chapter he predicts that he (Peter) will deny him. Christians believe that Jesus is God [May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from believing so.] Can the name God be reconciled with such an error? It is this very Peter that the Popes living in Rome today claim to represent, thus assuming to be the universal monarchs to whose disposal the earth has been bequeathed. And some people,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

believing in the Pope as such, have had the dream of entering Paradise.

8 — Again, when the episodes of 'Ishâ-i-Rabbânî (the Eucharist) [the last supper] narrated in the twenty-sixth verse of the twenty-sixth chapter of Matthew, in the nineteenth and twentieth verses of the twenty-second chapter of Luke and in the twenty-second and twenty-third verses of the fourteenth chapter of Mark are compared, it will be seen that one of them says that it was before night prayer, while another one says it was after night prayer, and that all the three Gospels state that there was wine on the table. It is stated in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of John that the so-called event took place and that there was only bread, no mention of wine being made.

Nevertheless, one of the dogmatic and practical principles of Christianity is eating the dinner of 'Ishâ-i-Rabbânî (the Eucharist) and believing that the bread is Jesus's flesh and the wine is his blood. John, who is more careful and more solicitous than the others on such matters of creed, does not mention the wine; this shows clearly that this dogma of theirs is another superstition.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 6 —

AN OBSERVATION OF THE EPISTLES

Christians accept Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as [Allah forbid] God, and the Apostles and Paul as a Prophet each. They accept the epistles and letters written by them as heavenly books and epistles revealed through wahy (revelation). Therefore, these epistles come right after the four Gospels in the New Testament of the Holy Bible.

A close look at these epistles will show that, though the epistles are said to be the complementaries and supplementaries of the four Gospels, there are so many inconsistencies within themselves and so many contradictions between them and the four Gospels that an attempt to explain them one by one would end up in huge volumes of books larger than the Holy Bible itself.

Here are some examples:

Rahmatullah Efendi's account of the event of Paul's conversion in his book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq** is as follows:

There are many paradoxes on how Paul believed in the ninth, twenty-second and twenty-third chapters of the Book of Acts (of the Apostles). I explained them in ten paragraphs in my book titled **Izâlat-ush-shuqâq**. But in this book of mine I shall mention only three of them:

1 — In the seventh verse of the ninth chapter of the Book of Acts (of the Apostles): "And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man." (Acts: 9-7)

In the ninth verse of the twenty-second chapter, on the other hand: "And they that were with me saw indeed the light, and were afraid; but they heard not the voice of him that spake to me." (ibid: 22-9)

And in the twenty-sixth chapter the question whether the voice was heard or not is passed over without any mention. The opposition between these three expressions is apparent.

2 — In the sixth verse of the ninth chapter of the same book: "... And the Lord said unto him, Arise, and go into the city, and it shall be told thee what thou must do." (ibid: 9-6)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

In the tenth verse of the twenty-second chapter: "... And the Lord said unto me, Arise, and go into Damascus; and there it shall be told thee of all things which are appointed for thee to do." (ibid: 22-10)

On the other hand, in the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth verses of the twenty-sixth chapter: "But rise, and stand upon thy feet: for I have appeared unto thee for this purpose, to make thee a minister and a witness both of these things which thou hast seen, and of those things in the which I will appear unto thee;" "Delivering thee from the people, and from the Gentiles, unto whom now I send thee," "To open their eyes, and to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may receive forgiveness of sins, and inheritance among them which are sanctified by faith that is in me." (ibid: 26-16, 17, 18) The conclusion to be drawn from these is that according to the verses in the ninth and twenty-second chapters he is told that what he will do will be explained to him after arriving in the town. And according to the verses in the twenty-sixth chapter, at the place where he hears the voice he is told what he is to do.

3 — In the fourteenth verse of the twenty-sixth chapter: "And when we were all fallen to the earth, ..." (ibid: 26-14) However, according to the seventh verse of the ninth chapter those who are with him get tongue-tied; they cannot talk. And in the twenty-second chapter, no mention is made concerning tongue-tiedness.

It is also written in **Izhâr-ul-haqq** that the contradictions in the other chapters of the Book of Acts (of the Apostles) are even worse.

It is written in the first and later verses of the tenth chapter of the first epistle written by Paul to Corinthians: "... how that all our fathers were under the cloud, and all passed through the sea;" "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea;" (1 Cor: 10-1, 2) "Neither be ye idolators, as were some of them; ..." "Neither let us commit fornication, as some of them committed, and fell in one day three and twenty thousand." (ibid: 7, 8) It is written in the first and later verses of the twenty-fifth chapter of the book Numbers in the Old Testament: "And Israel abode in Shit'tim, and the people began to commit whoredom with the daughters of Moab." (Num: 25-1) "... and the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel." (ibid: 25-3) "... So the plague was stayed from the children of Israel." "And those that died in the plague were twenty and four thousand." (ibid: 25-8, 9) Since

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

there is a difference of one thousand between the given numbers of the dead, one of them is certainly wrong.

Again, in the fourteenth verse of the seventh chapter of the Book of Acts: "Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls." (Acts: 7-14) In this passage, Yûsuf 'alaihis-salâm' himself and his two sons in Egypt are not included in these seventy-five people. The number mentioned gives only the number of the people in Ya'qûb's 'alaihis-salâm' tribe.

Nevertheless, the twenty-seventh verse of the forty-sixth chapter of Genesis states that "... all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten." (Genesis: 46-27) The passage from the Book of Acts is apparently erroneous.

Such is the matter with the four Gospels, which form the basis for the Christian creed, and with the epistles. As we have remarked above, these are not the only contradictions in these Gospels or in the Old Testament and the New Testament. Since an explanation of all these contradictions one by one would take volumes of books and some of them have been explained in the books **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq** and **Shams-ul-haqîqa,** we have not given detailed information here. Those who would like to obtain more information in this respect ought to consult the book titled **Tahrirât-i-enâjîl,** which was written and published in 1233 [A.D. 1818] by Giesler, a Protestant scholar; Sellirmagir's **Muqaddima-i-kitâb-i-Ahd-i-jedîd,** published in 1817; Sîfirs's **Birinci Incilin Aslı** (The Real Origin of the First Gospel), published in 1832; the book **İnciller Üzerine Mülâhezât** (A Criticism of the Gospels), written by Your, one of the contemporary orientalists; the orientalist Shuazer's **Yuhannâ İncîli Üzerine İnceleme** (An Observation of the Gospel of John), published in 1841; the book written by Gustav Ichtel, a contemporary writer, to describe the manners of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; and [any of the countless books] written by historians such as Strauss.

As for Qur'ân al-kerîm, to which Muslims adhere, [and attain felicity in this world and the next by obeying it]; as foreordained by the blessed meaning of the ninth verse of the sûra (chapter) Hijr, which purports, **"We sent the Qur'ân al-kerîm down, and we again shall protect it,"** it has been protected under the divine guard of Allâhu ta'âlâ for twelve hundred and ninety-three years [fourteen hundred eighteen years as of today], i.e. from the time of hijra-i-nabawiyya (the Hegira) to our time, without the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

slightest addition or subtraction even in its punctuation marks, though its copies have been possessed by Muslims of various nationalities ever since; this is a universally verified fact. And now a few priests, who are in Islamic countries on a mission of several golds' salary, are indulging in a dream in which they enjoy having a true religion by contrasting it [Christianity, whose inner essence we have explained above,] to Islam, which was founded on a firm basis and which has reached us today with its pristine authenticity and soundness; aren't their assertions too preposterous to be answered? If their attempts were intended to disclose the truth as they claim, they could be tolerated to some extent, for they have not studied Islamic books with due attention. But it is not the case; their real purpose is to wheedle the ignorant out of Islam by means of various sophistries and tricks. Being unable to answer the books written by Islamic savants or the questions they are asked by them, they have been attacking Islam with their usual insolent ignorance [and obduracy] as if they had not seen those books. They have been secretly writing and publishing books and pamphlets full of lies and slanders and spreading them in a clandestine way.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 7 —

AN ANSWER TO THE BOOK GHADÂ-UL-MULÂHAZÂT

It is written in the third chapter of the second section of the book **Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât,** which was written by a priest: *"This chapter covers the explanation of the curious fact that Muhammad's religion appeared amongst the heathens of Arabia instead of rising in the horizon of Christianity as Christianity had spread among the Israelites. All the worlds are the property of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and we do not doubt that He can dispense of His property as He wills. All His divine deeds come about through some causes full of divine wisdom. As a requirement of His divine wisdom, He first sent down the canon of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as a preparation for the spiritual and complementary religion of hadrat Mesîh (the Messiah). It takes a little reflection to realize how compatible it is with divine wisdom that Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' appeared at the expected place and time and established his church, i.e. his community, on fundamentals capable of this (preparatory role). By the same token, if abrogation of Christianity had been the will of Allâhu ta'âlâ, the tree of perfection to be planted in its place should have emerged from the root of Christianity, that is, at a place geared to yield a new religion, which is the involuntary conclusion both from the syllogistic point of view and as a requirement of the natural course of events. But the person who established Islam was not born in a Christian country, nor did he arise from the Israelites. On the contrary, as is shown clearly in historical documents, he emerged from among the nescient Arabs, who had filled Kâ'ba-i-mu'azzama with nearly three hundred idols. It is a fact, especially known by people cognizant of the Arabic history, that when Hadrat Muhammad 'alaihis-salâtu was-salâm' declared his prophethood and began to publicize his religion the Meccans were not disposed to accept the so-called religion. They opposed his prophethood, objected to his teachings, and continuously insulted him, so much so that had it not been for the powerful support of Abû Tâlib and his dynasty and his personal talents, which were*

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

reinforced by the consequent tribal rivalry and zeal which he adroitly exploited to attain his goal, the so-called religion would have been impaired by the aggression of its adversaries, thus perishing in its budding period yet. The using of so many material agencies and worldly means at liberty for the promotion of the new so-called religion, i.e. Islam, is a vigorous proof of the fact that Islamic religion is not so spiritual as the Christian religion and that Arabia was not ready for its emerging yet. If Islam had been a spiritual religion and Arabia had been ready to receive it, it would have spread quietly and peacefully without recourse to worldly media, like the spreading of Christianity.

Since it would have been possible to send the most perfect and the highest religion at once for the spiritual guidance of the pagans and the ignorant, why didn't Allâhu ta'âlâ the most compassionate of the merciful send Islam instead of Christianity six hundred years before or instead of Judaism two thousand years before that; why didn't He send Islam before them? What was the reason for such a long postponement? Muslims can infer from this proof of ours whether their religion is a true one sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ."

In summary, this writing of Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât contains three claims:

First: The reason for the virtue and superiority of Christianity, the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', is that it emerged among the Israelites, who had had religious education before and were ready to embrace it, versus Islam, the religion of Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wasallam', which emerged among pagans who had not had any religious education and were not ready to receive it.

Second: While Christianity spread mildly in peace, Islam's spreading was through violence, force and worldly means.

Third: It is possible for Allâhu ta'âlâ to send a Prophet and He is the most merciful of the merciful; so it would have been incompatible with His justice not to send a religion superior to the others, i.e. Islam, before the others.

THEIR FIRST CLAIM: *"Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm emerging from a tribe with previous religious education, and Muhammad's 'alaihis-salâm' emerging in a tribe without previous religious education."*

ANSWER: These assertions of theirs are answerable in various ways.

The sons of Israel were fit to receive the heavenly rules taught

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and they had had the experience of obeying canonical rules before. And yet eighty-two people believed and followed Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' throughout his life. On the other hand, Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' called the heathen Arabs, who had not had any canonical or religious education and therefore were not inclined to accept any religion, to a new religion, i.e. Islam, which was entirely contrary to the religion of their fathers and grandfathers and ran counter to their sensuous desires and flavours. From the time when Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu ta'âlâ alaihi wasallam' declared his prophethood to his death, more than a hundred and twenty-four thousand sahâbas accepted his invitation and became Muslims willingly. We refer it to the wisdom of our readers to decide whether superiority belongs to Christinatiy or Islam. It is true that Abû Tâlib did his best to protect and guard our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. But this protection and assistance of his did not contribute considerably or as much as it is believed to have done to the spreading and promotion of Islam. This protection of his was not because he believed in our Prophet's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' religion. It was because he was his relation and lest he would be killed or tormented. For Abû Tâlib was one of the unbelievers. At that time some of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwân' could not endure the polytheists' persecution and migrated to Abyssinia. Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' and the Ashâb-i-kirâm remained confined in Mekka for three years, being prohibited from all sorts of correspondence. Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded our Prophet twice to call his kith and kin together and to invite them to Islam. The two hundred and fourteenth âyat (verse) of the Shu'arâ sûra (chapter) purports: **"Warn your close relations of the torment of Allâhu ta'âlâ."** To carry out the command of this âyat-i-kerîmâ, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' invited his relations to become Muslims. [When Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' convened his relations he stated: **"Believe and obey Allâhu ta'âlâ and save yourselves from His torment. Or else your being my relations will do you no good."]** None of them believed. In fact, his paternal uncle Abû Lahab and Abû Lahab's wife the wood-carrier went so far in their harassing and tormenting Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' that they and some notables of the Qoureish went to Abû Tâlib to complain about him; they requested him to give up protecting Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. Upon this Abû Tâlib called Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' and advised him to

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

give up the business of inviting people to the Islamic religion. It is an established fact testified with this proof and hundreds of other similar proofs that Abû Tâlib's protection, [contrary to the assertion of the protestant priest], did not cause Islam's acceptance by the Qoureish tribe.

Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' arose in a tribe not liable to believe him and was sent as a Prophet to them, whereas Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had emerged among the Israelites, who had been expecting a Prophet. Like the other Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm', Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' suffered many troubles and afflictions caused by the Jews. But the enemies of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' perished when that Serwer (Rasûlullah) was alive yet, and the blessed Prophet left this transient world and honoured the eternal hereafter with his presence as he was in his bed in Âisha's 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ anhâ' home in Medina-i-munawwara.

It is written in the four Gospels existing today that when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was caught, members of a tribe who had had religious education and were ready to receive the new religion, i.e. Peter and the other apostles, were so thoroughly preoccupied in their own troubles that they immediately decamped, leaving Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and that the same night Peter, who was the closest Apostle of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', swore and denied to know Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' with curses before the predicted rooster crow.

Abû Bekr as-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwân' who were living in pagan tribes not ready to accept a religion [and without any previous religious education] but accepted Islam and were honoured with the blessed suhba of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. During the hijra he accompanied Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' in the cave. [Lest Rasûlullah should get hurt, he tore his waistcoat and plugged the snake nests with the pieces. There was no piece left for the last hole, so he closed it with his foot. The snake bit his foot. He neither pulled his foot back nor made the slightest murmur. When a tear coming out of his eyes dropped on Rasûlullah's blessed face, Rasûlullah woke up, and put his blessed spittle on Abû Bakr's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' foot. The wound healed as a mu'jiza.] He dispensed all his property for Islam. Later, he fought against the apostate Arabs and brought them to Islam.

'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh', the first day he became a Muslim, placed himself in front of the Ashâb-i-kirâm and fearlessly announced his becoming a Muslim despite the persecutions and oppressions of the Meccan polytheists. There were great

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

conquests throughout the period of his caliphate. Islam spread far and wide. And in justice no other commander, no other evenhanded person equalled him. These facts are written in history books.

And Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' sacrificed himself for our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' by lying in his bed on the night of his hijra. In a number of combats he acted up to his given nickname, (the Lion of Allah).

As for 'Uthmân-i-zin-nûreyn 'radiy-Allâhu anh'; he was one of the richest Meccans. All the property he had he spent for the reinforcement of Islam. [We shall mention only the amount he gave in the Ghazzâ (Holy War) of Tabuk here: Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' encouraged the As-hâb-i-kirâm to donate for the Holy War of Tabuk in the mosque. 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh' stood up and said: "O Rasûlallah! I undertake to donate a hundred camels together with their back-cloths and pack-saddles." Rasûlullah went on with his encouragement. 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh' stood up again and said: "O Rasûlallah! I undertake to give another hundred camels together with their back-cloths and pack-saddles." Rasûlullah said as he alighted from the mimbar (pulpit in a mosque): **"Uthmân shall not be called to account for what he will do from now on."** As he went on encouraging the As-hâb-i-kirâm, 'Uthmân "radiy-Allâhu anh' said: "O Rasûlallah! I undertake to give another hundred camels together with their back-cloths and pack-saddles for the sake of Allah." Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared: **"There is the Paradise for the person who has equipped the army of Tabuk!"** Upon this 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh' brought a thousand golds and poured them on Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' lap. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' invoked: **"O my Allah! I am pleased with 'Uthmân. May you be pleased with him too!"** 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh" equipped half of the army of Tabuk (Sunan-i-Dârakutnî: 4-198).[1] 'Uthmân-i-zin-nûreyn "radiy-Allâhu anh' donated nine hundred and fifty camels and fifty horses together with their harnesses to this army, provided their cavalry accoutrements, and in addition sent them a thousand dinârs or seven rukyas of golds. All the other As-hâb-i-kirâm Guzîn 'radiy-Allâhu anhum ajma'în' never hesitated to sacrifice their lives and property upon each commandment of our Master Rasûlullah. Islam's superiority over Christianity, and the

---

[1] Alî Dâra Kutnî passed away in Baghdad in 385 [A.D. 995].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

difference between the believers of these two religions and between the people who saw these two Prophets, is as visible as the sun.

As for our Prophet's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' arising from amongst the Arabs, who were the descendants of Ismâ'îl (Eshmael) 'alaihis-salâm', instead of emerging among the Israelites; there is many a use, virtue and superiority in this fact.

First: Allâhu ta'âlâ sent an angel to hadrat Hâjar (Hagar) and gave her the good news: "O Hâjar, I have brought you the good news from Allâhu ta'âlâ that your son Ismâ'îl shall own a great ummat and your offspring shall be superior to that of Sâra (Sarah)." It was this promise of Allâhu ta'âlâ that manifested itself on Muhammad Mustafâ 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', who was a descendant of Ismâ'îl 'alaihis-salâm'. Allâhu ta'âlâ, while nominating many of the descendants of hadrat Sâra as Prophets, sent only Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' out of the offspring of Ismâ'îl 'alaihis-salâm', thus fulfilling His promise. Doesn't this signfiy the virtue and superiority of our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'? The priest who is the author of **Mîzân-ul-haqq** distorts this good news by interpreting it that "the gist of this (promise) was giving Hagar the good news concerning the [heathen] rich Arabs." If a zealous and pious Christian is told: "Your offspring will be rich men, but they will be magians and idolaters," will he be pleased with this news, will he be happy? [Of course not. He will be sorry.] Likewise, it would mean that Allâhu ta'âlâ gave hadrat Hâjar the news that she would have polytheistic descendants instead of consoling her (May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from such belief).

Furthermore, the passage about the good news does not contain the phrase (rich Arabs). But it expresses that the descendants of Ismâ'îl 'alaihis-salâm' shall be a great ummat and they shall be dominant over the Israelites. It is quite obvious that before the rising of Islam there was no event on the part of the Arabs significant enough to overpower the Israelites and that the real crunch came with Islam.

Second: The Israelite Prophets had been learning and teaching the rules in the Torah (Pentateuch) and Zabûr (the holy book revealed to Hadrat Dâwûd) until the advent of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. If Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' had been of the Israelite descent, there is no doubt he would have been slandered as having learned the Qur'ân al-kerîm and all the heavenly teachings from the Israelite scholars. Our master Rasûlullah, who

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

is the highest of Prophets, always lived in his tribe, never went away even for a short while, never learned even a letter from anyone, never held a pen in his blessed hand, and there were no Jews or Christians in the blessed city of Mekka. Despite this fact, in **Mîzân-ul-haqq** and other books of theirs, priests profess that our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' learned from a monk named Bahîrâ or from some notable Christians when he honoured Damascus with his blessed presence for trade. In actual fact, our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' was twelve years old when he went to Damascus with his paternal uncle Abû Tâlib. All books of Siyer (biographies of our Prophet) report this fact unanimously. And his conversation with the monk Bahîrâ took only a few hours, Bahîrâ, after looking at our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' carefully, realized that he was the would be Prophet of the latest time. Then he said to Abû Tâlib: "If the notables of Christians and Jews sense that this child is the Messenger of Allah, they may attempt to kill him." Upon this warning of the monk's, Abû Tâlib took his advice, sold his merchandise in Busrâ and in its neighborhood, and returned to Mekka-i-mukarrama. As for the monk who is said to have taught to our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'; wouldn't he just as soon announce his own prophethood instead of teaching so much knowledge to our Prophet? Moreover, from what rich source had the so-called teacher Bahîrâ acquired all this endless lot of knowledge which emerged in our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'? For the knowledge that Allâhu ta'âlâ communicated to Rasûlullah 'sall-allâhu alaihi wasallam' did not only cover the Bible and the Torah but also contained numerous pieces of information that did not exist in them. Consisting of more than six thousand âyats (verses), the Qur'ân al-kerîm covers many rules and ma'rifat (spiritual information). Moreover, the pieces of information and ma'rifat uttered through Rasûlullah's blessed language; i.e. seven hundred thousand hadîth-i-sherîfs concerning sunnat, wâjib, mustahab, mendûb, nahy, mekrûh, and other narratives are recorded, narrated and published by the 'ulamâ of hadîth. Imâm-i-Nesâî[1] 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' confirms this: "I had compiled seven hundred and fifty thousand hadîth-i sherîfs. But fifty thousand of them were from unsound sources, so I left them out, and recorded seven hundred thousand of them." As for the existing copies of the Pentateuch and the Bible, which are the

[1] Nesâi Ahmad passed away in Ramleh in 303 [A.D. 915].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

word of Allah according to Jews and Christians; if you leave aside the episodes and bring together all the verses concerning the commandments, prohibitions and other religious precepts, the number will not reach seven hundred all in all. We shall explain this fact in detail in the chapter about **Qur'ân al-kerîm and Today's Gospels.** We wonder what kind of knowledge Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' learned, and from which of the Christian monks? Is it possible to make an ocean from a small pool? This signifies the following fact: this slander is brought against Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' despite the fact that there were no monks in his tribe; the kinds of slanders that would have been brought against him had he been sent among the Israelites are beyond imagination. It is for this reason that Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is wâjib-ul-wujûd, protected His most beloved one by not sending him among the Sons of Israel.

Third: A retrospection into the history of today's existing peoples and a meticulous observation of their traditions, customs and deeds will show that the Arabs, even when they were nomadic Bedouins, had superior and high qualities and habits such as patriotism, nationalism, hospitality, charity, bravery, heroism, cleanliness, nobility of pedigree; generosity, goodness, modesty, and love of freedom. Is there another race to equal the Arabs in these qualities and in such merits as intelligence, eloquence and rhetoric? It is written throughout the Torah what a bad character the Israelites have. It is a plain fact that they are the worst race. Which of these cases would be better for our master the Fakhr-i-kâinat 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'; to come from the most virtuous, the highest of races, or from the Israelites [Jews]? The Israelites attained the blessings of Allâhu ta'âlâ and were superior to other nations as long as they obeyed their Prophets and acted upon the canonical laws of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. But later, when they betrayed their Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm' and killed most of them, they were degraded and became the most ignoble, the basest people. This fact is known by Christians as well. On account of Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' malediction, they shall lead a detestable, abhorrent and base way of life and are doomed to an everlasting life of disgrace. Now, what an astonishingly contradictory objection it would be to say, *"If Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' were the highest of Prophets, he would have descended from these Israelites who shall never be rescued from this state of ignominy and contemptibility."* The second âyat (verse) of Hashr sûra purports: **"O you owners of**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

reason! Learn what you do not know by inference from what you have been taught."

Fourth: Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was sent as the Prophet among the Israelites through various miracles, and some of his blessed statements comprised the figurative elements of his time's current language; so the priests that came some time later, being unable to interpret his symbolic expressions, established a system of creed called Trinity, that is, believing in three gods, which could never be accepted by anyone with common sense and which had existed in the ancient Indian cults and in Plato's philosophy. On the other hand, those kinds of our master Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' teachings that are called mutashâbihât (symbolic, parabolical, ambiguous teachings), which include âyat-i-kerîmas, hadîth-i-sherîfs and other teachings, are explained at length in books of tafsîr and hadîth, which report also that such teachings contain countless other ultimate and subtle divine denotations, connotations, nuances, and inner essential meanings. [Mutashâbihât are those âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs with occult, hidden meanings whose façade meanings do not agree with the established meanings of the popular types of narratives and which therefore need to be interpreted.] Their number is very much larger than those in the teachings of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. If our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' had been chosen and sent from among the Israelites, they would have altogether denied the divinity of Allâhu ta'âlâ, saying, *"There is no God but hadrat Muhammad."* Who on earth will doubt this?

THEIR SECOND CLAIM: The second assertion put forward in **Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazat** is that *"While Christianity spread gently through kindness, Islam spread by violence, force, and by giving wordly advantages."*

ANSWER: This assertion of theirs is, like the others, false, groundless, as follows:

First: It is a fact declared in the Bible and confirmed by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' that Christianity was not a religion other than Judaism, but it was a complementary of Judaism. The only difference was that it (Christianity) did not command jihâd-i-fî-sebî-l-illâh (Holy War only for the sake of Allah). Absence of jihâd in Christianity is a proof of its deficiency, rather than proving its superiority. To assert that a religion that spreads through physical means [violence, force, power] is not a true religion would mean to confess that Christianity, before any other religion, is a false one.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Second: If a religion's spreading by physical media is to be asserted as a proof for its falsity, it will be necessary to take a look at the methods resorted to for the spreading of Christianity. Take the following examples: As Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' invited the people to his religion, he hid himself for fear of a probable assassination on the part of his adversaries; he advised that his miracle be kept in secret; he ordered his Apostles not to tell anyone that he was the Messiah; he advised his disciples that anyone without a sword should buy himself a sword even if it would cost him his clothes; he ordered them to pay tax as a sign of homage to the pagan Romans; many wars broke out and millions of people were killed because of the controversies among the Christian sects after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; popes caused a number of revolutions and conflicts in Europe; millions of innocent people were massacred by Christians in the events of Templier and Saint Bartholomew and during the tribunals of inquisition; in the continent of America and in the other lately discovered islands, the turbulences instigated by missionaries caused millions of people to be put to the sword; when you read about these events and many other similar events in history books, how can you claim that Christianity spread gently through kindness without resorting to physical means, that is, to force, violence, power, or worldly advantages? The cruelties, massacres and savageries exercised during the crusading expeditions, which continued in eight waves for 174 years, from 489 [A.D. 1096] to 669 [A.D. 1270], could not be tallied. The crusaders burned and demolished all the places they went by, including Istanbul, which was the capital city of the Byzantine Greek Empire, their co-religionists. Michaud, a Christian who wrote a book of five volumes about the crusading expeditions, says: "In 492 [H. 1099] the crusaders managed to enter Jerusalem. When they entered the city they jugulated seventy thousand (70,000) Muslims and Jews. They cruelly killed even the Muslim women and children who had sheltered in mosques. Blood flowed through the streets. Corpses blocked the roads. The crusaders were so savagely ferocious that they jugulated the Jews they came across on the banks of the Rhine in Germany." These facts are written by Christian historians, who are their own men. When Christians routed the Andalusian Omeyyeds[1] in 898 [A.D. 1492] and entered Qurtuba (Cordova),

[1] The Andalusian Islamic State was founded in 139 [A.D. 756], and demolished in 898.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

they attacked the Qurtuba mosque first. They entered this beautiful, magnificent mosque on horseback. They pitilessly jugulated the Muslims who had taken refuge in the mosque. So much so that blood poured out through the doors of the mosque. They massacred the Jews in the same manner. The barbarous Spaniards Christianized all the Muslims and Jews at the point of the sword. Those who managed to escape took sanctuary in the Ottoman country. The Jews living in Turkey today are their grandchildren. After annihilating all the Muslims and Jews in Spain, Ferdinand the Spanish king bragged of his victory and said, "There are neither any Muslims nor any unbelievers left in Spain." Here is the Christianity that is said to have spread through tenderness and kindness and here are the cruelties of Christians who claim to be tender and affable!

The cruelties inflicted by the Christian sects upon one another are no less in severity. But the most notorious cruelties are the persecutions exercised by Christians over Jewry, who are praised by the priestly author of the book **Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât** on account of their familiarity with the canonical laws.

It is written as follows in the twenty-seventh page of the book **Keshf-ul-âsâr wa fî qisâs-i-enbiyâ-i benî Israâîl,** which was written by priest Dr. Alex Keith, translated into Persian by priest Merik, and published in 1261 [A.D. 1846] in Evenborough: "Three hundred years before the Hegira, Constantine the Great ordered that the ears of all the Jews be cut off and persecuted them by deportations and banishments."

It is written in the twenty-eighth page: "In Spain the Jews were oppressed to choose one of the following three alternatives:

a) Accepting Christianity;

b) Imprisonment for those who refused Christianity;

c) Deportation if none of these two choices are taken. Similar methods were used in France. Thus Jews travelled from one country to another. At that time there was no home for them, neither in Europe nor in Asia."

And in the twenty-ninth page: "Because Catholics reckoned Jews as unbelievers, they persecuted them. The most notable priests came together and took some decisions:

1 — If a Christian defends a Jew, he has made an error. He is to be excommunicated. That is, he must be excluded from Christianity.

2 — Jews are not to be assigned any official duties in any

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Christian states.

3 — No one can eat or cooperate with Jews.

4 — Children born among the Jews shall be raised by the Christians. The oppressiveness of this article is obvious." In the thirty-second page: "When the Portuguese caught Jews, they threw them into fire and burned them. When they did so, their men and women came together and celebrated the events. Their women danced, sprang and jumped with happiness."

It is written as follows in the book **Siyar-ul-muteqaddimîn,** which was written by priests: "In the Christian year 379, Gratinaus the Roman emperor, after consulting with his commanders, ordered the Christianization of all the Jews in his country. Accordingly, those who refused Christianity were to be killed." These writings belong to eminent Christian priests.

The torments inficted upon Protestants by Catholics and vice versa are no less cruel than the ones related above.

It is written as follows in the fifteenth and sixteenth pages of the thirteenth fascicle of an Arabic book which was published in thirteen fascicles in Beirut in 1265 [A.D. 1849]: "The Roman church inflicted numerous persecutions, torments and massacres upon Protestants. The witnesses to prove this fact are in the European countries. In Europe, more than 230,000 people were burnt alive because they did not believe in the pope though they believed Jesus and made the Holy Bible their guide in belief and worship. Likewise, thousands of them were either put to the sword or annihilated in prisons or through various tortures such as disjointing their bones or extracting their teeth or nails with pincers. Only on the day of Marirsu Lemavus thirty thousand people were killed in France.

The massacre of Saint Bartholomew and many other massacres that would take a long time to relate are the witnesses of the cruelties Catholics inflicted upon Protestants. Sixty-five thousand Protestants were killed in the massacre of St. Bartholomew. Catholic priests publicize this event as something to take pride in. Henry IV, who came to the throne of France in 1011 [A.D. 1593], stopped the massacre of Protestants. The bigoted Catholics who did not like this had Henry IV killed. In 1087 [A.D. 1675] the persecutions and massacres were resumed. Fifty thousand families fled from their country to escape death.

The Protestants were no less cruel to the Catholics than the Catholics were to them. It is written as follows in the forty-first

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and forty-second pages of a book which was translated into Urdu from English by a British Catholic priest named Thomas and was published with the title **Mir'ât-us-sidq** in 1267 [A.D. 1851], and which was widely sold in India: "The Protestants first usurped 645 monasteries, 90 schools, 2376 churches and 110 hospitals from their Catholic owners and sold them very cheaply, dividing the money among themselves. They evicted thousands of the poor residents into the streets, leaving them destitute." It is written in its forty-fifth page: "The Protestants' grudge and hostility reached the dead lying in their graves with equal savagery. Exhuming the corpses, they tormented them and robbed them of their shrouds." In the forty-eighth and forty-ninth pages: "Also the libraries disappeared among the other property usurped from the Catholics. Cyl Birl's doleful account of these libraries is as follows: The Protestants plundered the books they found in the libraries. They burned the books to cook on them, cleaned their candlesticks and shoes with them. They sold some of the books to herbalists and soap makers. They gave most of them to bookbinders overseas. They were not only fifty or a hundred books. They amounted to countless shiploads. They were annihilated in such a manner as to consternate the foreign nations. I saw a merchant buy two libraries, each for twenty rupees. After these cruelties, they robbed the treasuries of churches, leaving them in bare walls only. They thought they were doing something good." In the fifty-second and later pages: "Now we shall relate the cruelties that the Protestants have done so far: In order to torture the Catholics, the Protestants passed hundreds of laws far from justice, mercy and ethics. The following are some of them:

"1 — A Catholic cannot inherit his/her parents' property.

"2 — No Catholic past the age of eighteen can buy property, unless he accepts the Protestant sect.

"3 — No Catholic can set up a business for him or herself.

"4 — No Catholic can be a tutor (in any branch of knowledge). He who opposes this shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life.

"5 — The Catholics shall pay double the taxes.

"6 — Any Catholic priest who conducts a (religious) rite shall pay a fine of 330 sterlings. If a lay Catholic does this he shall be fined 700 sterlings plus one year's imprisonment.

"7 — If a Catholic sends his son abroad for education, he and

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

his son shall be killed. His property and livestock shall be confiscated.

"8 — No Catholic can be employed in the Civil Service.

"9 — If any Catholic does not attend Sunday masses or other religious celebrations in a Protestant church he shall be fined 200 sterlings monthly and shall be dismissed from society.

"10 — If a Catholic goes five miles away from London he shall be fined 100 sterlings."

It is written in pages sixty-one through sixty-six: "With the command of Queen Elizabeth most of the Catholic monks and other clergymen were taken out on ships and thrown into the sea. Then the soldiers of Elizabeth came to Ireland to Protestantize the Catholics. The soldiers demolished the Catholic churches. Whereever they came across a Catholic priest they killed him immediately. They burned towns. They destroyed crops and animals. But they treated non-Catholics well. Then, in 1052 [A.D. 1643-44], the parliament sent forth men to a number of cities to expropriate all the property and land belonging to the Catholics. These cruelties inflicted upon the Catholics went on till the time of king James I. In his time these cruelties became less severe. But the Protestants were angry with him. In 1194 [1780] forty-four thousand Protestants petitioned to the king for the maintenance of the laws concerning the Catholics so that they could go on tormenting them through the parliamentary power as before. But the king turned down their proposal. Upon this some hundred thousand Protestants came together in London and burned the Catholic churches. They devastated the districts where the Catholics lived. They started conflagrations at thirty-six different places. This vandalism lasted for six days. Then the king passed another law in 1791, giving the Catholics the rights they have been enjoying ever since."

It is written as follows in the seventy-third and seventy-fourth pages: "You probably have not heard about the event of Cortiraskuln in Ireland. The stories telling about his doings in Ireland are true. Every year the Protestants collected two hundred and fifty rupees and the rentals of various places and with this money bought the children of poor Catholics. They sent these children away to live with Protestants in other places so that they would not recognize their parents (on returning to their hometowns). When they grew up, they were sent back home and did not recognize their parents, brothers and sisters, as a result of which they sometimes married their brothers, sisters, and even

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

parents."

[The most inhuman, the most ferocious of the cruelties inflicted upon Muslims by Christians were done by the British in India.

Allâma Fadl-i-Haqq Khayr-âbâdî, one of the greatest Islamic 'ulamâ in India, says in his book **As-sawrat-ul-Hindiyya (The Indian Revolution),** which is explained by Mawlânâ Ghulâm Mihr Alî in the 1384 [A.D. 1964] Indian edition of its commentary **Al-yawâqit-ul-mihriyya:**

In 1008 [A.D. 1600] the British first received the permission of Ekber Shâh to open business places in the Calcutta city of India. In the time of Shâh-i-Âlam they bought land in Calcutta. They brought military forces to protect their land. Upon curing Sultan Ferrûh Sîr Shâh in 1126 [A.D. 1714], they were given this right all over India. In the time of Shâh-i-Âlam-i-thânî they invaded Delhi, took control of the administration, and began to exercise cruelty. In 1274 [A.D. 1858] the Wahhabis in India said that Bahâdır Shâh II, who was a Sunnî, a Hanafî, and a Sufî in fact, was a bid'at holder and a disbeliever. With their help, which was reinforced by the support of Hindu unbelievers and the treacherous vizier Ahsanullah Khan, the British army entered Delhi. They raided homes and shops and plundered goods and money. Even women and children were put to the sword. The people could not find water to drink. The very old Bahâdır Shâh II, who had taken refuge in the tomb of Humâyûn Shâh, was taken towards the fortress together with his household with their hands and feet fastened. On the way the Patriarch Hudson had the three sons of the Shâh undressed, leaving them in underwears, and then martyred them by shooting them in their chests. He drank their blood. He had their bodies hung at the entrance of the fortress. The following day he took their heads to the British commander Henry Bernard. Then, boiling the heads in water, he made a soup and sent it to the Shâh and his wife. Being extremely hungry, they (the Shâh and spouse) immediately put the meat into their mouths. But they could not chew it, nor could they swallow it. They took it out and left it on the soil, though they did not know what sort of meat it was. The traitor named Hudson said, "Why don't you eat it? It is very delicious soup. I had it made from the flesh of your sons." Then they banished the Shâh, his wife and close relations to the city of Rangon and had them put in dungeons. The Sultân passed away in the dungeon in 1279. They martyred three thousand Muslims by shooting and twenty-seven

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

thousand by slaughtering in Delhi. Only those who fled at night managed to survive. The Christians massacred countless Muslims in other towns and villages, too. They ruined historical works of art. Peerless, invaluable pieces of ornamental goods and jewelry were loaded on ships and sent to London. Allâma Fadl-i-Haqq was martyred in his dungeon on the island of Endoman by the British in 1278 [A.D. 1861].

In 1400 [A.D. 1979] Russians invaded Afghanistan and began to destroy the Islamic works of art and martyr the Muslims. They first shot to martyrdom the great 'âlim and Walî Ibrâhîm Mujaddidî together with his hundred and twenty-one disciples, his wife and daughters. This savage and ignoble attack, too, was caused by the British. For in 1945 the German commander Hitler, who had routed the Russian armies and was about to enter Moscow, cried to England and America through the radio: "I admit the defeat. I shall surrender to you. Let me go on with my war against Russia, rout the Russian army and remove the nuisance of communism from the earth." Churchill, the British prime minister, refused this proposition. They persisted in helping the Russians and did not enter Berlin before the arrival of the Russians. They caused Russians to be a pestilence over the world.

Abdurrashîd Ibrâhîm Efendi states as follows at one place of the chapter called "Hostility of the British against Islam" in the second volume of his Turkish book **Âlam-i-İslâm** (The Islamic World), which was published in Istanbul in 1328 [A.D. 1910]: "Extirpation of Khilâfat-i-Islâmiyya (the Islamic Caliphate) is the primary British goal. Their causing the Crimean war and helping the Turks there was a stratagem to destroy the Caliphate. The Paris Treaty divulges this stratagem clearly. [They state their enmity overtly in the secret articles of the Lausanne Peace Treaty in 1923.] All the disasters the Turks have undergone so far, whatsoever the cover, have come from the British. The British policy is based on the annihilation of Islam. The reason for this policy is their being afraid of Islam. In order to deceive Muslims, they use saleable consciences, and introduce these people as Islamic scholars or heroes. In short, Islam's biggest enemy is the British."

For those who desire more detailed information about the treacheries and murders carried on by the British on various dates in various parts of the world, especially those which were done against Muslims and the Islamic religion; we recommend that they read the book **Jinâyât-ul-İngiliz** (The Murders by the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

British) by Es-Sayyîd Muhammad Habîb Ubeydî Beg, which was published in Beirut in 1334 [A.D. 1916].

Bryan William Jennings, an American lawyer and politician, was a renowned writer and lecturer, and at the same time was a U.S. Congressman between 1913-1915. He died in 1925. He gives detailed information about the British enmity against Islam and their barbarisms and cruelties in his book **(The British Dominion in India).**

The British sent their own men to their colonies whom they had been tyrannizing. These men started, so to speak, the movement of independence and in appearance broke their right of independence away from the British. They always used men of this sort for invading their colonies morally and inwardly while giving them their independence materially and outwardly. In other words, they imposed these men, whom they trained or bought for their own purposes, as leaders or saviors to such countries. And the inoffensive people of these countries, without even having time to consider the matter to sense the British lie, delivered their younger generations to the awful methods of propaganda. These countries had national anthems and flags. But morally and spiritually they were never independent. They had parliaments, prime ministers, ministers. But they never had authorities.][1]

We have mentioned only a few of the cruelties of Christians here. These are only a few examples of the barbarisms and savageries of Christians, who are said to have had a religious background and who claim to believe in the advice of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm': "If someone slaps you on one cheek, offer him your other cheek." We do not presume that the priest who wrote the book **Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât** is too ignorant to know about these cruelties and savageries. Thinking Muslims unaware of these historical events, he pretends not to know of them in order to reinforce his assertion.

Third: If the spreading of a religion were possible only through physical media, that is, by violence, force and power, the whole world would have been Christianized by now and there would be no Jews left after all these combats, barbarisms and massacres.

Fourth: The jihâd-i-fîsebîl-illâh commanded by Islam does not mean to compel (others) to become Muslim by the sword. Jihâd

---

[1] Please also see the book **Confessions of A British Spy,** which is available from Hakîkat Kitâbevi, Fatih-Istanbul-Turkey.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

means to announce and spread the kalima-i-tawhîd all over the world and to reveal the superiority and the merits of the true religion of Allâhu ta'âlâ to the other religions. This jihâd is done by teaching and advising first. That is, it is stated that Islam is the true religion commanding all sorts of happiness, justice, freedom, and human rights. Those non-Muslims who admit this are given the right of citizenship and enjoy all sorts of freedom enjoyed by the Muslims. War is opened to those obstinate states and tyrannical dictators who turn down this invitation. If they lose the war, the former invitation is repeated once more. That is, they are invited to accept Islam. If they accept it they become free like the other Muslims. If they refuse they are proposed to pay the income tax called jizya. Those who accept to pay the jizya are called **zimmî.** They can by no means be forced to change their religion. [The old, the invalid, the women and children, the poor, the clergy are not liable to the jizya.] They are completely free as to their religious duties, rites and ceremonies, and their property, lives, chastity and honour are, like the property, lives, chastity and honour of Muslims, protected by the state. Muslims and non-Muslims are held equal in all sorts of rights.

THEIR THIRD ASSERTION: The third assertion put forward by the priests is that *"Though it would have been possible for Allâhu ta'âlâ to send down a Prophet without any preparatory canonical education, Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is the most compassionate of the merciful, (is said to have) sent such an exalted religion (as Islam) not before the religions of Jesus and Moses; this is paradoxical with His justice."*

ANSWER: These words of the priests are answerable in various ways.

One of them is this: Allâhu ta'âlâ has infinite power. For Him there is no difference between creating the seven layers of the earth and the heavens and creating an ant, [a cell, an atom]. Nothing is beyond the creative power of Allâhu ta'âlâ, except having a partner, which is impossible. [May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from such a belief!] If, as they assert, it were impossible to send a Prophet without any preparations, this would be another mu'jiza of Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' in addition to his other mu'jizas (miracles). For the number of all the Israelites who believed Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was eighty-two by the time of his ascension to heaven though they were ready to accept a new religion and had been expecting a Prophet who would be their savior. On the other hand, our Master Fakhr-i-kâinât 'alaihi

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

efdalut-tahiyyât', before his decease, had already guided to îmân (belief in the true religion) more than a hundred and twenty-four thousand of the Arabs, who had had no religious education whatsoever and therefore were not ready to receive a new religion; this means to make the impossible possible, and is therefore a mu'jiza. Also, their statement that *'it is incompatible with the mercy, compassion and justice of Allâhu ta'âlâ not to send the better and superior one before"* is contrary to all sorts of reason. For the Christian creed is as follows: "The reason why Jesus was killed after various insults and then burned for three days in Hell was because all people, including all Prophets, were smeared with the original sin committed by Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' and hadrat Hawwâ in Paradise, and therefore Allâhu ta'âlâ willed to forgive them by shedding the blood of His beloved son (may Allah protect us from such belief)." Now we ask them: since Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is, according to Christian creed, the son of Allah, or perhaps the same as He (may Allah protect us from this belief), would it not have been better if he had been sent immediately after Âdam 'alaihis-salâm', so that the whole lot of these Prophets and so many innocent people would not have gone to Hell? It is a rule of protocol among rulers and presidents that the one with the highest rank position arrives last. It is a social custom that in big speeches the most important part is mentioned finally. The same rule applies in everything. For instance, skillful artists have their novices rough out the layouts of their works first and then finish their works by doing the final, important and delicate parts of their works themselves. This procedure is natural. Then, it is more suitable with the divine law of causation of Allâhu ta'âlâ who is the absolutely wise Creator to send the Sayyid-al-mursalîn 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', the most superior, the highest of Prophets, as the last Prophet, thus bringing His religion to perfection.

The book **Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazat,** again, makes the following comment concerning the matter whether Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' had mu'jizas (miracles), in the fourth chapter of the second section: *"Jesus and Moses displayed various miracles in order to prove to the people that they were Messengers sent down by Allah. Had it not been for such a touchstone as this to distinguish between the true and the false, many mendacious and immodest liars would have dared to profess being Prophets. And there would not be a gauge to test whether Allâhu ta'âlâ had given His Word to a person, whether He had chosen him as His*

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Prophet. Therefore, if you test Muhammad's 'alaihis-salâm' claim for prophethood by rubbing it against this touchstone, you will see that it is not so firm or so proven as the claims of Moses and Jesus 'alaihimas-salâm'!

"Even if we believe the testimonies of historians and the scholars of siyar and suppose that Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' displayed many miracles to prove his prophethood, we will not be convinced. For when we compare the wonderful, extraordinary events that they ascribe to their Prophet with the miracles of Jesus Christ and other Prophets, it is too difficult to believe that the so-called wonderful events are from Allah, on account of the discrepancies and similarities among them. Let us take the following examples: With the command of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' a tree left its place and walked towards him and a voice from its middle part said: **Esh-hadu an lâ ilâha ill-Allah wa esh-hadu anna Muhammadan abduhu wa Rasûluhu,** *thus bearing witness to his Prophethood; animals, mountains, stones and even a bunch of dates expressed the word of testimony we have given above; whatever clothes he put on, whether they were shorter or longer (than his size in appearance), suited him perfectly; now, is it possible not to doubt when we hear such events? For these events are imaginary. They are obviously contrary to the proofs and signs put forward by all the past Prophets."* In short, at the end of all this long, roundabout writing of his, the priest means to say that our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' did not have miracles although other Prophets had miracles.

ANSWER: It should be known well that one of the methods used by priests to mislead all Christians against Islam has been the slander that Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' did not show any miracles. (May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us against believing them!) These lies are answered convincingly and by definite proofs in the books **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq** and **Shams-ul-haqîqa.** Various answers are given to each of their questions. These priests pretend not to have seen these books and not to have heard of these answers. To be more precise, because they do not have any proofs sound enough to rebut the answers and evidences put forward to them, they ignore them as if they were unaware of them and repeat their former objections and lies in their books **Mîzân-ul-haqq, Miftâh-ul-esrâr, Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât,** and other books full of lies and slanders which they published as against Muslims. These books of theirs bear their evil intentions of deceiving the ignorant and spoiling their belief by changing the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

titles of the books they wrote before. Yet we have considered it appropriate to write a few of the answers given to the missionaries in the books **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq** and **Shams-ul-haqîqa**, which we have mentioned above:

All Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm', as a witness for the authenticity of their prophethood they were appointed, put forward as miracles some extraordinary, preternatural, superhuman events that were at the same time valued and accepted by the people they were appointed to (as Messengers). It is written in books of Siyar that the number of miracles that occured through Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' was more than three thousand. The existence of these miracles, which are stated in Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs and which were narrated by those who saw and heard them, thus reaching us by passing through generations, is beyond the reach of any sort of doubt. We shall explain some of these miracles (mu'jizas) in two different categories:

THE FIRST CATEGORY: This category contains the miracles that occured through Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' on past and future events.

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' related episodes about the past Prophets. Without reading the books of the Old Testament and the New Testament or learning from anyone, he gave information about the past peoples that had perished thousands of years before and whose signs had already disappeared. As a matter of fact, it is written in the fourth paragraph of the first chapter of the fifth section of the book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq:** "Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' related the episode of Nûh 'alaihis-salâm'. This mu'jiza is mentioned in Qur'ân al-kerîm. The forty-ninth âyat of Hûd sûra purports: **'This narrative of Nûh's** (Noah) **'alaihis-salâm' is one of the ghayb** (unknown) **pieces of information which we reveal** (wahy) **to you [through Jebrâîl]. Until now, neither you nor your tribe knew about it.'** But some differences between the Qur'ân al-kerîm and the past (heavenly) books are explained in the second chapter of the fifth section of the book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq.** Qur'ân al-kerîm contains many unknown narratives about past tribes." The third paragraph of the first chapter of the fifth section of the same book quotes twenty-two of the narratives given in Qur'ân al-kerîm:

1 — The two hundred and fourteenth âyat of the Baqara sûra purports: **"O Believers! Do you expect to enter Paradise right away? You have not undergone the despair experienced by the**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

beloved ones of Allah before you. I sent vehement poverty, ailment, hunger and affliction upon them. They were so badly worried by the afflictions they were suffering that the Prophet and his believers were saying: When will help come from Allâhu ta'âlâ? Be careful, be on the alert, for the help of Allâhu ta'âlâ is soon to come." The help promised in this âyat-i kerîma includes Muslims in general; and the help promised soon came about. Islam spread first in Arabia and then all over the world.

2 — Before the Holy War of Badr, Allâhu ta'âlâ gave the good news of victory to the As-hâb-i-kirâm and declared in the forty-fifth âyat of Qamer sûra: **"They will soon be routed, run away and turn their backs** (to the battlefield)." Exactly as it was declared, the Qoureish tribe were routed and destroyed at Badr.

3 — As is purported in the first, second, third and fourth âyats of Rûm sûra, Allâhu ta'âlâ declares: **"The Rûm were beaten** [by the Iranians] **at the closest place** [to the Arabs, in the vicinity of Damascus]. **Three to nine years after the defeat, they will beat their enemies** [the Iranians] **here. Beating or being beaten,** [be it known that], **is within the command of Allâhu ta'âlâ in the beginning and in the end. The Believers will be pleased at the victory of the Rûm over the Iranians."** The fact on which the mufassîrs (interpreters of Qur'ân al-kerîm) and the 'ulamâ of Siyar agree as to the interpretation of these âyats is as follows: It is predicted that the Rûm will beat the Iranians after being beaten. And everything occurred exactly as it was predicted. In fact, when this âyat-i-kerîma descended, Ubayy bin Halef, one of the outstanding disbelievers of Qoureish, denied it. In the conversation he had with Abû Bakr 'radiy-Allâhu anh', he affronted him and insisted on refusing that the other side would win. Upon this they made a contract to wait for three years and then for the losing party to give fifteen female camels to the party whose prediction came true. Abû Bakr as-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' came to Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' and submitted the matter. Rasûlullah 'sall-allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated that the word (bid')[1] in the âyat-i-kerîma included the numbers from three to nine and ordered him to go to him (the bettor) and increase both the duration of time and the number of camels. Upon this, Abû Bakr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' renewed the contract they had made, prolonging the duration to nine years and augmenting the number of camels to one hundred. In the six

---

[1] [Bad'].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

year of the Hegira, the news about the Rûm's victory over Iran reached them at Hudaybiyya. But Ubayy bin Halef had been killed with a spear which Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' picked from the ground and threw at him. So Abû Bakr-i Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' took the mentioned hundred camels from his inheritors. [Obeying our Prophet's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' command, he distributed the hundred camels to the poor.]

As for the other mu'jizât-i-nabawiyya (the Prophet's miracles) on the information about the ghayb (unknown), which are reported in hadîth-i-sherîfs; they are countless. We shall give a few examples:

In the beginning of the call to Islam some of the As-hâb-i-kirâm migrated to Abyssinia because of the polytheists' persecutions. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' and those of the Ashâb-i-kirâm who remained in Mekka-i-mukarrama were deprived of all sorts of social activities such as buying and selling, visiting or talking to people other than Muslims for three years. The polytheists of Qoureish had written a contract announcing these decisions of theirs and posted it on the Kâ'ba-i-muazzama. Allâhu ta'âlâ, the omnipotent, sent a wood-boring maggot called **arza** unto that notice. The maggot ate up all the written part except the phrase **Bismikallâhumma** (=in the name of Allâhu ta'âlâ). Allâhu ta'âlâ let our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' know of this event through Jibrîl-i-emîn (the Archangel Gabriel). And our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' in his turn related it to his uncle Abû Tâlib. The following day Abû Tâlib went to the notables of polytheists and said, "Muhammad's God told him so. If what he said is true, cancel this prohibition and do not prevent them from going around and seeing other people like before. If he didn't tell the truth, I shall no longer protect him." The notables of Qoureish accepted this. They all came together and made for the Kâ'ba. They took the contract down from the Kâ'ba, opened it up, and saw that, as Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' had said, all the written parts had been eaten up, with the exception of the phrase, **Bismikallâhumma.**

AN EXPLANATION:

[Dost Muhammad Qandihârî,[1] a great Islamic scholar in India, states in his twenty-ninth letter: "The polytheists of Qoureish used to write the phrase **Bismikallâhumma** at beginning

[1] Muhammad Qandihârî passed away in 1284 [A.D. 1868].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

of their letters. In the early years of Islam, our Master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' followed the Qoureishi custom and had the phrase **Bismikallâhumma** written at the head of his letters. Later, upon the revelation of the âyat of **Bismillah,** he had the phrase **Bismillâh** written as the starting phrase of his letters. Afterwards, when the âyat-i-karîma containing the word Rahmân descended, he had the phrase **Bismillâh-er-rahmân** written. Finally, when the phrase **Bismillâh-er-rahmân-er-rahîm** descended with the sûra of Naml, he began to have this phrase written. As a matter of fact, the letter he sent to the Byzantine Greek emperor Heraclius with (his private messenger) Dihya-i-Kelebî began with **Bismillâh-er-rahmân-er-rahîm.** It is sunna to begin a letter with this phrase of Basmala even if it is written to a disbeliever. In the peace of Hudaybiyya, he ordered hadrat Alî to write **Bismillâh-er-rahmân-er-rahîm.** Suhayl, the Qoureishi representative, said, "We don't know what Bismillâh-er-rahmân-er-rahîm is. Write Bismikallâhumma." As it is seen, since Âdam 'alaihis-salâm', Allâhu ta'âlâ had taught His name as (ALLAH) to all Prophets, and even disbelievers had used this name.]

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated, **"The fortress of Hayber will be conquered with Alî bin Ebî Tâlib."** So did it happen. Also, he predicted the conquests of Iran and Byzantium by stating, **"Muslims will share the treasures of Ajam (Iran) and Rûm (Byzantium) and the Iranian girls will serve them."**

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated, **"My Umma will part into seventy-three groups. All of them will go to Hell. Only one of them will be saved."** He also stated, **" The Ajams will beat the Muslims once or twice, the Iranian state** (Sassanians) **will be annihilated."** And he stated, **"Many Rûm** (Byzantine Greek) **generations will prevail. As each of them perish, those in the following era, that is, the next generation will take their place."** All these events took place as Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' had predicted.

The east and the west were rolled up and shown to him. He predicted that his Umma would possess the places that were within his sight and that his religion would spread over those places. So Islam spread in the east and west, exactly as he had predicted. [In fact, there is no country where Islam has not been heard of in today's free world.]

He stated, **"As long as 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' lives, fitna** (instigation) **will not arise among Muslims."** So the Ummat-i-Muhammad (Muslims) lived in safety till the end of the caliphate

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

of 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh', as he had predicted. Later instigations began to break out.

Again, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' predicted that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' will descend form the heaven, that Mahdî 'alaihir-rahma' will appear, and that Dajjâl also will appear.

He predicted that 'Uthmân-i-zin-nûrayn 'radiy-Allâhu anh' would be martyred while reading Qur'ân al-kerîm, and that Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' would be wounded with the stroke of Ibn Muljam's sword and would be martyred. As a matter of fact, whenever Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' saw Ibn Muljam, he would show his head and say, "When are you going to make this bleed all over?" Ibn Muljam would commit himself to the protection of Allâhu ta'âlâ from this, and would request, "Since such a base and evil deed has been predicted by our Prophet, o Alî, then you kill me. I don't want to be the cause of this atrocity and be accursed till the end of the world." Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' would answer, "One cannot be punished before murder. You will be retaliated after the action." So all these events took place exactly.

In the the Holy War of Hendek (Trench), he said to Ammâr bin Yâsir 'radiy-Allâhu anh', **"You will be killed by bâghîs** (rebels)." Later, he (Ammâr bin Yâsir) was martyred in Siffîn by those people who were on the side of Muâwiyya 'radiy-Allâhu anh.'

He said about Berâ bin Mâlik 'radiy-Allâhu anh': **"Some people that have dishevelled hair and who are repelled from doors are so (valuable) that if they stated something on oath Allâhu ta'âlâ would create it to confirm them. Berâ bin Malik is one of them."** In the war of Ahwâz the Muslim soldiers besieged the fortress of Tuster for six months and fought for eighty days in front of its gate. Lots of people died in both sides. This statement of Rasûlullah's was known among the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwân'. So they gathered around Berâ bin Mâlik 'radiy-Allâhu anh' and begged him to swear that the fortress would be conquered. Upon this, Berâ bin Mâlik 'radiy-Allâhu anh' swore both the conquest of the fortress and his own martyrdom. That day he attained the rank of martyrdom. And the same night the fortress was conquered, so the Muslims attained victory with the help of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

One day Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' slept in Umm-i-Hirâm's 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ' house. When he woke up he was smiling. She asked, "O Rasûlullah, why are you smiling?" Rasûlullah said, **"I saw some of my Umma getting on board ships**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and going out for Holy War against disbelievers." Umm-i-Hirâm said, "O Rasûlallah! Pray for me so that I may be one of them!" Rasûlullah said, **"O my Allah! Make her one of them!"** It came about as Rasûlullah predicted. In the time of hadrat Muâwiyya, Umm-i-Hirâm and her husband joined others getting on ships and sailed to Cyprus for jihâd. There she fell down from a horse and attained martyrdom 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ'.

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated about his blessed daughter, Fâtimâ 'radiy-Allâhu anhâ': **"Of my Ahl-i-bayt, you will be the first to meet me** (in the next world)." Six months after his honouring the next world, Fâtima, our mother, 'radiy-Allâhu anha', honoured the next world with her presence.

He predicted that Abû Zer-i-Ghifârî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' would pass away alone at a solitary place. It happened exactly so. [He passed away lonely as he was at a place called Rabaza. Only his daughter and his wife were with him. Shortly after his death Abdullah ibn Mes'ûd and some other high persons arrived. They washed, laid out, and shrouded his corpse 'radiy-Allâhu anhum ejmaîn'.]

He said to Surâqa bin Mâlik 'radiy-Allâhu anh', one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm: **"How will you be when you put on the Chosroes' bracelets?"** Years later, during the caliphate of 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh', the riches that were gained by the conquest of Iran were brought to Medîna-i-munawwara. Among the gains were the Chosroes' fur coat and bracelets. Dividing the gains, 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh' gave the Chosroes' bracelets to Surâqa 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. Surâqa put the bracelets on his arm. Being too wide, they went up to his elbow. He remembered what Rasûlullah had said years before, and wept.

THE SECOND CATEGORY: Lots of actual miracles came about from Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. Since the capacity of this book is not convenient for a detailed account of these miracles, we will mention a few of them:

1 — The event of **Mi'râj** (Ascent to Heaven), which took place both physically and spiritually, and as he (the Prophet) was awake. The disbelievers of Qoureish did not believe this miracle. And some Muslims, being weak both in faith and in mind, fell into the mischief of doubt and confirmed only after asking Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' various questions and getting their answers. Those who want to know what the disbelievers' questions and their answers were may consult to the book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq.** If Mi'râj had happened only spiritually,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

there would be no reason to deny it. For the soul travels between the east and the west in an instant when asleep. If a person's dream takes place in exactly the same way, it may be admitted as true; it cannot be denied.

Mi'râj happened both spiritually and physically. Allâhu ta'âlâ is capable to speedily move anything He wishes. For this reason, those wise people who believe in Mi'râj and those who narrate it can by no means be censured. Yes, Mi'râj is incompatible with the normal course of events. But all miracles are incomptatible with the normal course of events. Ibn Sînâ,[1] a notable philosopher, proves by reasonable evidences the possibility of this miracle, which is contrary to the normal course of events, and describes its occurrence in his book **Shifâ.** Those who have doubts may consult to the book. [Principles of (Islamic) belief should be learned not from philosophy books, but from the books of the 'ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna.]

Furthermore, bodily ascent to heaven is not impossible according to the people of the book, either. For it is written in the twenty-fourth verse of the fifth chapter of Genesis and in the first verse of the second chapter of the second book of Kings of the Holy Bible that Ehnûh (E'noch), Elia and Elijah (E-li'jah and E-li'sha) 'alaihimus-salâm' physically ascended to heaven. And it is written in the nineteenth verse of the sixteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark: "So then after the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received up into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God." (Mark: 16-19) It is written in the second verse of the twelfth chapter of the epistle written to Corinthians by Paul: "I knew a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I cannot tell; or whether out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth;) such an one caught up to the third heaven." (I Corinthians: 12-2) As is seen, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' also was taken up to heaven (mi'râj).

2 — The miracle of **Shaqq-i-qamer,** the splitting of the moon, which is related in Qur'ân al-kerîm. In this respect, the objections of the deniers, i.e. the Christian priests, are written at length in the books of **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq** and **As'ila-i-hikamiyya.**

3 — The miracle of **Remy-i-turâb.** In the Holy War of Bedr, the number of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwan' was one-fourth that of the polytheists. At a vehement time of the combat,

---

[1] Ibn Sînâ (Avicenna) Husayn passed away in Hemedân in 428 [A.D. 1037].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

as the polytheists augmented their offensive, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' put his blessed head on the ground in prostration under the trellis and invoked (Allah) for victory and said: **"O my exalted Allah! If you do not lead these handful of Muslims to victory, no one will be left on the earth to promulgate Thine unity."** Then he kept silent for a while. Presently signs of joy appeared in his blessed eyes, and he informed Abû Bakr-i-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh', who was with him and who had been his companion in the cave, that he had been given the good news of victory and the aid of Allâhu ta'âlâ. He left the trellis, honoured the battle field with his presence and, taking a handful of sand from the ground, threw it towards the polytheist soldiers. Each grain of sand went to an enemy soldier's eye like a lightning of disaster and utter defeat, and they were destroyed without any apparent reason. The seventeenth âyat-i-kerîma of the Enfâl sûra descended to describe this miracle. The meaning of the âyat-i-kerîma was: **"What you threw to the disbelievers was not thrown by you. They were thrown by Allâhu ta'âlâ."** This âyat-i-kerîma was recited in all the native and foreign languages. None of the polytheists attempted to say, "No such soil came to my eye." Perhaps they thought it was magic. (May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us against such belief.)

4 — The miracle of water gushing out from between Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' fingers at various places. Several hundred Sahâbîs drank from that water and quenched their thirst. On the day of Hudaybiyya, the number of the As-hâb-i-kirâm that were there and drank that blessed water was more than a thousand. In addition, they filled their water-bottles. This miracle was seen at the market of Medîna, at the Holy War of Buwat, at the Holy War of Tabuk, and at many other places. In fact, at Hudaybiyya the water poured from his blessed fingers like pouring from fountains. After the thirsty ones drank, the water sufficed even their animals. These facts are narrated unanimously by very trustworthy 'ulamâ of Siyer through very sound documents.

5 — The miracle of **Berekât-i-taâm.** Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' gave a woman and her husband a quarter bushel of barley. Their guests and children ate from it for a long time but could not finish it.

Once, he fed a thousand people with a piece of barley bread and a young goat, and the amount of the food did not decrease at all.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Once, a hundred and eighty people ate from a piece of bread, and the bread became even bigger.

Once, he fed a hundred and thirty people with a piece of bread and a cooked lamb. The remainder was loaded on a camel and taken away.

He satiated an Abyssinian with a few dates. This miracle took place a number of times.

He fed those who were with him, all his household, and all his relations with one portion of food.

6 — The miracle of **Teksîr-i-derâhim,** i.e. increasing the amount of money. Selmân-i-Fârisî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was the slave of a Jew. When he was honoured with Islam, his Jewish owner said he would be emancipated from slavery on condition that he would plant three hundred date saplings, they would give fruits, and he would give him (the Jew) 1600 dirhams (drachm) of gold.

[The As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwân' helped Selmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh' in digging the holes for the saplings. When the holes were dug, our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' honoured the place with his presence and] planted the three hundred saplings resolved upon with his blessed hands. All of them came to maturity in a year and began to yield fruits. [One of the saplings had been planted by 'Umar-ul-Fârûq 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. The sapling did not give any fruits. When Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' replanted it with his blessed hands, it gave fruits at once.]

He gave Selmân 'radiy-Allâhu anh' a gold that was the size of an egg and which had been gained in a Holy War. Selmân-i-Fârisî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' said to Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', "This is too small to weigh sixteen hundred dirhams." He (Rasûlullah) took the gold in his blessed hands and gave it back, and said, **"Take this to your owner."** When his owner weighed it, it was exactly the weight (decided upon); so Selmân-i-Fârisî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' joined the free Muslims.

7 — The miracle of **Teksîr-i-berekât.** Abû Hurayra 'radiy-Allâhu anh' relates: "We were starving in a Holy War. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said, **'Is there anything?"** I said, 'Yes, o Rasûlallah! I have some dates in my bag." He said, **"Bring them to me."** When I took them to him he put his blessed hand into my bag, took out a handful of dates, placed them on a handkerchief which he laid on the ground, and prayed for bereket (abundance). The As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwân' being there came and ate

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

dates. They were fully fed. Then he said to me: **'O Abâ Hurayra! Take a handful of the dates on this handkerchief and put them in your foodbag.'** I took a handful and put them in my bag. The dates in my bag were never finished. We both ate and offered to others from them during the life-time of Rasûlullah 'sall-allâhu alaihi wasallam' and later, during the caliphates of Abû Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmân 'radiy-Allâhu anhum'. They were still not finished. When 'Uthmân-i-Zinnûrayn was martyred during his caliphate, my foodbag was stolen."

Many other similar miracles occurred through our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. Books mention miracles like these about other Prophets, too. It is written in the fourteenth chapter of the second book of Kings of the Old Testament [and in the seventeenth chapter of the first book of Kings, beginning with the tenth verse] that some of these miracles occurred through Elijah 'alaihis-salâm'. A similar miracle occurred through Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; it is written in all the Gospels that he fed four or five thousand people with a few pieces of bread and fish. [Matthew, chapter 14, verse 15. Mark, chapter 6, verse 35 and onward.]

8 — The miracle of **Selâm** and **Shahâdat-i-ashjâr.** When a nomad Arab asked Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' for a miracle, he (Rasûlullah) summoned a tree by the road. The tree pulled up its roots and shuffled towards Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'; when it came in front of him it testified to his prophethood and then went back to its place.

And once a date tree also bore witness to the prophethood of our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' and resumed its place.

[There was a date-stump in the Masjîd-i-Nebewî in the blessed city of Medîna. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' made his hutbas (speeches) leaning on the stump. When a minber (pulpit used in a mosque) was made for him, he stopped going to the Hannâna.] This date stump began to moan with the loss of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. That is, a voice of crying was coming from the stump. All the assembly heard it. When our Master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' got down from the new minber and hugged Hannâna, the voice stopped. He (Rasûlullah) stated, **"If I did not hug it, it would cry with the loss of me till the end of the world."**

9 — The idols in the Kâ'ba-i-muazzama fell face downwards when he made a signal with his blessed finger. There were three hundred and sixty idols (statues) erected in the Kâ'ba. When the blessed city of Mekka was conquered and Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

alaihi wasallam' entered Harem-i-sherîf, he pointed to them one by one with a date branch in his blessed hand and at the same time recited the eighty-first âyat of Isrâ sûra, which purported: **"When the right came, the wrong disappeared, it was gone."** The idols fell on their faces. [Most of the idols were tightly fixed to the ground by lead and tin poured into holes made in the rock.]

10 — The miracles of **Ihyâ-i-Mewtâ, redd-i-ayn** and **keshf-i-basar.** One day a nomad Arab came to Rasûlullah 'sall-allâhu alaihi wasallam.' Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' invited him to Islam. The nomad said that his neighbor's daughter had died, that he loved her very much, and that he would become a Muslim if he (Rasûlullah) resuscitated her. [Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said, **"Show me the girl's grave."** They went together to the grave.] When they were by the grave, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' called the girl by her name. A voice said from the grave: "Yes, sir," and the girl came out of the grave. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' asked her, **"Would you like to come back to the world?"** The girl answered, "No, o Rasûlallah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. I swear by the name of Allah that I feel more comfortable here than I did when I was in my parents' home. A Muslim will be better off in the next world than he is in this world. So I will not come back." Then she went back into her grave.

Jâbir bin Abdullah 'radiy-Allâhu anh' cooked a sheep. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' and the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwân' ate it together. He said, **"Do not break the bones."** He put the bones together, put his blessed hands on them and prayed. Allâhu ta'âlâ resuscitated the sheep. And the sheep went away wagging its tail. [These and other miracles of our Prophet are written in detail in **Mawâhib-i-ledunniyya** by Imâm-i-Qastalânî; in **Shifâ-i-sherîf** by Qâdî Iyâd; in **Hasâis-un-nabî,** by Imâm-i-Suyûtî; and in **Shawâhid-un-nubuwwa** by Mawlânâ Abdurrahmân Jâmî[1] 'rahmatullahi alaihim ajmaîn'.]

In the Holy War of Uhud one of the eyes of Abû Qatâda 'radiy-Allâhu anh' came out and fell on his cheek. They took him to Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. He placed his eye in its socket with his blessed hand and said: **"O my Allah! Make his eye beautiful!"** This eye was now more beautiful and keener in sight than the other. [One of Abû Qatâda's grandsons came to the caliph 'Umar bin Abd-ul-azîz. When he asked who he was, he

---

[1] Molla Jâmî passed away in Hirat in 989 [A.D. 1492].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

recited a couplet saying that he was the grandson of the person whose eye Rasûlullah had restored with his blessed hand. Upon hearing the couplet, the caliph respected him highly and gave him presents.]

One day a man whose both eyes were blind came up and said: "O Rasûlallah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. Pray for me so that my eyes will open." Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said to him: **"Make a faultless ablution. Then say this prayer: O my Allah! I beg Thee. I ask of Thee through Thine beloved Prophet Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'. O my most beloved Prophet, hadrat Muhammad! I beg my Allah through you. I want Him to accept my prayer for your sake. Make this exalted Prophet my intercessor! Accept my prayer for his sake."** This person made an ablution and said this prayer for the opening of his eyes. His eyes were immediately opened. [Muslims have always said this prayer and obtained their wishes.]

There was an old man whose eyes had become too clouded to see clearly. When he (Rasûlullah) breathed onto his eyes with his blessed breath, his eyes immediately healed, so that he could see for himself.

Iyâs bin Seleme says: in the Holy War of Hayber Rasûlullah sent me to call Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' had an eye sore. Holding his hand, I took him with difficulty. He (Rasûlullah) spat on his blessed finger and put it on Alî's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' eyes. Handing him the flag, he sent him to fight at the gate of Hayber. Hadrat Alî unhinged the door, which they had not been able to open for a long time, and the As-hâb-i-kirâm entered the fortress. Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' never had an eye sore again the rest of his life.

They brought him (Rasûlullah) a child that was dumb and insane. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' made an ablution, and they made the child drink the remaining water. The child immediately healed, began to talk, and became sane.

Muhammad bin Hâtib says: When I was a small boy boiling water was poured on me. My body was scalded. My father took me to Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. He put his spittle on the scalded parts with his blessed hands and prayed. The scalds immediately healed.

The inner part of Shurahbil-il-Ju'fî's 'radiy-Allahu anh' hand was swollen, and this case hindered him from holding his sword or the halter of his animal. He petitioned to Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

alaihi wasallam'. Rasûlullah massaged his palm with his blessed hand. He raised his hand, and there was not a sign of the swelling left.

Enes bin Mâlik 'radiy-Allâhu anh' is reported to have related the following event: My mother said to Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam': "O Rasûlallah! Enes is your servant. Ask a blessing on him." Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' supplicated: **"O my Allah! Make his property plentiful and his children numerous. Make his lifetime long. Forgive him his sins."** In the process of time there was an increase in his property. His trees and vines yielded fruits every year. He had more than a hundred children. He lived a hundred and ten years. [Towards the end of his life he said: O my Allah! You have accepted and given me three of the blessings which Your Most Beloved One asked for me! I wonder what will become of the fourth one, the forgiving of my sins? Upon this he heard a voice that said: "I have accepted the fourth one, too. Do not worry about it."]

He (Rasûlullah) sent a letter of invitation to Islam to Husraw, the Persian King. Husraw tore the letter to pieces and martyred the messenger. When the Messenger of Allah 'alaihis-salâm' heard this he was very sorry, and prayed as follows: **"O my Allah! Tear his sovereignty to pieces as he has torn my letter!"** Rasûlullah was still living when Husraw was stabbed to pieces by his son Shîrawayh. During the caliphate of 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh', Muslims conquered all the Persian land, and Husraw's descendants and sovereignty perished completely.

[Esma binti Abû Bekr 'radiy-Allâhu anh' stated: "Whenever we washed the blessed robe worn by Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', we gave the water left to ailing people, and they recovered."]

If the priestly author of the book **Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât** meant some wonderful events that were seen on Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' as he was only a child and which have not been transmitted through sahîh (technically acceptable) narrations, we might be silent. [For, one of the stipulations for a mu'jiza (miracle of a Prophet) is that it must happen after the Prophet has disclosed his prophethood. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' spoke in the cradle; when he asked for dates from a dry tree, dates came into his hand; as Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' was a child, his chest was incised and his heart was taken out, washed and purified; there was always a cloud over his blessed head for shade; stones and trees saluted him: these and other such extraordinary events,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

which happened before his prophethood and was publicized, were not mu'jizas. They were karâmats (miracles that happen on people who are loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ and yet who are not prophets). They are called **Irhâs** (beginnings). They are intended to confirm the prophethood. These miracles may happen on the Awliyâ (people loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ), too. Prophets are never inferior to the Awliyâ, nor even before they are informed with their prophethood. Karâmats are seen on them. The mu'jiza takes place a short time after the declaration of prophethood. For instance, if (the Prophet) says such and such an event will happen in a month and if the event does happen, it is a mu'jiza. But it is not necessary to believe his prophethood before the happening of the event. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', showed thousands of mu'jizas after the declaration of his prophethood.]

Some of his miracles of this kind, such as the pouring of water from his blessed fingers, the moaning of the date-stump in the mosque, the idols' falling down on the floor upon his beckoning, his curing the blind, his curing many kinds of illnesses, took place in the presence of thousands of Sahâbîs, were transmitted from generation to generation, were spread and heard everywhere, and their veracity was taken for certain. These miracles of Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' have reached the highest degree of tawâtur. [Tawâtur is a narrative that is told unanimously by those who are the most reliable people of their times and who can by no means agree on a lie, and which therefore forms a piece of absolute knowledge.] For instance, such facts as the bravery of Alî bin Ebî Talîb 'radiy-Allâhu anh' and the generosity of Hâtem-i-Tâî have become widespread and known in the forms of tawâtur; no one, therefore, could deny them. Christianity, on the other hand, has been founded on a narrative told by only one person, i.e. it is the personal account of either Matthew, or Mark, or Luke, or John. The pieces of information which they gave about themselves and the times they lived in teem with suppositions and doubts, and they mostly contradict one another. None of the four Gospels would be accepted as documentary knowledge if they were scrutinized according to the rules of the knowledge of **Usûl-i-hadîth** which the scholars of Hadîth have laid as conditions to be fulfilled by every individual hadîth-i-sherîf narrated for being accepted. [The conditions which Muslims observe in narrating Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' hadîths are very stringent. Since there is no authenticity of narration in the existing Gospels, they cannot

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

be compared with hadîths with respect to authenticity. Christian priests also have virtually admitted this fact by publishing a number of books proving that the Bible has been defiled by way of implantation, mutilation or miscopying.] As a matter of fact, if such miracles as curing the born blind, healing the skin disease called leprosy, and enlivening the dead, which occurred through Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', were not verified by Qur'ân al-kerîm, no Christian would ever be able to prove that they actually occurred.

In an attempt to deny the miracles of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', priests put forward the ninetieth and ninety-first âyats of Isrâ sûra as a proof, which purport:

"We shall not believe you unless you make a spring well up for us in this place [Mekka]. **Or you should have date orchards and vineyards amidst which you make rivers flow,** [said the inimical polytheists when they were thwarted by the eloquence and grandeur of Qur'ân al-kerîm and the miracles that they saw clearly]." While this proof foils their own purpose, they still claim to prove that Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' did not show any miracles. And this, in its turn, is never compatible with reason or justice. [In fact, in the âyats that we mention and which the (priests) offer as documents, the polytheists ask for more and more miracles because they have felt amazed, disqualified and incapacitated upon seeing the various miracles, especially that of Qur'ân al-kerîm. This case reveals the priests' mendacity, let alone supporting their thesis.] It is so strange that while there is no certain or even dependable information as to the real authors or dates of the epistles appended to the four Gospels, and despite the apparent oddities and contradictions in the narratives written in the Biblical copies kept by Christians, they still accept each of their verses as a principle of creed. On the other hand, not even a single letter of Qur'ân al-kerîm has been smeared with interpolation for twelve hundred [now fourteen hundred] years; the da'îf hadîths, and the fabled ones have been distinguished from one another by way of scientific and authentic documentation; each of the narratives in the Islamic religion has been proved through numerous evidences; and yet they (the priests mentioned above) insist on protesting the believers (of Qur'ân al-kerîm).

[Those who wish to become informed on the miracles of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'; we recommend that they read the (Turkish) book **Herkese Lâzım Olan Îmân** and also the (English) book **Why Did They Become Muslims?**]

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 8 —
QUR'ÂN AL-KERÎM
and
TODAY'S GOSPELS

Protestants are trying to prove that the Biblical commandments and injunctions are superior to the commandments and injunctions of the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' (Mosaic Laws) by comparing them from their own unilateral viewpoints. Then, attempting to test whether the commandments in Qur'ân al-kerîm are superior to the Biblical commandments and injunctions, they say: *"The value and the significance of any cause is proportional to the soundness and the convincing power of the evidences put forward [to prove the cause]. All the owners of wisdom have adapted their daily matters to these rules. For instance, if an expert claims that he has invented a new weapon which is stronger and has a longer range than the old ones, a country that must improve its weaponry will not accept the weapon without testing it. The assertion that Islam is superior to Christianity is exactly like this. It is unreasonable, unwise to accept Islam blindly in haste without giving it a test on a weighing apparatus. Therefore, it is necessary to subject the commandments in Qur'ân al-kerîm to accurate experimentation to see whether they are superior to and better than those declared in the Bible. If the result is that Qur'ân al-kerîm is greater as has been presumed, it will be necessary to abandon the Bible and to embrace Qur'ân al-kerîm."*

ANSWER: If we knew that the person who wrote these statements wrote them with the sheer purpose of revealing the truth instead of carrying out the duty assigned to him by the Protestant missionary organization, we would thank him for his final words, which are rather reasonable. But, as everyone knows, and as he himself admits, we must warn him not to add any dissimulation to his real motive, which is to earn a living by working for the Protestant missionary society. Nevertheless, since the gauge he propounds is true, it is a pleasure for us to agree

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

with him. Yet some âyats in Qur'ân al-kerîm must be collated with their counterparts in the Bible in such a manner as their comparison will indicate the following evidences.

If we leave aside the episodes and statements in the four Gospels, their teachings on ethics, on wordly affairs [muâmalât], on the knowledge pertaining to the heart and to next world consist in the following:

"Turning completely away from the world, being contented with poverty and destitution. Loving Allâhu ta'âlâ with all your heart and more than your own life and wishes. Loving your neighbor as well as your own self and sympathizing with him in times of sorrow and trouble. Pitying the oppressed. Sympathizing with children. Repelling evil thoughts from the heart. Reconciling two estranged believers to each other. Putting up with troubles patiently for the sake of your faith. Not committing homicide. Not stealing. Not becoming angry. Not saying bad words. Not uttering expletives or profanities. Being aware of your own faults, even if they may seem venial, and tolerating others' faults, even if they are grave; not blaming others. Being patient when you are pelted by others because you give them advice. Not defiling or changing the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ; not hurting your brother in religion; not committing fornication; not looking at women [except your spouse] lustfully; not divorcing your wife without any reason; not swearing; not resisting evil (Matt.: 5-39); when you are smitten on one cheek, offering your other cheek (to be slapped) (ibid); when you are asked to give your shirt, giving your coat, too; uttering benedictions on people who utter maledictions on you; in short, doing favours to everyone who bears malice against you; avoiding hypocrisy in alming, fasting and praying; not praying too long; not saving money so much as to keep your heart busy with it; not worrying about your subsistence or clothing. Whatever you ask sincerely from Allâhu ta'âlâ He will give you. He who obeys the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ will enter Paradise." The Gospels contain the following pieces of advice, too: "Do not take money for teaching others their religious commandments. When you enter someone's place greet (people being there). Do not stay where you are not wanted. When teaching a commandment, (remember that) the commandment is given by Allâhu ta'âlâ, not by you. Do not fear anyone when you teach the (religious) rules; do not try anyone or pass judgement on anyone. Forgive any fault and be modest. I have come to make peace among people; I have not brought faction or sword; I have

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

not come to make dissension or war. He who loves his parents more than me is not with me. In the next world good deeds will be rewarded and bad deeds will be punished with torment. He who obeys Allâhu ta'âlâ is my brother. He who admits the true word upon hearing it shall be rewarded in the next world, and he who denies it shall be tormented. Be good to your parents. A person will not become foul or dirty with the dirty words he utters. But he will be dirty if he actually does the dirty acts he utters, i.e. if he kills someone or commits adultery or bears false witness. Do not refuse to pay tax when you are asked to. He who is modest will be exalted by Allâhu ta'âlâ. The conceited one will be downgraded. Give alms from your property, and you will be paid back by Allâhu ta'âlâ; entering Paradise will be difficult for those rich people who hoard property. We have come not to be served, but to serve."

All the commandments, prohibitions, and the rules of good and bad conduct in the Gospels consist in the matters written above.

Qur'ân al-kerîm, the highest, the most superior of the heavenly books sent down by Allâhu ta'âlâ, also covers all the teachings in the Bible in the most immaculate style. If we were to collate all the commandments, prohibitions, and the rules pertaining to worldly matters and ethics with those in Qur'ân al-kerîm, we would need to mention and explain only a minority of the rules in Qur'ân al-kerîm. We will therefore exemplify only a few of them:

1 — It is written in the Gospel of Matthew: "Blessed are the poor in spirit; for theirs is the kingdom of heaven." [Matt: 5-3. Here good news is given to those who do not esteem the world and it is stated that the world is worthless.]

In Qur'ân al-kerîm, on the other hand, this fact is expressed in the best and the most compendious style and in such a choice of vocabulary as will be understood by anyone:

The twentieth âyat of Hadîd sûra purports: **"Know ye (all), that the life in this world is but play and amusement, pomp and mutual boasting and multiplying, (in rivalry) among yourselves, riches and children...."** (57-20)

The thirty-second âyat of En'âm sûra purports: **"What is the life of this world but play and amusement? But best is the Home in the Hereafter, for those who are righteous. Will ye not then understand?"** (6-32)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

The forty-sixth âyat of Kahf sûra purports: **"Wealth and sons are amusements of the life of this world: But the things that endure, Good Deeds, are best In the sight of thy Rabb (Allâhu ta'âlâ), as rewards, and best as (the foundation for) hopes."** (18-46)

"It is purported in the thirty-ninth and fortieth âyats of Mu'min sûra: **"O My people! This life of the present is nothing but (temporary) convenience: It is the Hereafter that is the Home that will last." "He that works evil will be requited but by the like thereof: And he that works a righteous deed – whether man or woman – and is a Believer – such will enter the Garden (of Bliss): therein will they have abundance without measure."** (40-39, 40)

The twelfth âyat of Shûrâ sûra purports: **"To him belong the keys of the heavens and the earth: He enlarges and restricts the sustenance to whom He will: for He knows full well all things."** (42-12)

The thirty-sixth âyat of Shûrâ sûra purports: **"Whatever ye are given (here) is (but) a convenience of this life: but that which is with Allâhu ta'âlâ is better and more lasting: it is for those who believe and put their trust in their Rabb;"** (42-36) Besides these âyats and many other similar âyats stating that the world is evil, there are quite a number of hadîth-i-sherîfs uttered by our Prophet, Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'. [The (Arabic) words dunyâ (world) and adnâ, which are written in (the original versions of) the âyats that we have quoted above and the hadîths that we shall quote below, mean harmful, evil things. In other words, Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs (the blessed utterances of our Prophet, Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm') prohibit from harmful and evil things. People who have 'aql-i-selîm (real common sense) recognize harmful and evil things. People with imperfect wisdom, especially if they are short-sighted, cannot distinguish harmful and evil things from useful and good ones. They confuse them with one another. Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', being extremely merciful upon human beings, have also explained what the world they have prohibited from is, that is, they have stated clearly what the harmful and evil things are. Accordingly, world (dunyâ) means things that are prohibited by Allâhu ta'âlâ and which are said to be makrûh by our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. As it is seen, those worldly matters that are not prohibited by Allâhu ta'âlâ, and some of which are even commanded by Him, are different from the world that is harmful and evil. Hence, it is not worldly to work and earn as

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

much as you can, to learn and utilize science, medicine, arithmetics, geometry, architecture, means of war and, in short, to make and earn all sorts of means of civilization that will provide ease, peace and happiness for mankind. It is an act of worship to make and use all these things in manners, ways and conditions prescribed by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Allâhu ta'âlâ likes Muslims who do so. He will give them endless blessings and felicities in the Hereafter.] The following are some of the hadîths (mentioned above):

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' states in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which is narrated by Abdullah Ibn 'Umar 'radiy-Allâhu anh': **"If a person is given a small worldly thing** [which is more than he needs], **he will lose some of his esteem before Allâhu ta'âlâ, even if he is a valuable person according to Allâhu ta'âlâ."**

Another hadîth-i-sherîf declares: **"Setting one's heart to the world is the origin of all sins."**

Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' invokes in a hadîth-i-sherîf, which is narrated by Abû Hurayra 'radiy-Allâhu anh': **"Yâ Rabbî** (O my Allah)**. Send the subsistence of Muhammad's household as much as will suffice for them."**

Another hadîth-i-sherîf declares: **"Be like a destitute person or a wayfarer in the world; consider yourself dead."**

There are other hadîth-i-sherîfs, as follows:

"The fortunate is the person who has forsaken the world, that is, dismissed its love out of his heart, **before the world has forsaken him."**

"If a person wishes the next world and works for the next world, Allâhu ta'âlâ makes this world his servant."

"If a person believes that the next world is eternal, it will be extremely consternating if he sets his heart to this world."

"The world has been created for you, and you have been created for the next world! In the next world there is Paradise and Hell fire, and no other place."

"Curse the person who worships money and food!"

"I am not anxious about your becoming poor. But I fear that, as was the case with your predecessors, taking possession of plenty of the world, you will disobey Allâhu ta'âlâ and become hostile to one another."

"The damage of greed for wealth and fame to a person is more than the harm of two wolves attacking a flock of sheep."

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

"Do not be inclined to the world so that Allâhu ta'âlâ will love you. Do not envy others' property so that people will love you."

"Life in this world is like a bridge to be crossed. Do not try to adorn this bridge. Cross it fast and go on your way!"

"Work for this world as much as is necessary for your stay here; and work for the next world as much as will be necessary for your stay there!"

Beside those âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs which prohibit from setting the heart on the world and advise sparing more energy for the Hereafter, the Islamic religion contains numbers of commandments, âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs promoting knowledge, science, techniques, sculpture, arts and commerce and encouraging to work for them. For the salvation and welfare of a civilized society or nation is not possible in poverty. On the contrary, wealth is indispensable for establishing institutions of charity, public kitchens, schools, madrasas, cookhouses, hospitals, for helping the disabled, the poor and the destitute, [and for serving humanity by making fountains and bridges and founding factories]. As a matter of fact, the twenty-ninth âyat of the Nisâ sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm purports: **"O ye who believe! Eat not up your property among yourselves in vanities,** [such as interest and gambling, which are forbidden by Islam]; **but let there be amongst you traffic and trade by mutual good-will: ..."** (4-29)

The two hundred and seventy-fifth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"... But Allâhu ta'âlâ has permitted trade and forbidden ribâ** [interest]..." (2-275)

The fourteenth and the fifteenth âyats of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purport, **"Fair in the eyes of men is the love of things they covet: women and sons; heaped up hoards of gold and silver; horses branded (for blood and excellence); and (wealth of) cattle and well-tilled land, such as the possessions of this world's life; but in nearness to Allâhu ta'âlâ is the best of goals (to return to)." "Say: Shall I give you glad tidings of things far better than those? For the righteous are Gardens in nearness to their Rabb, with rivers flowing beneath; therein is their eternal home; with compassions pure (and holy); and the good pleasure of Allâhu ta'âlâ, for in Allâhu ta'âlâ's sight are (all) His slaves,** – " (3-14, 15)

The eleventh âyat of Naba' sûra purports: **"And (We have) made the day as a means of subsistence** [so that you may earn your living during the day]." (78-11)

The tenth âyat of A'râf sûra purports: **"It is We Who have**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

placed you with authority on earth, and provided you therein with means for the fulfilment of your life: [We have created sustenances necessary for you to live by agriculture, trade and working.] **Small are the thanks that ye give;"** (7-10)

Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"The best, the most auspicious food a person eats is that which he earns with his wrist. Dâwûd** (David) **'alaihis-salâm', who was a Prophet of Allâhu ta'âlâ, ate what he earned with his hands."**

"For a devout person who spends (his property) **for beneficial purposes, property earned through halâl** (through means prescribed to be legal by Islam) **is so beautiful."**

"The righteous merchant shall be included in the assembly of siddîqs and martyrs on the Day of Judgement."

"For those who make things easy in selling and buying, Allâhu ta'âlâ will make things easy in whatever they do."

And another: **"May Allâhu ta'âlâ have mercy upon those who make things easy in selling and buying."**

One early morning, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' was talking to his As-hâb (Companions), when a robust youngster walked by and made for his shop. Some of the company said he might as well join them and learn a few things instead of going to work so early in order to earn what is worldly. Upon this Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"Do not say so! If he is going lest he, his parents and household be in need, each of his steps is worship. If his purpose is to assume an arrogant air to others or to live in luxury, he is with the Shaytân** (Satan)."

Another hadîth-i-sherîf declares: **"If a Muslim earns through halâl and does not need anyone's help and helps his neighbors and relations, on the Day of Judgement he will be as luminous as the full moon."**

[It is declared in (other) hadîth-i-sherîfs: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ likes a skilled Believer."** and **"The most halâl** (legal) **thing is an artisan's earnings."** and **"Do trade! Nine-tenths of** (your) **sustenance are in trade."** and **"If a person makes himself so poor as to beg others for alms, Allâhu ta'âlâ will inflict seventy kinds of needs upon him."**

It is declared in other hadîth-i-sherîfs: **"Those who suffer hardships for earning through halâl deserve Paradise."** and **"After performing the daily five prayers of namâz, it is incumbent on each Muslim to work and earn through halâl."** and **"The best trade is drapery, selling textile fabrics. The best handicraft is that**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

of a tailor."]

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' commanded and promoted craftsmanship and trade, and many âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs explain in full detail the prohibitions and the permissions in trade together with the reasons for each of them.

In the Bible, on the other hand, trade or working for the world is never permitted; on the contrary, you are commanded to sell whatever you have and donate the earnings as alms.

2 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted." (Matt: 5-4)

As for Qur'ân al-kerîm; there are numerous âyat-i-kerîmas that were revealed to explain the rewards that will be given to those who put up with the distresses that befall them. For example:

The hundred and fifty-fifth, the hundred and fifty-sixth and the hundred and fifty-seventh âyats of Baqara sûra purport: **"**(Ye who believe)! **Be sure that We shall test you with** [a little] **fear** [of the enemy in the Holy War], **with hunger** [caused by fasting or famine], **with insufficient property** [caused by catastrophes and damages], **with lack of health** [because of illness or weakness], **with deficiency in your crops,** [in your fruits or in your children, which are like fruits; which may have been caused by celestial or terrestrial catastrophes]. (O My beloved one)! **Give glad tidings** [of My blessings and kindnesses] **to those who patiently persevere, "– "Who say, when afflicted with calamity: To Allâhu ta'âlâ we belong, and to Him is our return": – "They are those on who (descend) blessings from Allâhu ta'âlâ, and Mercy, and they are the ones that receive guidance."** (2-15, 16, 17)

3 — Again, it is written in the Gospel of Matthew: "Blessed are the meek: for they shall inherit the earth." (Matt: 5-5)

The hundred and thirty-fourth âyat of the Al-i-'Imrân sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm purports: **"Those... who restrain anger, and pardon (all) men; – for Allâhu ta'âlâ loves those who do good; – "** (3-134)

[The fortieth âyat of Shûrâ sûra purports: **"... If a person forgives** (for the injury he has been inflicted on) **and makes reconciliation, his reward is due from Allâhu ta'âlâ: ..."** (42-40) The forty-third âyat purports: **"But indeed if any show patience and forgive, that would truly be an exercise of courageous will and resolution in the conduct of affairs."** (42-43)]

The hundred and fifty-ninth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra bears the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

following meaning: **"It is part of the Mercy of Allâhu ta'âlâ that thou dost deal gently with them. Wert thou severe or harsh-hearted, they would have broken away from about thee:..."** (3-159)

Our master Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' would say this prayer: **"O my Rabb** (Allah)! **Make me rich with knowledge, adorn me with hilm** [mildness], **bless me with taqwâ, and beautify me with health."** [We shall quote some hadîth-i-sherîfs about mildness below.]

4 — Again, it is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: "Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy." (Matt: 5-7)

[There are many âyats about mercy, compassion and tenderness] in Qur'ân al-kerîm. The hundred and twenty-eighth âyat of Tawba sûra purports: **"**(O human beings!) **Now hath come unto you a Messenger from amongst yourselves: it grieves him that ye should perish: ardently anxious is he over you: to the Believers is he most kind and merciful."** (9-128)

[Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ is suave. He likes blandness. He gives to the soft-mannered Believer as He has not given to the rough-mannered or to anyone else."**

It is stated in hadîth-i-sherîfs: **"He who does not behave gently is not beneficent."** and **"A Believer who has been endowed with softness has been gifted with the goodnesses of this world and the world to come."** and **"I am pronouncing the person who is forbidden from Hell and whom Hell is forbidden to burn. Pay attention! This person is the Believer who makes things easy for people and shows them affability."**

Another hadîth-i-sherîf declares: **"If a person is able to do anything when be becomes angry and yet does not become angry, Allâhu ta'âlâ will call him among all other people. He will say unto him: Go to the houri you like."** Another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"As aloes will decompose honey, so anger will spoil îmân."**

When a person asked Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' for a piece of advice, he stated: **"Do not become angry** [don't get nervous!)." When he repeated his question several times, He (Rasûlullah) gave the same answer: **"Do not become angry!"]**

It is written in Qur'ân al-kerîm that As-hâb-i-kirâm loved one another and were kind and compassionate to one another. The final âyat of Fat-h sûra purports: **"Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' is the Messenger of Allâhu ta'âlâ; and those who are**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

with him [the As-hâb-i-kirâm] **are strong against unbelievers, but compassionate amongst each other. ...”** (48-29)

Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf: **“He who does not respect our elders and is not compassionate to our youngers is not one of us.”**

5 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: “Blessed are the pure in heart: for they shall see God.” (Matt: 5-8)

[Many âyats in Qur’ân al-kerîm and very many hadîth-i-sherîfs of our Prophet’s ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ command beautiful moral qualities and being pure hearted. Islam assigns great emphasis to purity of heart.]

The eighty-eighth and the ninetieth âyats of the Shu’arâ sûra of Qur’ân al-kerîm purport: **“On the Day of Judgement no one will get any use from his property or children. Those who come to Allâhu ta’âlâ with a pure and faultless heart are excepted.** [They shall attain blessings.]”

Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ declared: **“Pay attention. I am informing** (you)! **There is a piece of flesh in man’s body. If it is good all the** (other) **limbs are good. If it is evil all the** (other) **limbs are evil. This piece of flesh is the heart.”** [This piece of flesh is the home of an essence that is called the heart and which cannot be seen or perceived through the sense organs. Purity of this piece of flesh means purity of the heart. This piece of flesh has been metaphorically called the heart, too.]

6 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: “Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God.” (Matt: 5-9)

Qur’ân al-kerîm declares in the tenth âyat of Hujurât sûra: **“The Believers are but a single Brotherhood: so make peace and reconciliation between your two (contending) brothers; and fear Allâhu ta’âlâ, that ye may receive Mercy.”** (49-10)

The hundred and fourteenth âyat of the Nisâ sûra purports: **“In most of their secret talks there is no good: but if one exhorts to a deed of charity or justice or conciliation between men, (secrecy is permissible): to him who does this, seeking the good pleasure of Allâhu ta’âlâ, We shall soon give a reward of the highest (value).”** (4-114)

The fortieth âyat of Shûrâ surâ purports: **“The recompense for an injury is an injury equal thereto (in degree): but if a person forgives and makes reconciliation, His reward is due from Allâhu ta’âlâ: ...”** (42-40)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

7 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: “Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness’ sake: for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.” “Blessed are ye, when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake.” “Rejoice, and be exceeding glad: for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets ‘alaihimussalâm’ before you.” (Matt: 5-10, 11, 12)

Qur’ân al-kerim contains many âyat-i-kerîmas that were revealed (to inform) on the kinds of patience and the reward for each of them. The hundred and seventy-seventh âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **“It is not benediction or piety to turn your face to the east or west. The** (real) **benediction and piety is to believe** (the existence and onesesses of) **Allâhu ta’âlâ, the Hereafter, the angels, the** (heavently) **Books revealed by Allâhu ta’âlâ, and Prophets; and to give** (a reasonable amount of) **your property to your poor relations, to poor orphans, to the needy, to stranded travellers** [and guests], **to poor people who ask for it, to the slaves called mukâtab** [those slaves who have made a contract with their owner and will be free when they pay a certain amount of money], **and to captives** [in order to set them free], **willingly and for** [the sake of] **Allâhu ta’âlâ; and to perform** (the daily prayers of) **namâz correctly, and to give the alms called zakât, and to keep your promises in contracts, and to be patient in times of poverty, destitution and straits and in Holy War; and to be loyal to those who have these qualities. Such people are the Muslims with taqwâ.”** (2-177)

The two hundredth âyat of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra purports: **“O Believers! Be patient** [with the persecutions of the enemies of religion]. Race your patience against that of your enemies in order to beat them in Holy War. Keep guard along the borders (of your country) **in order to perform jihâd** (Holy War) **against disbelievers, and fear Allâhu ta’âlâ so that you attain salâh** [salvation].” (3-200)

The ninety-sixth âyat of Nahl sûra purports: **“... Allâhu ta’âlâ will certainly give the rewards of those who are patient,** (and these will be) **more than what they deserve,** (both) **in amount and in beauty.”** (16-96)

The tenth âyat of Zumar sûra purports: **“Belivers who are patient shall attain countless rewards** [on the day of Judgement].” (39-10)

The hundred and fifty-third âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **“O Believers! Ask for help from Allâhu ta’âlâ by patience and salât**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

[namâz]. **Certainly** [the help of] **Allâhu ta'âlâ is with patient Believers."** (2-153)

The twenty-second âyat of Ra'd sûra purports: **"They are the people who are patient in order to attain the approval of Allâhu ta'âlâ. They perform their** (daily prayers of) **namâz correctly. They give alms secretly and overtly from the sustenance We have given them. They do favours to those who have wronged them. There is felicity and comfort for those Believers** [in return for their deeds] **in the Hereafter."** (13-22)

Allâhu ta'âlâ declared in a hadîth-i-qudsî: **"O sons of Adam! If a person does not approve My qadhâ** (fate), **does not endure the misfortunes coming from Me with patience, does not thank for the blessings I have given, is not contented with the worldly blessings I have bestowed, let him look for another Rabb** (Allah), **O the son of Adam! If a person endures My pestering** (him) **with patience, he has approved Me, that is, he has accepted Me as** (his) **Rabb."**

8 — The Gospel of Matthew states about justice: "For I say unto you, That except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matt: 5-20)

Qur'ân al-kerîm contains very many âyats about justice, too.

[The lexical meaning of justice is allocation of something to its right place. There are two definitions of justice. Firstly, "justice is to act within the laws, regulations and limits which a ruler or a sovereign has put and prescribed in order to govern the country. And injustice is to trespass the circle drawn by these laws." The more realistic definition of justice is "to use one's own property." Accordingly, injustice is transgression of someone else's property. Allâhu ta'âlâ, who has created (all) the worlds, is the supreme sovereign of all (other) sovereigns, the real owner, the one and only one Creator of all. Allâhu ta'âlâ is the absolute owner of justice. For He does everything within His property. For this reason, the final and the most perfect religion He has sent upon mankind consists in immaculate justice. And what is beyond this justice is injustice.

Qur'ân al-kerîm not only commands justice, but also prohibits injustice, which is the opposite of justice. There are many âyats pertaining to this. In fact, a person is even prohibited from doing injustice to himself.]

The fifty-eighth âyat of Nisâ sûra purports: **"... and when ye**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

judge between man and man, (Allâhu ta'âlâ commands) **that ye judge with justice: ..."** (4-58)

The ninetieth âyat of Nahl sûra purports: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ commands you to act with justice, to do kindness,**[1] **and to give** (alms) **to your relations** [who are in need]. **He prohibits you from obscenity** [from fornication], **from munker** [from wrongdoing], **and from injustice."** (16-90)

[Doing kindness, according to our Prophet's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' definition for this occasion, is **"To worship Allâhu ta'âlâ in such a manner as if you saw Him. He sees you though you do not see Him."** Doing kindness is first abstaining from the harâm (the forbidden acts and then doing the fardh (the commandments).]

The eighth âyat of Mâida sûra purports: **"O ye who believe! Stand out firmly for Allâhu ta'âlâ, as witnessess to fair dealing, and let not the hatred of others to you make you swerve to wrong and swerve from justice,** [thus making you responsible. That is, do justice even to your enemies.] **Be just** [with friends and foes alike]**: that is next to Piety: and fear Allâhu ta'âlâ, for Allâhu ta'âlâ is well-acquainted with all that ye do."** (5-8)

The thirty-first âyat of Insân (Dahr) sûra conveys the following meaning about those who do injustice: **"... But the wrong-doers, – for them has He (Allahu ta'âlâ) prepared a grievous penalty."** (76-31) The subject of justice and injustice in Qur'ân al-kerîm is not briefly explained, as it is in the Bible. It is explained in detail in Qur'ân al-kerîm and through hadîth-i-sherîfs. It would therefore take a huge book to recount all the examples.

9 — What is told from the twenty-first verse through the twenty-seventh verse of the fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew consists in: "Do not hurt your brother, stop what you are doing (for yourself) and help him when he needs (you), be friendly with him even if he is your enemy; in short, always have beautiful morals, behave gently and do good." (Paraphrased from Matt: 5-21 to 27)

The thirty-sixth âyat of Nisâ sûra contains all these things, and even more. The âyat purports: **"Worship Allâhu ta'âlâ. Do not attribute any partner to Him. Do kindness to your parents** [by words and actions], **to your relations** [by sila-i-rahîm, by visiting

---

[1] The Arabic word used in the original text is **ihsân.**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

them], **to orphans** [by pleasing them], **to the poor** [by alms], **to your neighbors who are** (at the same time) **your relations** [by mercy and compassion], **to your neighbors** [by doing them favours and protecting them against harms], **to your friends and acquaintances** [by observing their rights and by being affectionate towards them], **to your guests and visitors** [by offering them food and drink and by facilitating their ablution and praying], **to your slaves and jâriyas** [by clothing them and treating them gently]. **Certainly Allâhu ta'âlâ does not like those who assume an arrogant air and boast instead of doing kindness** [to creatures]." (Paraphrased from 4-36)

The thirty-fourth âyat of Fussilat sûra purports: **"Nor can qoodness and evil be equal. Repel (evil) with what is better: then will he between whom and thee was hatred become as if he were thy friend and intimate!"** (41-34)

The eighth âyat of Mumtahina sûra purports: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ forbids you not, with regard to those who fight you not for (your) faith nor drive you out of your homes, from dealing kindly and justly with them: For Allâhu ta'âlâ loveth those who are just."** (60-8)

Ubâda bin Sâmit 'radiy-Allâhu anh' stated: Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said to the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwân': **"Shall I inform you on things that will make you distinguished in the opinion of Allâhu ta'âlâ?"** When the As-hâb-i-kirâm said, "Yes, o Rasûlallah", He 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"If you want to be distinguished in the opinion of Allâhu ta'âlâ and attain high grades, behave gently towards a person who becomes angry with you. Forgive a person who has been cruel to you. Visit also those who do not visit you."**

Abû Hurayra 'radiy-Allâhu anh' narrates: Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' asked the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alahimur-ridwân': **"Shall I teach you a few words** [give you some advice]? **Who among you will act upon it and learn it?"** When Abû Hurayra 'radiy-Allâhu anh' said, "I will, o Rasûlallah," Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' held him by the hand and stated: **"Refrain from things made harâm** [forbidden] **by Allâhu ta'âlâ, and you will become the best worshipper among men. Be contented with what Allâhu ta'âlâ has given to you** [however little it may be], **and you will become the richest of those people** [to whom Allâhu ta'âlâ has given richness of the heart]. **Be kind to your neighbor and help him** [both in your heart and actually], **and you will become a mature Believer. If you desire something for**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

yourself, desire it for all others, and you will become a [perfect] **Muslim."**

10 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: "... Thou shalt not commit adultery:" "But I say unto you, That whosoever looketh on a woman to lust after her hath committed adultery with her already in his heart." [Matt: 5-27, 28]

[Qur'ân al-kerîm not only prohibits fornication definitely but also prohibits everything that may cause fornication. For instance, it is forbidden to look lustfully at a woman who is not your wife, and also women are forbidden to look at other men. In addition it is forbidden to stay together with a nâ-mahram woman in private, to listen to a nâ-mahram woman's voice, and to talk to nâ-mahram women without any good reason or in a charming manner. Capacity of our book is not convenient to include (all) the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ and the hadîth-i-sherîfs of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' in this respect. We shall write some examples, however.]

The thirty-second âyat of Isrâ sûra purports: **"Nor come nigh to adultery: for it is a shameful (deed) and an evil, opening the road (to other evils)."** (17-32)

[The sixty-eighth âyat of Furqân sûra purports: **"Those** [Believers] **who invoke not, with Allâhu ta'âlâ, any other god, nor slay such life as Allâhu ta'âlâ has made sacred, except for just cause, nor commit fornication; ..."** (25-68)]

It is noteworthy that the sharî'a of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' has forbidden fornication clearly by stating, "Do not commit fornication"; and the sharî'a of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' has not only forbidden fornication but also stated that it is fornication also to look lustfully.

As for Islam, the most superior and the most perfect religion; it has prohibited from 'coming nigh to' fornication, thus covering both (of the two previous religions) in the most comprehensive way. For when you are prohibited from approaching, you are naturally prohibited from the act of fornication and from looking. Another âyat-i-kerîma gives good news to those who refrain and keep away from fornication. This âyat-i-kerîma, namely the thirty-fifth âyat of Ahzâb sûra, comprehends five to ten verses of the Bible. The âyat-i-kerîma conveys the following meaning: **"Men and women who obey the decree** [commandment] **of Allâhu ta'âlâ; believing men and believing women; men and women who are steady in their**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

worships; faithful men and faithful women [in their actions and promises]; **patient men and patient women; men and women who fear Allah; men who give alms and women who give alms; fasting men and fasting women; men and women who protect themselves from fornication; men and women who mention Allâhu ta'âlâ very much; Allâhu ta'âlâ has prepared forgiveness and a great reward for them."** (33-35)

[The thirtieth âyat of Nûr sûra purports: **"O My Messenger** 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'! **Say to the believing men that they should lower their gaze and guard their modesty** [awrat parts]; ..." (24-30)]

The following hadîth-i-sherîfs would suffice to show that it is like fornication and forbidden to look at nâ-mahram[1] women with lust: **"May Allâhu ta'âlâ curse those who commit fornication with two eyes"** and **"A man who looks lustfully and the woman who makes** (him) **look!"**

[Abû Sa'îd-i-Hudrî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' narrates that Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared: **"A man should not look at** (another) **man's awrat parts, and a woman** (should not look) **at** (another) **woman's** (awrat parts)!"

Aqaba bin Âmir narrates: Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared: **"Do not stay alone with a nâ-mahram woman in a room!"**

'Umar ul-Fârûq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' narrates: Rasûlullah 'sall-allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared: **"If a man stays together in private with a nâ-mahram woman, the third person in their company will be Shaytân (Satan)."**

Burayda 'radiy-Allâhu anh' narrates: Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said to hadrat Alî: **"O Alî! If you see a woman turn your face away from her. Do not look at her again! It is not sinful to see** (a woman) **unexpectedly, but it is a sin to look at her again."**

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared: **"May Allâhu ta'âlâ curse him** (or her) **who exposes his** (or her) **awrat parts or who looks at someone else's awrat parts."**

He declared in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"A person who commits fornication is like one who worships idols."]**

The punishment of hadd (the lash) for fornication is explained clearly in Qur'ân al-kerîm. [The second âyat of Nûr sûra purports:

---

[1] Please see the twelfth chapter of Endless Bliss-5

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

"The woman and the man guilty of adultery or fornication, – flog each of them with a hundred stripes [if they are single]: **Let not compassion move you in their case, in a matter prescribed by Allâhu ta'âlâ, if ye believe in Allâhu ta'âlâ and the Last Day: ..."** (24-2)

In the act of fornication, which has to be proven by four eyewitnesses or by the confession of the delinquents themselves, the punishment to be given to a married male or female Muslim for this abominable offense is stoning to death in an open space of ground. This is called **Rejm.** This punishment is recompense for spreading this ugly deed. This punishment is intended to deter from adultery. This punishment is for jeopardizing a nation and its State. Adultery is a nuisance that will destroy and annihilate nations and states. Considering the damage of being a dishonest man's wife, the (probable) damage that the wife also may lose her chastity, the damage that will be given to the husband of the woman with whom the husband has entered into relations, if she is married, the damage that will be caused to the wife of the man with whom the wife may venture into relations, if he is married, the damage of the children that will be destroyed and the healths that will be endangered during all these events, we cannot consider the penalty given by Islam to those who commit adultery to be too much or unjust. For such pestilences as syphilis and gonorhoea, [and especially the recent years' fearful, fatal and incurable disease, namely AIDS], which are the results of illegitimate relations, have been threatening the whole world. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', who is called Son of God by Christians (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us against this belief), prohibited from fornication; yet the parts of the world where fornication is most widespread today are Christian countries.

It is reported in the 11 March 1987 issue of (the daily Turkish) newspaper **TÜRKİYE:** "In America, events of AIDS disease have been seen among some members and monks of the Catholic church. Newspapers such as **National Catenalic Reporter** and **New York Times** have reported that at least twelve priests died of AIDS." AIDS is a fatal and pandemic disease, which appeared in 1980. It has been found out that the disease originates from those who practise the abominable act of the people of Lût (people of Sodom and Gomorrah) and from prostitutes, and spreads rapidly. Its spreading among priests divulges the fact that they have taken to dishonest, shameless practices. It is reported that today great numbers of men, women and girls have desisted from going to

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

church and confessing their sins lest they should catch this disease. The fact that this fatal, infectious and terrifying nuisance has never been seen in Islamic countries or among Muslims is a strong document distinguishing between the right and the wrong. We should not believe those lewd egoists who try to deceive Muslim children by giving such names as modernism and fashion to the immoral and shameless practices of Europeans and Americans. Today research on the treatment of AIDS carried out by spending billions of dollars from state budgets prove fruitless. Fornication is so widespread in America and in England that there are projects to open birth clinics within university campuses for university students. AIDS has become such a nightmare for humanity that tourists from Christian Europe can leave their country only after taking a medical certificate proving that they do not bear AIDS. Please note the greatness of the hikmat of Allâhu ta'âlâ: He has sent the worst, the most dangerous diseases upon practices without Islam. The children lost in these illegitimate practices should not be considered as children not born. They are killed, murdered children. Islam's command in this respect is very subtle. The command of **rejm,** stoning the married adulterer (or adulteress) to death, is the penalty for an intercourse which will bring about an illegitimate child deprived of its right of family and honour as a human being.

We will quote a few more hadîth-i-sherîfs which prohibit from doing things that will cause fornication:

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared: **"If a person looks at a nâ-mahram woman with lust, his eyes shall be filled with fire, and he shall be thrown into Hell. If a person shakes hands with a nâ-mahram woman, his hands shall be tied to his neck and he shall be put into Hell. Those who talk to nâ-mahram women without any good reason to do so, and lustfully, shall stay in Hell for a thousand years for each word."**

He 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"If a person sees a nâ-mahram girl and turns his head away from her out of his fear of the torment of Allâhu ta'âlâ, Allâhu ta'âlâ will make him enjoy the taste of his worships."** Like in every respect, Islam has made the best and the most correct judgement in this respect, too. How lucky for those who read the books of Islamic 'Ulamâ and who adapt themselves to those great religious men.]

WARNING: In the existing copies of the Bible, all the laws of the Taurah (Pentateuch) were abrogated, and only the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

prohibition of adultery remained. Because the Bible did not declare a certain punishment for those who committed fornication, Christians looked on the prohibition of fornication as an abrogated law; this fact is known by those who are informed on the facts about Europeans. Although Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' declared clearly that looking (at nâ-mahram women) with lust is the same as fornication. Christians have not covered their women, [but left them exposed so that others may look at them with lust. It is harâm (forbidden) to do things that will cause harâm (forbidden act). Women's showing themselves to men without covering themselves, by ornamenting themselves or putting on perfumes cause men to look at them with lust. Then, today's existing Gospels command Christian women to cover themselves. It is for this reason that girls and nuns in all churches and monasteries cover themselves like Muslim women]. But now priests have allowed women to dance tightly with youngsters they like, let alone sitting together with nâ-mahram men. Therefore, every Christian may be said to be an adulterer or adulteress according to the statement of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Yet if they answer that *"Those are ignorant people, uneducated Christians. Advice has no effect on them. Christian men of religion and priests are displeased with these habits of women;"* then why do they not prevent men and women from coming together in churches, wearing all sorts of ornamentations and flirting with one another under the name of worship? Furthermore, when hearing confession, young priests and young women with bare faces sit together in private, knee to knee, the women recounting the sins they have committed and the priests listening to them; and when leaving church young lads offer holy water to young women; such things show that no priest, let alone ignorant common Christians, can escape fornication of the eyes.

These explanations clarify the fact that priests, who have legitimized many a deed that was forbidden by all heavenly books [by all heavenly religions] with their personal interpretation afterwards, should have legitimized fornication likewise. In Islam, on the other hand, a woman is prohibited from showing herself to nâ-mahram men, with the exception of her face and hands, and from staying with them in private. Those women who obey the commandment of Allâhu ta'âlâ shall be under the divine protection of Allâhu ta'âlâ in this world. [And in the world to come they shall attain the countless blessings of Jannat-i-a'lâ (the noble place called Paradise). Thus Muslim women are in peace

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and comfort in the world and shall be given many a blessing in the Hereafter.] They are not subjected to the humiliation of being lascivious men's objects of pleasure like European women.

[No other religion, no other system of belief, no other cult, no other doctrine has given the woman the value as has been endowed by Islam. Islam has crowned the woman by honouring her as the mother and the sultan of the home. Europeans, who claim to be civilized, employ women in factories, offices, workshops and stores, thus depriving them of their real office of duty.

In Islam, the woman does not have to work within or without the house or to earn money. If she is married, her husband, if she is not married, her father, and if she does not have father, her closest relative, has to work and meet all her needs. If a woman does not have anyone to take care of her, the house of treasure of the (Islamic) State, which is called **Bayt ul-mâl,** has to support her and meet all her needs. In Islam the burden of earning has not been divided between man and woman. A man cannot force his wife to work in the field, in a factory or any other place. If a woman wishes she can, with the permission of her husband, work at places offering work for women without getting mixed with men. But the woman's earnings belong to herself. Her husband cannot seize anything from her forcibly. He cannot even force her to buy what she needs. Nor can he compel her to do housework. A woman does housework as a gift, kindness to her husband. Each of such things is a virtue, an honourable property possessed by Muslim women. In communist countries today women are forcibly employed with men in the heaviest works in return for food, like animals. In the so-called world, i.e. Christian countries, being told that "life is common", women are made to work in factories, fields and commercial businesses like men, and they live in grievances. As it is seen very frequently in daily newspapers, most of them regret having married and law courts teem with divorce suits. If women knew the value, the comfort and peace, the freedom, the right of divorce that Islam recognized for them, women all over the world would become Muslims and endeavour to spread Islam in every country. Islam's giving women very many rights and protecting them against being slaves or playthings in men's hands shows that Allâhu ta'âlâ values women greatly.]

After all that has been said so far, we request people with wisdom and reason to say for the sake of Allah which one is compatible with heavenly books and with the proprieties and

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

necessities of humanity; Christianity or Islam?

11 — It is written in the Bible: "It hath been said, Whosoever shall put away his wife, let him give her a writing of divorcement:" "But I say unto you, That whosoever shall put away his wife, saving for the cause of fornication, causeth her to commit adultery: and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery." (Matt: 5-31, 32)

We shall give detailed information on Christians' criticisms of divorce as prescribed by Islam and their answers in the section sub-titled **DIVORCE.** Yet we shall direct a few questions to all Christians for the time being:

a) Since it was declared by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' that looking (at a nâ-mahram woman) with lust is the same as committing adultery according to the twenty-eighth verse of the fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, which we have quoted earlier; when the event of adultery takes place it becomes necessary to divorce (the wife) according to, again, the thirty-second verse of the fifth chapter of Matthew. Because there is no question of nâ-mahram men and women's not seeing one another among Christians today, it has become a daily matter-of-fact event for any Christian woman to see any young man she likes, and vice versa, in public or secretly; then do Christians manage to avoid the looking which is (said to be) fornication?

b) As is written in European histories, (some) European kings divorced their wives [and some of them even married a number of women] though their wives mostly did not commit adultery. Why did priests allow those kings to divorce their wives despite the limitless authority they had?

c) Divorce is written and valid in today's European laws, which recognize other reasons for divorce in addition to fornication, such as exceeding incompatibility and anger, and even agreement between the woman and man (to divorce); and yet they cannot divorce. In the divorce actuated by the husband, by keeping his new woman in his house or by the agreement of husband and wife, the husband and wife can establish a new marriage with someone else only three years later. Yet in the divorce caused by the guilt of adultery it is possible to marry someone else only after at least ten months has elapsed. These are some of the articles of European laws. Now, what has become of the Biblical statement: "Divorce the adulteress at once"?

12 — It is written in the Bible: "Again, ye have heard that it

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

hath been said by them of old time, Thou shalt not forswear thyself, but shalt perform unto the Lord thine oaths:" "But I say unto you, Swear not at all; neither by heaven; for it is God's throne:" "Nor by the earth; for it is his footstool: neither by Jerusalem; for it is the city of the great King." "Neither shalt thou swear by thy head, because thou canst not make one hair white or black." "But let your communication be, Yea, yea; Nay, nay; for whatsoever is more than these cometh of evil." (Matt: 5-33 to 37)

As is undrestood from these verses of the Gospel of Matthew, it is an absolute commandment not to swear at all. Since it would be unreasonable and incompatible with the Hikmat (Divine Wisdom) to annihilate altogether such a means of security, which is one of the greatest media of social dealings, this (verse) is presumably one of the interpolations in the Bible. Like in the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', there is swearing in Islam. There are three sorts of swearing in Islam:

a) **Yemîn-i-Ghamûs:** To swear falsely for something in the past although you know (that it is not true). It is one of the gravest sins. Kaffârat is not necessary for this type of swearing. [It is necessary to repent at once and say instighfâr (beg Allâhu ta'âlâ for forgiveness).]

b) **Yemîn-i-Laghw:** To swear by mistake thinking that you did something (in the past, though you did not do it). When it becomes clear that you did not do it, the swear lapses. [That is, it is not a sin, nor is it necessary to do kaffârat.]

c) **Yemîn-i-Mun'aqida:** To swear falsely to do or not to do something in the future. If a person promises to do something the next day and swears **"by the name of Allah"** and then does not abide by his promise by doing it, he becomes a **hânis** (liar), and it is now necessary for him to perform kaffârat. Qur'ân al-kerîm contains clear declarations stating that kaffârat is necessary for this type of swear. The eighty-ninth âyat of Mâida sûra purports: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ will not call you to account for what is futile in your oaths** [for yemîn-i-laghw], **yet He will call you to account for your deliberate oaths** [for yemîn-i-mun'aqida]: **for expiation, feed ten indigent people, on a scale of the average for the food of your families; or clothe them; or give a slave his freedom. If that is beyond your means, fast for three days. That is the expiation for the oaths ye have sworn. Protect your tongues from** [swearing falsely] **and breaking your swears. ..."** (5-89) As for swearing by something other than the name of Allâhu ta'âlâ, such as (swearing) by the earth, by heaven, by your head or by your

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

children; it has been prohibited through various hadîth-i-sherîfs and therefore is not permissible canonically.

13 — As it is written in the Gospel of Matthew, after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' narrates the âyat of retaliation in the Taurah, it is stated in the thirty-ninth and later verses of the fifth chapter: "But I say unto you, That ye resist not evil: but whosoever shall smite thee on thy right cheek, turn to him the other also." "And if any man will sue thee at the law, and take away thy coat, let him have thy cloak also." "And whosoever shall compel thee to go a mile, go with him twain." "Give to him that asketh thee, and from him that would borrow of thee turn not thou away." (Matt: 5-39 to 42) "But I say unto you, Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, ..." (ibid: 44) and it is advised to greet everybody and to forgive those who are harmful and cruel to others. Retaliation, that is, punishing the guilty person, is altogether denied.

Retaliation (lex talionis) is legalized in heavenly books and commanded in Qur'ân al-kerîm. The forty-fifth âyat of Mâida sûra purports: **"... Life for life, eye for eye, nose for nose, ear for ear, tooth for tooth, and wounds equal for equal. ..."** (5-45) The hundred and seventy-ninth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"In the Law of Equality there is (saving of) Life to you, O ye men of understanding; ..."** (2-179) Yet there are also âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs stating that it will be better and very beneficent for the inheritors of the victim (of murder) or the injured or mutilated person to forgive (the offender) instead of demanding retaliation. Yet the Bible's forgiving retaliation altogether is a strong evidence of the fact that it has been interpolated. For talion existed in every religion, in every canon. In fact, retaliation was executed even in Christian countries. If Christians had admitted the soundness, the correctness of this Bible, they would not have done retaliation.

Also, the commandments, "If someone slaps you on one cheek offer him your other cheek, too. If someone asks for your coat give him your cloak, too. If anyone asks you to go with him, go with him," should be interpolations like the matter of retaliation. For no nation, no society can survive with a canon of that sort. The most evident proof of this is the fact that Europeans take no heed of these principles of Christianity.

[The material well-being, the scientific and technical improvements in Europe appeared in the wake of turning away from Christianity. The reason for those developments were the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

reformations in Europe. The agents of those reformations were those Europeans who had been educated in the Andalusian (Spanish) madrasas. These people took the field against Christianity, which was an impediment against all sorts of improvement, and proved through mental and scientific evidences that Christianity hinders progress. They wrote books repudiating Christianity and proving the fact that it is an obstruction for improvement. Some ignorant people who did not know Islam read these books written by Europeans and thought that it was the case with Islam, too. This gave them the idea of reforming Islam, which commands knowledge and all sorts of improvement. They deviated from the lightsome way of Islam and caused others to deviate, too, thus showing how ignorant and stupid they were. As we have pointed out before, Muslims have improved as long as they have adhered to Islam, and the farther Christians have withdrawn from Christianity the more progress they have made.]

14 — The Gospel of Matthew commands: "... go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor, ..." [Matt: 19-21]

Qur'ân al-kerîm, on the other hand, encourages alms and favours. [Instead of commanding to give all your property as alms, Qur'ân al-kerîm prohibits from making yourself needy and contemptible in the society by giving all your property as alms.] In fact, the twenty-sixth âyat of Israâ sûra purports: **"Do right by your relations,** [which means, depending on the situation, doing sila-i-rahîm (visiting your relations), giving alms to the poor and needy ones, and getting on well with them]. **Do right by the poor and travellers** [by giving them zakât and food], **depending on their situation. ..."** (17-26) And the twenty-ninth âyat purports: **"Do not tie your hand on your neck,** [that is, don't be stingy]; **and do not open your hand too wide,** [that is, don't be extravagant]; **otherwise you will go bad and need others."** (17-29)

[Qur'ân al-kerîm declares that giving alms will serve as an atonement for many sins and will cause them to be forgiven.]

15 — The third and fourth verses of the sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew states: "But when thou doest alms, let not thy left hand know what thy right hand doeth:" "That thine alms may be in secret: and thy Father which seeth in secret himself shall reward thee openly." (Matt: 6-3, 4)

Although it is appropriate to give alms secretly in order to avoid ostentation, it will not be wrong to give (alms) overtly, without any intention to make a show, in order to encourage others. Therefore, Qur'ân al-kerîm does not forbid giving alms

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

publicly, though it is declared in an âyat-i-kerîma that it is better to give (alms) secretly. The two hundred and seventy-first âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"If ye disclose (acts of) charity, even so it is well, but if ye conceal them, and make them reach those (really) in need, that is best for you: it will remove from you some of your (stains of) evil. And Allâhu ta'âlâ is well acquainted with what ye do."** (2-271) [The alms (which we are) advised to give openly in this âyat-i-kerîma is zakât, which is farz (one of the five commandments of Islam).] It is not ostentatious to give zakât, which is a commandment, openly; there is more thawâb (reward in the next world) in it, (in giving zakât openly). Yet it is better to give alms, which is tatawwu' [supererogatory], secretly. It is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf that the alms given secretly will be rewarded with seventy times as much thawâb as will be given for the alms done openly.] The reward that will ensue from the property donated in the way loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ is expressed in the two hundred and sixty-first âyat of Baqara sûra, which purports: **"The parable of those who spend their substances in the way of Allâhu ta'âlâ is that of a grain of corn: it groweth seven ears, and each ear hath a hundred grains. ..."** (2-261)

The alms must be given out of the property that one likes best. In this respect, the ninety-second âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purports: **"By no means shall ye attain righteousness** [Paradise] **unless ye give (freely) of that which ye love; ..."** (3-92)

The two hundred and seventy-third and the two hundred and seventy-fourth âyats of Baqara sûra purport: **"Your alms are for those who perform jihâd only for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ and those who acquire knowledge and those who are busy with a useful deed such as worshipping and those poor people who do not have** [the opportunity or] **time to deal in a trade or art on the earth. Because they refrain from begging, ignorant people think they are rich. O My Messenger, you will recognize them by their features. On account of their chastity, they do not disturb people by begging. If you give them alms out of your property, Allâhu ta'âlâ knows that you have given and why you have given. Those people who give their property as alms night and day secretly and openly; their rewards are rewards that will be** [the Gardens of Na'îm] (that will be given) **by Allâhu ta'âlâ. There is no fear or sorrow for them."** (Paraphrased from 2-273 and 274) [Abû Bekr-i-Siddîq 'radiy-Allâhu anh' gave a thousand golds in public, a thousand golds secretly, a thousand golds at night, and a thousand golds during the day. It has been narrated that the âyat-i-kerîma

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

(quoted above) was revealed upon that event.]

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"There are seven kinds of people whom Allâhu ta'âlâ will shelter in the shade of the Arsh on the Day of Resurrection, when there will be no shade except that which will be bestowed by Allâhu ta'âlâ. One of them is the person who gives alms so** (secretly) **that even his left hand is unaware of this right hand's giving** (alms)." It should not be inferred from this hadîth-i-sherîf that giving alms publicly is altogether forbidden. There are situations in which it is better to do something good and auspicious or give alms in public in order to encourage others, provided you will have pure intention and avoid riyâ. It is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf: **"A person who guides to doing something is like one who does it."** According to this hadîth-i-sherîf, there are double rewards for giving alms or doing good publicly; one reward for giving alms and another for encouraging others. From both logical and canonical points of view, goodness or alms done publicly for such a pure intention is for certain more beautiful than concealing it. While the existing copies of the Bible command frankly that alms should be given secretly, most Christians give alms openly, thus disobeying the Bible in this respect, too. As a matter of fact, it is one of the old European traditions for some beneficent people and carefully dressed madams to drive around in streets in order to moderate their selves by collecting alms.

16 — It is written in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that one should avoid riyâ when praying. [6-5, 6]

[Riyâ means to misrepresent something or, in short, it means ostentation. It is one of the illnesses of the heart. It is a bad habit. It means to attain worldly desires by doing the actions pertaining to the world to come, and by pretending to have directed oneself towards the Hereafter. The evils of riyâ have been stated by Allâhu ta'âlâ in Qur'ân al-kerîm, by Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' in his hadîth-i-sherîfs, and by the Islamic 'Ulamâ in their books.]

The fourth, the fifth and the sixth âyats of Mâ'ûn sûra purport: **"There is vehement torment for those who perform namâz in an oblivious or disrespectful manner and those who perform their** (prayers of) **namâz with evil thoughts and ostentatiously when they are in company and neglect the namâz when they are alone."** (107-4, 5, 6) The hundred and tenth âyat of Kahf sûra purports: **"... He who wants to attain his Rabb** (Allâhu ta'âlâ) **should perform 'âmel-i-sâlih** (pious deeds) **and should not attribute any**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

partner to his Rabb in his worshipping Him." (18-110) According to this âyat-i-kerîma, riyâ, that is, doing the worships for ostentation, is equivalent to shirk (attributing a partner to Allâhu ta'âlâ). For the person who makes a show (of his worshipping) attributes someone else as a partner to the Ma'bûd (the One who is to be worshipped, i.e. Allâhu ta'âlâ). Confirming this meaning, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated to the Ashâb-i-kirâm: **"What I fear most for you is your giving yourselves up to shirk-i-asghar** [slight shirk]" When the Ashâb-i-kirâm asked, "O Rasûlallah! What is slight shirk?", he stated: **"It is riyâ."**

[He 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"The person who worships with riyâ in the world will be told on the Day of Judgement: O you evil person! There is no reward for you today. Whoever you worshipped in the world, ask them to give you the reward."** The antonym for riyâ is ikhlâs, which means to do your worships only for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ without considering their wordly advantages. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' states: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ declares: I do not have a partner. He who attributes a partner to Me should ask him** (the partner he has attributed to Me) **for the thawâb** [the rewards I have promised]. **Do your worships with ikhlâs! Allâhu ta'âlâ will accept the deeds performed with ikhlâs."** As he 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' was sending off Muâdh bin Jabal 'radiy-Allâhu anh' as the governor to Yemen, he 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"Do your worships with ikhlâs! Deeds done with ikhlâs, few as they may be, will be enough for you on the Day of Judgement."** In another hadîth-i-sherîf he 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared: **"Good news to those who do their worships with ikhlâs. They are the stars of hidâyat** (the right way of Islam). **They will destroy the darknesses of fitna** (instigation)."]

17 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: "But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking." "Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him." "After this manner therefore pray ye: Our Father which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name." "Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven." "Give us this day our daily bread." "And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors." "And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever. Amen." (Matt: 6-7 to 13)

[Here, by saying, "Thy will be done in earth, as it is in

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

heaven," powerlessness is imputed to Allâhu ta'âlâ. And saying, "Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors," means to put Allâhu ta'âlâ under obligation. That is, it means to say, "As we have done, you also have to do." (May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so!) Again, only bread is asked for, whereas all blessings should be asked from Allâhu ta'âlâ.]

The Bible does not contain any prayers other than this. Therefore, Christians have to say this prayer daily. Muslims' daily prayer is Fâtiha-i-sherîfa, which is recited at every rek'at of the five daily prayers of namâz. Thus it is said at least forty times daily. The meaning of the sûra of Fâtiha-i-sherîfa is as follows:

"Bismillâh-er-rahmân-er-rahîm: I begin by saying the blessed name of Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is Rahmân[1] **and Rahîm.**[2] **The highest of hamd-u-thenâ** (praise, laud and thanks) **belongs to Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is the creator of all worlds,** [and who has associated them with one another in perfect harmony]. **Allâhu ta'âlâ is very merciful upon His born slaves in this world and in the world to come. He, alone, is the owner** [and the ruler] **of the Day of Judgement. We worship only You.** [There is none except You who is worthy of being worshipped.] **And only from You do we ask for help. Keep us in the right way,** [which is the medium way in our beliefs, deeds, words and morals]. [Keep us steady in the sirât-i-mustaqîm, which is the Islamic religion and the sunnat-i-enâm 'alaihis-salâtu wassalâm'.] **Keep us in the way of those whom You have blessed,** [i.e. Prophets, Walîs, and Siddîqs]; **not in the way of those who have subjected themselves to Your Wrath** [by not admitting the Truth] **and who have deviated** [from the right way)! [Yâ Rabbî] **Âmîn** [O my Rabb, accept this prayer]!" Qur'ân al-kerîm contains hundreds of other prayers; books of tafsîr (interpretation) explain them one by one.

18 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: "But thou, when thou prayest, enter into thy closet, and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which seeth in secret shall reward thee openly." (Matt: 6-6)

There are numerous âyat-i-kerîmas in Qur'ân al-kerîm [explaining the rewards that will be given to those who pray and stating that it is necessary to pray and that prayers shall be accepted]. The sixtieth âyat of Mu'mîn sûra purports: **"... Pray to**

---

[1] He has mercy upon both Muslims and disbelievers in this world.

[2] He has mercy only upon Muslims in the Hereafter.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Me, and I shall respond to you [accept your prayers]. ...” (40-60) The hundred and eighty-sixth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: “[O My Messenger]; **If My born slaves ask you of Me, I am close** (to them) [in knowledge and in accepting]. **When they pray to Me, I shall accept their prayers. They should ask for My accepting** (their prayers), **and they should believe in Me.”** (2-186)

19 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: “For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you:” “But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, neither will your Father forgive your trespasses.” (Matt: 6-14, 15)

The twenty-second âyat of the Nûr sûra of Qur’ân al-kerîm purports: “... [Tell them to] **forgive** [people’s faults], **and give up revenging. Pay attention! Don’t you like Allah’s forgiving you? Allâhu ta’âlâ is forgiving and merciful.”** (24-22) The hundred and thirty-fourth âyat of Âl-i-’Imrân sûra purports: “[The people of Taqwâ] **are those who** [give alms and] **subsist** (people) **in abundance and in paucity; in richness and in poverty. They do away with their anger;** [that is, they are patient enough to give up their estrangement while they have the choice and] **forgive** [those who deserve punishment]. **Allâhu ta’âlâ loves those who do kindness.”** (3-134) [Muslims have always acted upon these âyat-i-kerîmas. Here is an example of this: As Rasûlullah’s blessed grandson Huseyn bin Alî ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ sat at the (meal) table with his guests, his slave, who was bringing in some hot food in a container, tripped over something on the floor and poured the food he was holding on Huseyn’s ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ blessed head. When he looked hard at his slave’s face in order to warn him to be more careful, the slave said the part stating, **“They do not get angry,”** of this âyat-i-kerîma. When Huseyn the Imâm ‘radiy-allâhu anh’ said, “I have done away with my anger,” the slave recited the part stating, **“They forgive those people who are in fault.”** Imâm-i-Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ said, “I have forgiven (you)” Upon this the slave recited the part, **“Allâhu ta’âlâ loves those who do kindness.”** And Imâm-i-Huseyn ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ said, “I have emancipated you from slavery. You can go wherever you like.”] The seventeenth and eighteenth âyats of Balad sûra purport: **“Then they become Believers and advise patience and mercy to one another. They are among the as-hâb-i-yemîn, that is, the people of Paradise.”** (90-17, 18) Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ declared: **“He who does not have mercy upon others is not to be shown mercy to.”**

20 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: “Moreover, when

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance: for they disfigure their faces, that they may appear unto men to fast. Verily I say unto you, They have their reward." "But thou, when thou fastest, anoint thine head, and wash thy face;" "That thou appear not unto men to fast, but unto thy Father which is in secret: ..." [Matt: 6-16, 17, 18]

Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' commanded to fast only for Allah's sake and prohibited from ostentation. Since we have already explained the wickedness of ostentation according to Islam and quoted some of the âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs prohibiting from ostentation, we need not repeat them here. It must be noted, however, that while fasting is commanded clearly in these verses of the Bible, many years after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', Paul, who had not even seen his face and who, as it is confessed even by Christians, had done many a treason to his companions, changed this (commandment of) fasting, as he changed other commandments in the Bible.

21 — It is stated in the sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: "Therefore I say unto you, Take no thought for your life, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; ..." (Matt: 6-25) "Behold the fowls of the air: for they sow not, neither do they reap, nor gather into barns; yet your heavenly Father feedeth them. ..." (ibid: 26) "... Consider the lilies of the field, ..." (ibid: 28)

We have already quoted some âyat-i-kerîmas of Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs of our Prophet about not esteeming the world. There are also many âyat-i-kerîmas about tawakkul (putting one's trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ). We will mention only a few of them here.

The second and third âyat-i-kerîmas of Talâq sûra purport: **"... If a person fears Allâhu ta'âlâ, Allâhu ta'âlâ will bless him with a way off** (from poverty to well-being) **and will give him his subsistence through means that he does not expect. If a person puts his trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ, Allâhu ta'âlâ is sufficient for him. ..."** (65-2, 3)

[If all the âyat-i-kerîmas concerning tawakkul were put together, they would make up a volume bigger than the whole Bible. The twenty-third âyat of Mâida sûra purports: **"... If you have îmân put your trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ."** (5-23) The hundred and fifty-ninth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purports: **"... Allâhu ta'âlâ loves those who have tawakkul."** (3-159) The eleventh âyat of Ibrâhîm sûra purports: **"... And on Allâhu ta'âlâ let all men of faith put their trust."** (14-11)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"They showed me some of my Ummat** (Muslims). (They were so many that) **they covered mountains and fields. I was astonished and pleased to see that they were so numerous. I was asked if I was pleased. When I said, 'Yes,' I was told that only seventy thousand of them would enter Paradise. And when I asked who they were, I was told: They are those who do not mix their doings with magic, sorcery, cauterization or augury and those who do not put their trust in anyone except Allâhu ta'âlâ."** One of the listeners, Uqâsha 'radiy-Allâhu anh', stood up and said, "O Rasûlallah! Pray for me so that I shall be one of them." He (Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam') prayed: **"Yâ Rabbî** (o my Allah)**! Make him one of them!"** And when another stood up and asked for the same benediction, he 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared: **"Uqâsha has forestalled you."**

He (Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam') stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf: **"If you had full tawakkul in Allâhu ta'âlâ, He would send you** (your sustenance) **as He gives birds their sustenance. Birds go out with empty stomachs, hungry, in the morning, and come back with their stomachs filled, fully fed in the evening."** In another hadîth-i-sherîf he stated: **"If a person entrusts himself to Allâhu ta'âlâ, Allâhu ta'âlâ will reach him in everything he does. He will give him sustenance through places that he does not expect. If a person puts his trust on the world, He will leave him on the world."**

In Islam, tawakkul does not mean to expect everything from Allâhu ta'âlâ by not working at all. The divine law of causation of Allâhu ta'âlâ is such that He creates everything through some means. He is the creator of the means, and He, again, creates the occurence of events through the means. Islam commands us to find out the means that cause (the creation of) each event and hold fast to the means. In everything we do, we have to hold fast to the means that are known (to cause the creation of that thing) and then pray and supplicate to Allâhu ta'âlâ for the creation of the causative effect in the means. To expect that Allâhu ta'âlâ will make that thing without our holding fast to the means will mean to disobey Allâhu ta'âlâ and to attempt to suspend His law of causation. There is extensive information about the meaning of tawakkul and its kinds in the thirty-fifth chapter of the third fascicle of **Endless Bliss.**]

22 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: "And beholdest thou the mote that is in thy brother's eye, but considerest not the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

beam that is in thine own eye?" [Matt: 7-3]

The twelfth âyat of the Hujurât sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm purports: **"O Believers, beware from extensive supposition. For some suppositions are sinful. Do not try to find out** [others' faults], **and do not backbite one another.** [That is, do not make a slanderous statement about someone in his absence.] **Would any of you like to eat his dead brother's flesh? You would feel disgusted** [if you were offered it]. **Fear Allâhu ta'âlâ. Surely, Allâhu ta'âlâ will accept the tawba** (repentance) **of those who make tawba, and He is very compassionate."** (49-12) Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declared: **"If a person conceals people's faults and defects, Allâhu ta'âlâ will conceal his faults and defects."** In another hadîth-i-sherîf he stated: **"Search for the faults of your own self. Do not search for others' faults."**

[Another hadîth-i-sherîf declares: **"Backbiting is a sin which is graver than fornication."** Backbiting is forbidden vehemently in Islam. As fire destroys wood, so backbiting destroys hasanât [good deeds]. A hadîth-i-sherîf declares: **"On the Day of Judgement a person's book of thawâb will be opened. He will say: Yâ Rabbî** (O my Allah)**! I did such and such worships when I was in the world. They are not recorded on the page** (appointed for them). **He will be told: They have been erased from your book and recorded in the books of those whom you backbit."** And another hadîth-i-sherîf declares: **"On the Day of Judgement a person's book of hasanât will be opened. He will see worships that he did not do there** (in the book). **He will be told: These are the thawâbs of those who backbit you."** There are many hadîth-i-sherîfs that forbid backbiting and command to prevent backbiting. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"The person who helps his brother-in-Islam without his** (his brother's) **knowing about it shall be helped by Allâhu ta'âlâ in the world and in the Hereafter."** Again, he 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"If a person's brother-in-Islam is backbitten in his presence and yet he does not help his brother,** [that is, does not prevent his brother's backbiters], **his sins are enough for him in the world and in the Hereafter."**]

23 — It is stated in the Gospel of Matthew: "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, and many there be which go in thereat:" "Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, and few there be that find it." [Matt: 7-13, 14]

It is purported in Qur'ân al-kerîm, in the fourteenth âyat of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Âl-i-'Imrân sûra: **"Fair in the eyes of men is the love of things they covet: ..."** (3-14) Inclination towards something is natural, and therefore it is a wide way. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"Paradise has been surrounded with things that the nafs does not like, and Hell** (has been surrounded) **with the desires and lusts of the nafs."** In short, the way to Paradise is narrow and onerous, and the way to Hell is wide and adorned.

24 — It is written in the Gospel of Matthew that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said: "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven." "Many will say to me in that day, Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and thy name done many wonderful works?" "And then I will profess unto them, I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity." (Matt: 7-21, 22, 23)

The meaning of the word 'kingdom' mentioned here is not church organization as Protestant priests interpret it; on the contrary, its meaning is the **Mahkama-i-kubrâ** (the Grand Judgement), which will be seen on the Day of Resurrection, and the justice and vengeance of Allâhu ta'âlâ, which will take place meanwhile. Qur'ân al-kerîm contains many âyat-i-kerîmas similar to these verses of the Bible. The two hundred and fifty-fifth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"... His are all things in the heavens and on earth. Who is there can intercede in His presence except as He permitteth? ..."** (2-255) [The forty-fourth âyat of Zumer sûra is interpreted as, **"Tell them; no one can intercede without the permission of Allâhu ta'âlâ."** (39-44) The forty-eighth âyat of Muddaththir sûra purports: **"If those who are permitted to intercede** (use this permission to) **intercede for disbelievers, their intercession will do them no good."**] (74-48) Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu 'alaihi wa sallam' said to his blessed daughter Fâtima 'radiy-Allâhu ta'âlâ 'anhâ', who is the sayyidat-un-nisâ: **"On the Day of Judgement, I shall not give you any help unless Allâhu ta'âlâ gives** (me) **permission** (to do so)." [Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' is the owner of the Shafâ'at-i-uzmâ (the Grand Intercession). At the place of assembly for the Last Judgement, people will have recourse to (Prophets); Âdam (Adam), Nûh (Noah), Ibrâhîm (Abraham), Mûsâ (Moses), respectively; and finally to Îsâ (Jesus) 'alaihimus-salâm'. And Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', saying that he feels ashamed before Allâhu ta'âlâ because Christians made him a partner to Allâhu ta'âlâ, will send them to Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', who is the khâtam-ul-anbiyâ [the last

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Prophet], and Rasûlullah, being Allah's compassion for (all) worlds, will intercede for rescuing all people from the torment of the Judgement Day, his intercession will be accepted (by Allâhu ta'âlâ), and the torment of the Judgement Day will finally be raised from all people.

It is declared in hadîth-i-sherîfs: **"On the Day of Judgement, I shall intercede first."** and **"On the Day of Resurrection, I shall be the first to rise from the grave and the first intercessor."** and **"I can intercede for any Muslim, except those who calumniate my As-hâb."** and **"Of my Ummat, I shall intercede for those who have many sins."**]

Such is the belief held by Muslims with respect to shafâ'ât (intercession). Yet Christians believe that after Ascension, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' sat on the right hand side of the Father, undertook all the divine powers, and will be the absolute ruler of the Day of Judgement. [Matthew: 28-18; Mark: 16-19, and the other Gospels] They do not notice that this credo is clearly contrary to the verses of the Bible. Whereas Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said to the Apostles, "I shall not be useful to those who disobey Allah's commandments. I cannot help those who call out my name and beg me" [Paraphrased from Matt: 7-21 and later], Christians hold the wrong belief that "Hadrat Îsâ has sacrificed himself for us. Thus we have been saved from Hell."

25 — Again, despite the command of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', "Do not demand a price from anybody in exchange for preaching," it has been observed with dismay how Protestant missionaries strive to promulgate Christianity in return for thousands of pounds yearly and how priests of the other Christian sects have made a list of charges for various sins and deliver from each sin in return for a certain price; this practice has reached the extent that some Christians give their land property to priests, part by part, in return for deliverance from their sins, so that thousands of priests have been living in welfare and riches as a result of this trade. What is specially consternating here is the fact that this vicious belief is held by one-third of Europeans, who claim to be superior to other nations of the world in science, techniques and wisdom.

The hundred and eighty-sixth âyat of A'râf sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm purports: **"If Allâhu ta'âlâ has doomed a person to destruction and deprived him of îmân, there is no one to guide him to the right way."** (7-186)

26 — According to the Gospel of Matthew, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' made the following nuncupation to his disciples: "And when ye

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

come into an house, salute it." "And if the house be worthy, let your peace come upon it: but if it be not worthy, let your peace return to you." "And whosoever shall not receive you, nor hear your words, when ye depart out of that house or city, shake off the dust of your feet." [Matt: 10-12, 13, 14]

Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs contain many rules about how to make salâm, how to knock on a door, and how to enter a house. The twenty-seventh and the twenty-eighth âyats of Nûr sûra purport: **"O Believers. Do not enter houses other than yours without getting the host's permission and without making salâm. This** [your entering with permission and salâm] **is better for you,** [because (in this case) the host will (have time to) stop unsuitable things]**. If you consider these you will understand their hikmat** (ultimate divine causes). **If there is no one in a house, or if you are not permitted, do not go in. If they** [do not admit you and] **tell you to go back, then go back. This is more beautiful for you** [because it will represent your (beautiful) manners]. **Allâhu ta'âlâ knows all that you do."** (24-27, 28)

27 — Also, in the tenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, it is stated that the apostles who are sent forth for calling (people) to Christianity will suffer trouble and persecution as they preach Gospel, that they should flee to another city if they are persecuted in one city, that they should not fear anyone except Allâhu ta'âlâ, that (when they preach) it is not their selves but it is the Spirit of Allâhu ta'âlâ who speaks [May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from believing or saying so], and that if they are killed, the body only shall be killed, the soul being beyond the reach of their (enemies') aggression. (Matt: 10-16 to 28)

The thirty-ninth âyat of the Ahzâb sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm purports: **"Those people who preach the mission** [commandments and prohibitions] **of Allâhu ta'âlâ to people; they fear Allâhu ta'âlâ only, and they do not fear anyone except Allâhu ta'âlâ. Allâhu ta'âlâ, alone, is capable of paying for their deeds."** (33-39) The seventeenth âyat of Anfâl sûra purports: "[Yâ Muhammad (O Muhammad) 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'! In the Gazâ (Holy War) of Bedr], **You did not throw it** [a handful of soil to the disbelievers' eyes]. **But in reality Allâhu ta'âlâ threw it. ..."** (8-17) The hundred and fifty-fourth âyat-i-kerîma of Baqara sûra, whose blessed meaning is, **"And say not of those who are slain in the way of Allâhu ta'âlâ: 'They are dead.' Nay, they are living, though ye perceive (it) not."** [Mind is incapable of comprehending how they live]", (2-154) declares that martyrs' souls are alive, though

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

their bodies are dead.

28 — In the fortieth verse of the tenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' says to his apostles: "He that receiveth you receiveth me, and he that receiveth me receiveth him that sent me." (10-40)

In this verse, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' confirms the fact that he has been sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ and that he who obeys him obeys Allâhu ta'âlâ (by doing so). In this respect, it is stated in Qur'ân al-kerîm that obedience to Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' is obedience to Allâhu ta'âlâ. The eightieth âyat of Nisâ sûra purports: **"He who obeys the Messenger will have obeyed Allâhu ta'âlâ. ..."** (4-80)

29 — It is written as follows in the forty-sixth and later âyats of chapter twelve of the Gospel of Matthew: "While he yet talked to the people, behold, his mother and his brethren stood without, desiring to speak with him." "Then one said unto him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren stand without, desiring to speak with thee." "But he answered and said unto him that told him, Who is my mother? and who are my brethren?" "And he stretched forth his hand toward his disciples, and said, Behold my mother and my brethren!" "For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in heaven, the same is my brother, and sister, and mother." (Matt: 12-46 to 50)

In Qur'ân al-kerîm, on the other hand, Allâhu ta'âlâ commands to respect one's parents. The twenty-third and the twenty-fourth âyats of Isrâ sûra purport: **"Be kind to your parents. Do not say 'ugh' to them,** [do not insult them or shout at them, and] **say polite, kind, beautiful words to them. Be very compassionate to them and lower your wings in humilation and humbleness.** [That is, be kind and affable to them, do not be conceited], **and pray for them as follows: Yâ Rabb** (o my Allah), **have mercy on them as they gave me** (family) **education when I was a child."** (17-23, 24)

30 — At the beginning of the second chapter of the Gospel of John, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and his mother attend a wedding feast given in the city of Cana. During the meal, "And when they wanted wine, the mother of Jesus saith unto him, They have no wine." "Jesus saith unto her, Woman, what have I to do with thee? ..." (John: 2-3, 4) thus replying to (her) in a harsh manner. This woman is hadrat Maryam (Mary), who would be the topic of the discussions on "whether she was the mother of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' or of God [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so],"

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

which were held several hundred years later in the ecclesiastical assemblies called Councils and which ended in the decision that she would be the mother of God.

The creed held by priests has been based on contradictory principles such as these. When the facts written above are seen and known, however much thanks Muslims might express to Allâhu ta'âlâ, they would fall short of depicting the happy situation they are in on account of the gift of Islam they have been blessed with.

31 — In the third and later verses of the thirteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', giving various examples, classifies people who hear the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ into four groups, and likens each group to a seed that is sown. Then he says, "... Behold, a sower went forth to sow;" "And when he sowed, some seeds fell by the way side, and the fowls came and devoured them up:" "Some fell upon stony places, where they had not much earth: and forthwith they sprung up, because they had no deepness of earth:" "And when the sun was up, they were scorched; and because they had no root, they withered away." "And some fell among thorns; and the thorns sprung up, and choked them:" "But other fell into good ground, and brought forth fruit, some an hundredfold, some sixtyfold, some thirtyfold." "Who hath ears to hear, let him hear." (Matt: 13-3 to 9) Here, the first group, i.e. those seeds which are thrown on the roadside represent those people who hear the Divine Word but deny it and disbelieve it. The second group, i.e. the seeds that are sown on rocky ground and do not push out roots, represent renegades, who hear the Divine Word and first believe it but after a time deny it. The third group, i.e. the seeds scattered among bushes represent those who hear the Divine Word and believe it; but afterwards, being absorbed by the world and smitten with the desire of earning property, they neglect worshipping. The fourth group, that is, seeds that are sown on good soil are likened to those who hear the Divine Word, believe it, and act accordingly.

In the Islamic religion, the first group of these characters are called **kâfir**s (disbelievers, unbelievers); the second group are called **murtad**s (renegades) and **munâfiq**s (hypocrites); the third group are called **fâsiqs** [sinners]; and the fourth group are called **muttaqî,** or **sâlih, Mu'min**s (Believers who fear Allâhu ta'âlâ, or pious Believers); and these terms have been used so far.

[Those who vie after the love of Allâhu ta'âlâ are called **MUTTAQÎ** or **SÂLIH.** Person who has already attained the love

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

of Allâhu ta'âlâ, (i.e. who is loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ), is called **WALÎ.**[1] And the person who has attained the love of Allâhu ta'âlâ and who strives to guide others in the way of attaining the love of Allâhu ta'âlâ is called MURSHÎD.]

Qur'ân al-kerîm contains many âyat-i-kerîmas concerning these four groups of people and the rewards and punishments that will be given to them. Our book would be too small to compile them and to quote them all. We shall therefore content ourselves with the citation of the meaning of one âyat-i-kerîma about each group. The sixth and seventh âyats of Baqara sûra purport concerning disbelievers: **"O My Habîb** (Most Beloved One). **It is equal** (it makes no difference) **whether you give the warning of torment to disbelievers,** [whose hearts are inaccessible to the light of îmân, whose hearts have been suffocated by the darkness of disbelief]. **They will not have îmân. Allâhu ta'âlâ has sealed up, curtained their hearts, ears and eyes. There is great torment for them."** (2-6,7) Concerning munâfiqs (hypocrites), the eighth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"Some people say: We have had belief in Allâhu ta'âlâ and in the Day of Resurrection. Yet they have not had îmân."** (2-8) [In Qur'ân al-kerîm there are thirty-two long âyats specially telling about munâfiqs. In addition, many âyats refer to nifâq (hypocricy, and instigation caused by hypocrites]. The fifty-third âyat of Zumer sûra purports about sinners: "[O My Messenger!] **Tell** [Believers from Me]: **O My born slaves who are extravagant of their selves,** [that is, who exceed the due bounds], **in sinning. Do not give up hope of the mercy of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Certainly, Allâhu ta'âlâ is Ghafûr, that is, He is very forgiving. He is Rahîm, that is, He is very compassionate."** (39-53) [This âyat-i-kerîma was revealed after the conquest of Mekka. Most of the polytheists were in fear. They did not know what sort of treatment they would be subjected to. For they had persecuted many Believers, and martyred many others. When these polytheists became Believers, no penalty, not even a slightest one, was inflicted on them. They attained the honour of joining the As-hâb-i-kirâm. In fact, even Wahshî 'radiy-Allâhu anh', who had martyred Rasûlullah's most beloved (paternal) uncle Hamza 'radiy-Allâhu anh', was forgiven and became one of the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'radiy-Allâhu anhum ajmaîn'.] Concerning the muttaqî Believers, the fourth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"Those people who believe without any doubt in**

[1] Its plural form is **AWLIYÂ.**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Qur'ân al-kerîm and the Books sent to other Prophets, [that is, the Taurah (Pentateuch), the Zebûr (the heavenly Book revealed to hadrat Dâwûd), and the Injil (Bible) in their original, unchanged forms], **and in the world to come** [the Day of Judgement]. **These people are in the way of hidâyat** (guided) **by Allâhu ta'âlâ, which is the right way, and they shall find salâh** [salvation] **from torment and punishment."** (2-4)

32 — Again, in the thirteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' illustrates with some examples the situations into which sinners fall because of the doubts caused and the seeds of instigation sown by the devil, and says that on the Day of Judgement they will be punished by burning in Hell on account of their sins. (Matt: 13-39, 40)

In Qur'ân al-kerîm there are many âyat-i-kerîmas explaining these feats of the devil and the things that he does in order to mislead people and advising not to be taken in by his tricks. The sixth âyat of Fâtir sûra purports: **"Indeed Shaytân** (satan) **is inimical to you. So you should be inimical to him. For he tempts those who obey him** [to follow their nafs and to be fond of the world and] **to join the people of Hell."** (35-6) The two hundred and eighth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"O Believers, ... do not follow Shaytân's way,** [his doubts]." (2-208)

[The hundred and sixty-eighth and the hundred and sixty-ninth âyats of Baqara sûra purport: **"... Do not follow Shaytân's way. Certainly he is an evident enemy of yours. Shaytân orders you only fahshâ,** [which means evil, obscenity, being fond of the world, following your sensuous desires]**. ..."** (2-168, 169) The two hundred and sixty-eighth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"Shaytân will intimidate you by saying that you will be impoverished** [when you are to give alms in the way of Allah], **and he will order you not to give alms. ..."** (2-268) The sixtieth âyat of Nisâ sûra purports: **"... Shaytân wants to make them fall into a heresy far from hidâyat** [by tempting them to excess]." (4-60) The sixtieth âyat of Yâsîn sûra purports: **"Do not obey Shaytân. Have I not given you the advice that he is your evident enemy? O sons of Âdam!..."** (36-60) The ninety-first âyat of Mâida sûra purports: **"Shaytân wants to leave enmity among you by** (means of) **wine and gambling. He wants to deter you from making dhikr of Allâhu ta'âlâ and from namâz. Don't you beware from these** [after knowing that they are faults]?" (5-91) The thirty-sixth âyat of Zukhrûf sûra purports: **"When a person obeys his nafs and turns away from the religion of Allâhu ta'âlâ, we send him a shaytân to**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

pester him in the world." (43-36) Qur'ân al-kerîm contains more than eighty âyat-i-kerîmas telling about the Shaytân (Satan) and intimating his vices.]

Now we shall quote a few hadîth-i-sherîfs concerning the Shaytân:

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"The inspiration coming through angels is compatible with Islam. The doubt coming from the Shaytân causes one to leave Islam."** and **"The Shaytân gives doubts to the heart. When the name of Allâhu ta'âlâ is uttered he runs away. If** (the name of Allâhu ta'âlâ) **is not mentioned, he goes on causing doubts."** and **"The compassion of Allâhu ta'âlâ is on jamâ'at** (congregation of Muslim). **The Shaytân is with the person who does not join Muslims' congregation and who dissents from them."** and **"Like the wolf carrying off a sheep that has quit the flock, the Shaytân is man's wolf. Beware from forming separate groups. Get together in jamâ'at. Run to mosques."**

Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded the Iblîs (Satan) to go to Rasûlullah and give correct answers to all the questions that he (Rasûlullah) would ask him. The Iblîs appeared before Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' in the guise of an old person. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said: **"Who are you?"** "I am the Iblîs," was the answer. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said: **"Why did you come** (here)**?"** "Allâhu ta'âlâ sent me forth and commanded me to answer your questions correctly," replied the Iblîs. Rasûlullah said: **"Then, describe the people whom you dislike and to whom you are hostile."** The Iblîs answered: "Of the (whole) world, I dislike you most, and next (I dislike) equitable sultans (rulers), those rich people who are modest, those tradesmen who tell the truth, those 'ulamâ (savants, scholars) who have ikhlâs and who act compatibly with their knowledge, mujâhids who try to promulgate Islam, those who have mercy upon people, those who make tawba (repenting for one's sins and supplicating to Allâhu ta'âlâ for forgiveness) with tawba-i-nasûh (sincere determination not to sin again), those who refrain from harâms, those who always have abdest (ritual ablution), those Muslims who always do pious, charitable deeds, those Muslims who have beautiful moral qualities and who are useful to people, those hâfîzûn (people who have committed Qur'ân al-kerîm to their memory) who read Qur'ân al-kerîm in tejwîd (rules for reading Qur'ân al-kerîm correctly), those who perform namâz while others are asleep." Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

said: **"State the people whom you like,"** and the Iblîs answered: "Cruel sultans, conceited rich people, treacherous merchants, those who have alcoholic drinks, those who sing songs at bad places, those who commit fornication, those who use orphans' property for their personal benefits, those who slight namâz and are late in performing namâz, those who bear tûl-u-emel [long-term worldly aspirations], people who become angry easily and cannot get over their anger are my friends, I like them."

[There are many hadîth-i-sherîfs about the Shaytân. Those who wish may consult books of hadîth-i-sherîfs.]

33 — In the eighteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' prohibits his Apostles from being conceited and commands them to be modest.

[The harms of being conceited and the virtues of modesty have been explained in Qur'ân al-kerîm by Allâhu ta'âlâ and in hadîth-i-sherîfs by Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'.]

The thirty-seventh and the thirty-eighth âyats of Isrâ sûra purport: **"Do not swagger about,** [that is, do not walk in an arrogant and pompous manner,] **on the earth! For you cannot cleave the earth, nor can you increase your stature so as to equal mountains. All of these are mekrûh, repulsive before your Rabb** (Allah)." (17-37, 38) [The hundred and seventy-second âyat of Nisâ sûra purports: **"... If a person refrains from worshipping Allâhu ta'âlâ because of vanity, Allâhu ta'âlâ shall get** (him and other) **such people together** [in order to punish them] **on the Day of Resurrection."** (4-172) The forty-eighth âyat of A'râf sûra purports: **"The people of A'râf shall recognize the chiefs of unbelievers by their faces and shall say unto them: Abundance** [of your property and your helpers] **and your vanity did not protect you against the torment of Allâhu ta'âlâ."** (7-48)]

Our Master, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"A person with the tiniest mote of vanity in his heart cannot enter Paradise."** and **"Allâhu ta'âlâ declares: Pride and grandeur are My properties. If a person** (attempts to) **share these two with Me, I shall hurl him into Hell without showing any mercy on him."** and **"On the Day of Resurrection, those who are arrogant in the world shall be resurrected from their graves in a despicable and contemptible manner like ants. Everybody shall despise them. They shall be put into the pit called Bolis, which is the deepest place of Hell and whose torment is the most vehement."**

Another hadîth-i-sherîf states: **"In** (one of) **the former**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

ummats, (there was) **a conceited person** (who) **walked dragging his skirts along the ground. This** (manner of his) **annoying the Divine Honour, the earth swallowed him up."**

[Modesty is the opposite of arrogance. Modesty means to deem oneself as equal to others, neither superior nor inferior to others. Modesty is a very good manner for a person.] Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"If a person is modest for the sake of Allah, Allâhu ta'âlâ shall exalt him. If a person is arrogant, Allâhu ta'âlâ shall disgrace him."**

[It is stated in hadîth-i-sherîfs: **"How lucky for a person who is modest."** and **"A person who is modest, who earns** (his living) **through halâl, who has beautiful moral qualities, who is affable to everybody and who never hurts anyone, is a very good person."**]

34 — The eighteenth and the nineteenth verses of the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew states: "... Thou shalt not steal, ..." "Honour thy father and thy mother: and, Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." (Matt: 19-18, 19)

The thirtieth âyat of Hajj sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm purports: **"... Beware from idols, which are filthy, and from giving false testimony and lying."** (22-30) The seventy-second âyat of Furqân sûra purports: **"They are** (the people) **who do not give false testimony,** [who do not attend the festivals or revels of disbelievers and polytheists], **and who turn away from them and pass by nobly without getting involved in their atrocities when they come across** [their] **mendacious and aberrant practices."** (25-72) Allâhu ta'âlâ shall exalt such Believers to the highest positions in Paradise on account of their patience. We have related some of the âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs concerning rights of parents and rights of neighbors.

35 — It is written in the twenty-sixth verse of the twentieth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' stated: "... but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister;" (Matt: 20-26)

The thirteenth âyat of the Hujurât sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm purports: **"... The most superior, the highest person among you in the sight of Allâhu ta'âlâ is the person with the most fear of Allâhu ta'âlâ. ..."** (49-13)

Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated: **"The master of a community is the person who serves them."** [Another hadîth-i-sherîf declares: **"He who rescues his brother in Islam from trouble will be given the thawâb of hajj and 'umra."** Another

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

hadîth-i-sherîf states: **"He who does not help Muslims or work for their welfare and comfort is not one of them."]**

36 — It is written in the twenty-first verse of the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', upon being asked about paying tax to the kaiser, said: "... Render therefore unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's; and unto God the things that are God's." (Matt: 22-21)

The fifty-ninth âyat of the Nisâ sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm purports: **"... Obey Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger and the ulul-emr from among you,** [i.e. sultans, rulers, judges, savants, just and equitable commanders]**. ..."** (4-59) Yet the obedience to the ulul-emr mentioned here is not absolute obedience and is restricted with the hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Where Allâhu ta'âlâ is disobeyed creatures are not to be obeyed."** The hundred and fifth âyat of Mâida sûra purports: **"O Believers! The protection and improvement of your nafs** (yourself) **is** [a duty] **on you. After you show the right way** [by commanding benefaction and prohibiting malefaction to the best of your abilities], **a person's deviation** (from the right way) **will not do you any harm. ..."** (5-105) For it is fard in Islam to do emr-i-ma'rûf, i.e. to command benefaction, and nehy-i-munker, i.e. to prohibit malefaction. As a matter of fact, the hundred and fourth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purports: "[O Believers!] **Among you there should be a group** (of Muslims) **who invite people to khayr, that is, to obeying Qur'ân al-kerîm and the sunnat of Rasûlullah, and who prohibit** (people) **from munker** [malefaction], **that is, from opposing Qur'ân al-kerîm and the sunnat of Rasûlullah. They shall attain salvation."** (3-104)

[Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' declares: **"Teach Islam to one another. If you give up emr-i-ma'rûf,** [if no one among you does emr-i-ma'rûf], **Allâhu ta'âlâ will molest you with the worst one among you and will not accept your prayers."**

Again, he (Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam') stated: **"The thawâb given for all** (kinds of) **worships is like a drop of water in comparison with a sea when it is compared to the thawâb given for jihâd** (fighting for Islam). **And the thawâb of jihâd,** (in its turn), **is like a drop of water compared to a sea when it is compared to the thawâb** (that shall be given) **for emr-i-ma'rûf and nehy-i-munker."]**

It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf narrated from Nu'mân bin Beshîr: **"The case of those who obey the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ and those who disobey them or who are slack in doing the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ is like the position of a**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

group of people who are on board a ship: these people threw lots on board the ship. The lot fell to some of them as the lower part of the ship, i.e. the hold of the ship; and the others were allotted the deck. Those who were in the lower part of the ship, whenever they [became thirsty and] **wanted to use water, went up** (on the deck) **and worried the people there by treading on them.** (Finally) **they said** (to themselves): **We might as well make a hole in the hold and get the water we need through it without having to disturb those who are (living) above us.** [One of them took an axe and began to make a hole in the hold of the ship. Those who were up (on the deck) ran down (to the hold) and said: What on earth are you doing? He replied: We have been troublesome to you. But we do need water.] **If those who were upstairs allowed those who were downstairs to make a hole in the ship, they would be destroyed altogether. If they prevented them from holing the ship by holding their hands, all of them would attain salvation."** [As is inferred from this hadîth-i-sherîf, it is incumbent on every pious Muslim and also on the government to prevent evildoers from malefaction. If they neglect this duty of preventing, the good also shall be destroyed together with the malefactors. Therefore, doing emr-i-ma'rûf and nehy-i munker is the duty of all Muslims who have the necessary competence.]

Another hadîth-i-sherîf declares: **"By the time you see my Ummat** (Muslims) **being afraid to say to a cruel person: You are cruel!, khayr** (benefaction, goodness, doing good) **will have forsaken them."**

It is declared in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"If people see something evil, and yet do not change it,** [that is, if they do not prevent it or turn it into goodness], **Allâhu ta'âlâ shall make His torment comprehensive of all of them."** It is stated in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"You must certainly command benefaction and prohibit malefaction. If you cease from emr-i-ma'rûf and nehy-i-munker, Allâhu ta'âlâ shall make the worst of you** (continuously) **molest the good ones among you. Then, if the good ones among you pray** (to Allâhu ta'âlâ for the expulsion of the evildoers), **their prayers shall not be heard."** [The sixth âyat of Tahrîm sûra purports: **"... Protect yourself and your household against the fire,..."** (66-6) The hundred and tenth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân surâ purports: **"You** [Believers] **are a beneficent Ummat selected from among people. You command goodness and prohibit evildoing and have îmân in the unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ. If the ahl al-kitâb** [Christians and Jews] **also had îmân, it would be beneficial for**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

them. ...” (3-110) And the hundred and fourteenth âyat (of the same sûra) purports: **“They have îmân** (belief) **in the unity of Allâhu ta’âlâ and in the hereafter, and command people ma’rûf,** [that is, to confirm Rasûlullah’s prophethood], **and prohibit them from munker,** [that is, from denying Rasûlullah’s prophethood]. **They race** (one another) **in benefaction. Lo! They are of the pious.”** (3-114)

Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ stated: **“Prevent the sinner with your hand. If you are unable to do this, prevent (him) verbally. If you cannot do this, either, dislike** (it) **in your heart. And this is the lowest** (grade of) **îmân.”** There are many âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs concerning emr-i-ma’rûf and nehy-i-munker. Those who want to read and learn about them may have recourse to the books of tafsîr and hadîth-i-sherîf and the books of Islamic ’Ulamâ.]

37 — It is stated in the thirty-fifth, the thirty-sixth and the thirty-seventh verses of the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: “Then one of them, ... asked him a question, ... ,” “Master, which is the great commandment in the law?” “Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.” (Matt: 22-35, 36, 37)

On the other hand, it is declared in Qur’ân al-kerîm, in the fifty-fourth âyat of Mâida sûra: “[Those Believers] **love Allâhu ta’âlâ, and Allâhu ta’âlâ loves them.”** (Paraphrased from 5-54) The hundred and sixty-fifth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **“Believers’ love of Allâhu ta’âlâ is very strong and everlasting.”** (Paraphrased from 2-165)

“Allâhu ta’âlâ declares in a hadîth-i-qudsî: **“O thou, son of Âdam! If thou wantst to love Me, expel love of the world from thine heart. For eternally I shall not bring together love of Me and love of the world in one heart. O thou, son of Âdam! How couldst thou ever want love of the world together with love of Me! Then, search for love of Me in desisting from the world** [from things prohibited by Allâhu ta’âlâ]. **O thou, son of Âdam! Whatever you do, do it compatibly with My commandments, and I shall fill thine heart with loving Me.”**

38 — As Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ describes the events towards the end of the world in the twenty-fourth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, he relates: “Immediately after the tribulation of those days shall the sun be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

heavens shall darken:" "And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven: and then shall all the tribes of the earth mourn, and they shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." "And he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, from one end of heaven to the other." (Matt: 24-29, 30, 31) "Verily I say unto you, This generation shall not pass, till all these things be fulfilled." (ibid: 34) "But of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels of heaven, but my Father only." (ibid: 36)

If the âyat-i-kerîmas of Qur'ân al-kerîm concerning the events towards the end of the world were compiled, they would make up a book bigger than the sum of the four Gospels. We shall write a few examples:

The first and second âyats of Takwîr sûra purport: **"When the sun loses its nûr and becomes dark and when stars darken and fall down on the earth like rain** (drops)." (81-1, 2) The first, second, third, fourth and fifth âyats of Inshiqâq sûra purport: **"When the sky hears the command of Allâhu ta'âlâ, obeys the command and cracks, and when the earth rightfully hears the command of its Rabb, Allâhu ta'âlâ, and throws out its contents** [the dead and treasures] **and becomes empty, and when the earth becomes absolutely flat,** [people will see their pious deeds and sins]." (84-1, 2, 3, 4, 5,) The eighth and ninth âyats of Nâziât sûra purport: **"That day hearts are distressed with fear. Eyes** [of the owners of these hearts] **are in a contemptible manner with fear."** (79-8, 9) The fifty-first âyat of Yasîn sûra purports: **"When the sûr** (trumpet) **is blown** [the second time], **people will get up from their graves and go fast towards their Rabb."** (36-51) The sixth, seventh and eighth âyats of Zilzâl sûra purport: **"That day, in order to see the rewards for their deeds, people will go to the place of Judgement in groups. Any person who has done the tiniest amount of good shall see it,** [get its reward]. **Any person who has done the tiniest amount of evil shall be punished for it."** (99-6, 7, 8) [Everybody, whether a Believer or a disbeliever, shall see on the Day of Judgement what has been done in the world. If a Believer is sunnî, that person shall be forgiven for the sins (committed and then repented and) made tawba for in the world, and shall be given thawâb (rewards) for his or her good deeds. The good deeds of disbelievers and holders of bid'at, i.e. those Believers who have (blurred their belief with) aberrant tenets, shall be spurned, and they shall be punished for their atrocities.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

The gravest punishment to be inflicted on them shall be the eternal punishment on account of disbelief. Disbelievers shall stay eternally in Hell.] The sixty-third âyat of Ahzâb sûra purports: **"O My Messenger! Disbelievers will ask you when the end of the world will come. Tell them: Allâhu ta'âlâ, alone, knows it,** [He has not intimated it to anybody]. **Perhaps it is imminent."** (33-63)

Qur'ân al-kerîm contains many âyat-i-kerîmas about the rewards that will be given to those who have beautiful moral qualities, those who purify their hearts from vicious traits, those who perform pious deeds and the punishments that will be inflicted on sinners, about law, about mu'âmalât (laws and regulations concerning the dealings and relations among people), about the properties of Paradise and Hell, about the events that will take place during the qiyâmat (the end of the world, resurrection of the dead, the Last Judgement), and about the Person of Allâhu ta'âlâ, His Attributes and Names. If these (âyat-i-kerîmas) were classified in groups and interpreted, each group would make up a book more than several times as big as the existing Gospels. Comparing Qur'ân al-kerîm to today's Gospels would be like comparing an ocean to a small pool of water. In fact, such comparison would be like that which is done between a person who has a small yard with forty or fifty trees whose branches are broken and leaves shed and another person who has several thousand fruitful trees in his orchard. The forty to fifty trees, which are the contents of the small yard, are, with their healthy, fruitful branches, only a tiny part of the vast orchard which has thousands of extremely green trees with strong branches. Being unaware of the big orchard, or because of the jealousy (that has suffused him) after seeing only a part of the orchard, the owner of the small yard normally brags about a few kinds of fruits he has and challenges: "The delicious fruits in my yard are not in yours. My yard is better-cared-for and more useful than yours. You, and also all people must believe this." What could be done against such an ignorant and imbecilic assertion? After all, the best thing we could do was be humane enough to pity that person because he was unaware of the fact and show him how his yard and the other one (the orchard) were. If he were still stubborn and insisted on his claim, he would deserve only a grin. [So is the case with Christians. Some of them, being deceived by priests and having no knowledge about Islam, refuse to accept Islam. Those who have true information about Islam become Muslims willingly. But others, being too headstrong and too

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

bigoted to accept Islam and fearing that Islam's spreading will destroy, annihilate Christianity, stir up hostility against Islam. These people have deviated from the right way, and they mislead others, too.]

He (Îsâ) went up to heaven before death,
For he wanted to be in his (Muhammad's) Ummat.

Also, it was for his (Muhammad's) sake
That the rod of Mûsâ (Moses) became a serpent.

They supplicated to Allah so earnestly
That they might become (Muhammad's) Ummat.

No doubt they also are Prophets,
But (Ahmad) is the highest of them.

For he is the most worthy of being the highest.
He who does not know so must be dumbest.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 9 —

TRINITY (Belief in Three Gods) and its FALSITY

Protestants have chosen five criterial bases for comparing Qur'ân al-kerîm with todays Gospels. On the first basis, i.e. trinity, they attribute the nonexistence of belief in three hypostases, or three gods, (which are Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit), in Qur'ân al-kerîm to the deficiency of Qur'ân al-kerîm. They assert that the doctrine of trinity was implied in the former heavenly books. After admitting in some of their own publications that this solemn matter is vague in the Taurah, they cannot forward any documents to prove their thesis, with the exception of the Gospel of John, the Book of Acts and the epistles of the Apostles. However, the books and epistles which they refer to as proofs are of no value because they are not founded on dependable facts.

Before explaining the matter of trinity, it is necessary to make some observations and explicatory remarks on **Ishâ-i-Rabbânî.** As we have already mentioned earlier, Ishâ-i-Rabbânî (the Eucharist) is one of the tenets of the Christian belief. Accordingly, since it is believed by Christians that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is one of the three persons each of which is a true god, Christians, so to say, unite with him by eating his flesh and drinking his blood. Thus the sins they have committed are pardoned, they believe, at the cost of sacrificing the Son of God [May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying or believing so]. And they believe that when a priest breathes (a certain prayer) on a piece of leavened or unleavened bread and on some wine, the bread becomes the flesh of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and the wine becomes his blood.

They say that this fact is written in the twenty-sixth and later verses of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, in the twenty-second and later verses of the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark, in the nineteenth and later verses of the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel of Luke. In fact, an event

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

that was carried out when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was alive is narrated in these Gospels. Yet none of the Gospels contains any written account of a commandment such as, "After me, always do the same and have your sins pardoned by sacrificing me." It is written in the nineteenth verse of the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel of Luke: "this do in remembrance of me." But this does not mean to say, "Practice this as (an event of) deliverance from sins" or "Make this a principle of belief." Christians share and consume bread and wine in churches. Thus, they believe, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is sacrificed, eaten, and drunk. In the matter of bread and wine's changing into flesh and blood, which means the sacrifice of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', there are various interpretations among Christian churches. According to the creed held by some of them, *"Only bread and wine change into the body and blood of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and eventually become Îsâ himself."*

When several thousand priests breathe on the pieces of bread in their hands and consecrate them, at the same time, the Christs thus made by all these priests are either different from one another or the same as one another. Their being different runs counter to the Christian cult. [For it means that many Christs, or gods (May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so), come into being.] Their being the same, on the other hand, is contrary to the nature of matter. For the substance of each of them is different from that of another. It is an apparent fact that one thing cannot be at different places at the same moment. For this reason, the pieces of bread breathed on and made sacred cannot be one Christ. This, in its turn, is rejected by Christianity. For Christians believe in the existence of only one Jesus.

When a priest divides a loaf of bread into three pieces and gives each piece to a different person, either the Christs that came into being by the changing of the bread is broken into pieces, or each piece is an entire Christ. According to the first proposition, God is broken into pieces. Believing in God's being broken into pieces is not compatible with any religion.

As for the second proposition; the bread has already been changed to one Christ. Whence do the various Christs come when the bread is broken into pieces? According to Christians' belief, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' came to earth as the propitiation of people's sins and sacrificed himself. If the sacrifice of Ishâ-i-Rabbânî which priests are practicing in churches today is the same as the sacrifice which was once being performed on the cross by Jewry, then the first Ishâ-i-Rabbânî which was performed when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

was alive by making the Apostles eat bread and drink wine would have been enough for the expiation of peoples' sins. So the sacrificial crucifixion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' on a wooden cross by Jewry — as it is believed so by Christians — would have been unnecessary. Nor would there be any reason for priests to carry out [sacramental] ceremonies all over the world. It is written at the end of the ninth chapter of the epistle to the Hebrews that the self-sacrifice of Hadrat Îsâ for the expiation of peoples sins is an event that happened only once.

[Ulfat 'Azîz as-Samed, one of the teaching staff of Peshaver University, states as follows in the section (The Sources of the Christian Doctrine) of his book titled **A Comparative Study of Christianity and Islam,** the third edition of which was published in 1399 [A.D. 1976] in Pakistan:

"In the foregoing pages it has been shown that the religion of Jesus had very little in common with Christianity as it developed sometime after his passing away and as it is believed by the various Christian churches. Jesus was a prophet, a **man** who conveyed and preached to his people the truth which had been revealed to him through inspiration by God. He exhorted them to repent and give up their evil ways. Jesus was a reformer and reviver of the true religion of Moses and other Prophets, and not the founder of a new faith. His was the religion of Sermon, and not of Sacrament. He had come to show men the way to the Kingdom of Heaven, which they could attain through the love of God and good deeds, and not to redeem them by deliberately dying on the cross as vicarious sacrifice for their sins. After his departure from this world, his immediate followers formed themselves into a community called the Nazarenes. They lived in Jerusalem and chose James, the brother of Jesus, as their head. The Nazarenes were undoubtedly faithful followers of the religion of Jesus and believed in the single personality of God and in Jesus as the Messenger of God. They strictly observed the Law of Moses in all matters, as Jesus himself had instructed them to do.

"Jesus had come, as he had said, for the 'lost sheep of the house of Israel.' The Jews who lived in Jerusalem were only a small fraction of the total Israelite population of the world. There were large Jewish colonies in lands surrounding Palestine. At the time of Jesus' birth Alexandria was a great centre of learning and culture. A large number of religions and schools of philosophy flourished there. The Jews of the dispersion had come under the influence of Greek philosophy and of Mystery Cults, each with its

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

own saviour-god. [After the short-lived Prophetic mission of Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’, which had lasted only three years, the Jews who believed in him increased in number.] When the religion of Jesus spread to these Jews and many of them accepted him as the promised Messiah, they interpreted him and his message in the light of Greek philosophy and pagan cults. Thus, quite early in its history the religion of Jesus began to undergo a transformation and several different versions of it emerged. The first sign of change was a shift in emphasis from the teaching of Jesus to an interest in his person, and the consequent attempt to glorify him. Dr. Morton Scott Enslin, who is one of the greatest Christian scholars of our time, writes in this connection:

‘An interest in the person of Jesus, a desire to explain who he was and to interpret everything in terms of him, came gradually to obscure the fact that he had never made such claims for himself, but had been content to proclaim God’s purpose for the nation and to call it to repentance. Thus Jesus became more and more one whose person was to be understood and explained rather than one whose teaching was to be believed and obeyed.’

“This tendency ultimately led to the identification of Jesus with the Greek **Logos,** as this concept had been expounded by the Alexandrian Jewish philosopher Philo, and so the consequent deification of Jesus. [We shall tell about Philo in the section **“Proving the falsity of trinity by means of the statements of Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ ”** of our book.] The writings of the Church Fathers of this period are full of unedifying and, to the modern mind, senseless controversies about the nature of Christ, his relation to God the Father, and attempts to reconcile the Godhood of Jesus with the doctrine of monotheism, on which Jesus had laid so much stress. The religion of Jesus and of the Jerusalem community of his followers was nothing more than a reformed sect of Judaism, but among the Jews of the dispersion and their Gentile neighbours, who had neither seen Jesus nor had firsthand acquaintance with his teaching, and who moreover lived in a totally different social and intellectual environment, a new religion, absolutely different from the original faith of Jesus, began to emerge. It is significant that those who claimed to believe in Jesus were called Christians and their religion Christianity first of all at Antioch towards the end of the first century. In the words of Dr. Morton Scott Enslin:[1]

---

[1] Morton Scott Enslin, Christian Beginnings, Part II, p. 172.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

'But the transfer from Jewish to Gentile soil brought even more radical changes. Not only did the movement speedily become a separate religion, distinct from Judaism, but, as its message was translated into terms intelligible and appropriate to Gentile bearers it became gradually more and more like the other cults with which it found itself in conflict. By the middle of the second century — and probably much earlier — it had become one of the Graeco Oriental cults, and like the others offered salvation to its converts through its divine Lord.'[1]

"Perhaps the first and most important person to cut off the religion of Jesus from Judaism and make it into 'one of the Graeco-Oriental cults' was St Paul. This is what H.G. Wells writes about him:

'Chief among the makers of Christian doctrine was St Paul. He had never seen Jesus nor heard him preach. Paul's name was originally Saul, and he was conspicuous at first as an active persecutor of the little band of disciples after the crucifixion. Then he was suddenly converted to Christianity, and he changed his name to Paul. He was a man of great intellectual vigour and deeply and passionately interested in the religious movements of the time. He was well versed in Judaism and in the Mithraism and Alexandrian religions of the day. He carried over many of their ideas and terms of expression into Christianity. He did very little to enlarge or develop the original teaching of Jesus, the teaching of the Kingdom of Heaven. But he taught that Jesus was not only the promised Christ, the promised leader of the Jews, but also that his death was a sacrifice, like the deaths of the ancient sacrificial victims of the primordial civilizations for the redemption of mankind.'[2]

"That the religion of St Paul was absolutely different from the simple faith of Jesus is admitted by Dr. Morton Scott Enslin:

'It is today perfectly obvious that there is a vast difference between the nature of the messages of Jesus and Paul. At times this has led to unsparing condemnation of Paul and his associates who perverted the simple gospel stream. The slogan, "Back to Jesus," has simply meant "Away from Paul." But although many of the early Judaizers may well have shared this feeling, their

---

[1] Ibid Part II, p. 187.

[2] H.G. Wells, **A Short History of the World** (A Pelican Book), pp. 129-30

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

opposition was as futile as Canute's[1] attempt to hold back the waves. To make it concrete: Had Jesus been able to attend a Church service in Corinth in the year 54 A.D., he would have been astounded, and might well have asked himself in amazement: Is this the result of my work in Galilee? But it is none the less certain had there been no changes, there would have been no Christianity.'[2]

"Paul not only brought about a final cleavage between Jews and Christians by making Christianity into a mystery cult and Jesus into a savior-god, but he also declared the Law of Moses to be a 'curse,' although Jesus had said:

'Whosoever... shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach man so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven; but whosoever shall do and teach them, the same shall be called great in the kingdom of heaven' [Matthew, 5-19]. There were bitter controversies and charges and counter-charges between Paul and his associates on the one hand and the Jerusalem community of the followers of Jesus on the other. Faint echoes of these controversies can still be heard in the New Testament. It was naturally the Pauline version of Christianity which proved more popular among the Jews of the dispersion and the Gentiles, and spread rapidly over large parts of the Roman Empire. Then with the destruction of the Temple and the expulsion of the Jerusalem community of the followers of Jesus, together with the Jews, from Jerusalem in 70 C.E., the original faith of Jesus received a stunning blow from which it could not fully recover. It, however, continued to flourish for some time as a small sect in Syria. Recently a document has been discovered in the archives of Istanbul, which expounds the religious views of this sect of Nazarenes. This tenth-century manuscript is an Arabic translation of much older Syriac work, probably dating from the fifth century and written by a member of the Nazarene community. Dr. Shlomo Pines and Professor David Flusser (both of the Hebrew University), who have examined the manuscript, are of the view that the text accurately reflects the faith of the first

---

[1] Canute (995?-1035), a Danish king of England whose followers thought that he could stop the sea rising by ordering it back, but he showed them that it was impossible. People sometimes mention Canute and the waves when they are talking about how impossible it is to stop something from happening.

[2] Morton Scott Enslin, op. cit., Part II, p. 172.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

disciples of Jesus. This document refers to Jesus simply as a great Prophet and righteous man. Much of the text consists of polemics against St Paul, charging him with heretically substituting Roman doctrines and customs for the authentic teaching of Jesus and falsely proclaiming him to be God.

"The influence of the Greek philosophical schools of Platonism, Stoicism and Gnosticism was an important factor in the formulation of the Christian doctrine as Dr. Edwin Hathc has shown in his admirable work *The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity.* But the decisive influence was that of the Mystery Cults. There were several mystery cults in the Roman world of those days, having many differences among them, but they appear to have had at least four characteristics in common: (1) Every one of them believed in a saviour-god, whose death was an atonement for the sins of men and a means of salvation for those who believed in him, (2) All had some purifactory rite of initiation through which the initiate had to pass. (3) All were essentially mysteries of communion with the deity who, through a rite involving a symbolic eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, came into union with his votaries. (4) All looked forward to the future life and secured for the initiate a happy reception in the world beyond the grave.

[Encyclopedia Americana gives the following information about the word (Sacrifice):

'The ancient Greeks performed sacramental rites called (thusiai) and (sphagia) in the name of the god of heaven, Olympus. Thusiai was performed always during the day, preferably in the morning. Certain parts of the animals sacrificed were burned on stakes on a rock called (Bomos). The remaining parts were eaten by people that gathered around a tall rock. The rite ended in music and dancing.

'The sacrificial rite called Sphagia was performed at night. The rock used for the burning of the meat in this rite was called (eschara).

'These Greek names of rites were expressed only with the word (sacrifice) in Latin. And the word (Altars) was used for the words (Bomos), the rock whereon the sacrifices were burned, and (eschara), the rock around which people gathered and ate the sacrifices.'

On the other hand, in the sacrament called the Eucharist, which is performed in the Christian religion, the rock used for

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

putting the bread and wine on and gathering around is called (Altar), too. And this sacrament, too, is accompanied by music. When the consecrated bread is broken, (Christians believe), the sacrifice will have been performed, and when it is dunked into the wine and eaten, one will have, so to speak, united with God spiritually. Similarity between the Greek rites (thusiai) and (sphagia) and the sacrament called the Eucharist is quite obvious. We shall continue with this subject.] There can be no doubt about the fact that it was as a result of the influence of the mystery cults that Jesus was made into a saviour-god and his supposed death on the cross to be regarded as propitiatory sacrifice which had given satisfaction to the outraged justice of God, reconciled the angry God to sinful humanity and obtained salvation for those who believe in him. The two most important Christian rites or sacraments are Baptism and the Eucharist. The former is an initiatory rite by which a man is purified of the orginal sin, transformed from the child of wrath into the child of grace and initiated into the Christian fold. In the second of these rites (the Eucharist or the Mass or the Holy Communion) the participant supposedly eats the flesh and drinks the blood of Jesus Christ. The Roman Catholic Church and also a few orthodox Protestant churches believe that the elements (i.e. the consecrated bread and wine) are literally converted into the flesh and blood of Christ (the doctrine of the tran-substantiation). The less orthodox Protestant church consider this rite to be a symbolical eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood of Jesus Christ, which brings the participant into union with God. That Christianity had become and continues to be essentially a mystery cult, like so many others of that age, is frankly admitted by Dr. Morton Scott Enslin.

'By the second century Christianity had become one of these cults. Jesus was the divine Lord. He too had found the road to heaven by his suffering and resurrection. He too had God for his father. He had left behind the secret whereby men could achieve the goal with him. The convert that was buried with Christ in baptism, was born again. That Christianity was so regarded is perfectly clear from the pains Justin Martyr takes to prove that these resemblances between Christianity and the other religions were all due to the malignity of the demons. These wretched demons had read the Scriptures and had realised, although imperfectly, what was destined to be. They trembled as they saw their coming overthrow and realised their helplessness to prevent

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

it. To salvage as much as possible and to delude men they hastily concocted rites and ceremonies as near as possible to those they foresaw were to be instituted. Thus they hoped that when Christ appeared and instituted his worship men might be deluded into believing that the Christians were borrowing from older pagan ceremonies and beliefs. To the modern student this explanation of Justin may seem most naive; none the less, it is highly important as incontrovertible evidence of the growing likeness of Christianity to the other cults which made such an explanation essential."[1]

"In his book **The Origins of Religion,** Lord Raglan traces the origin of the mystery cults to what he regards as one of the earliest rituals, a sort of restoration rite. In prehistoric times, he points out, it was the custom in several communities to choose a young man as the destined divine victim and to keep him with divine honours for a year. He was treated as the most privileged guest of the whole community and all his wishes were satisfied. At the end of the year, however, he was ritually slaughtered and his flesh was eaten and blood drunk by some representative men of the community to bring new life to all those on whose behalf this rite was performed. Portions of the flesh and blood of the sacrificed man were also scattered over the field to give it fertility and revive the world. In the course of time the chosen sacrificial victim conspired with the priests to have a substitute slaughtered in his place. He would abdicate for a short while, the substitute would be compelled to take his place and be sacrificed. He would then resume the place of honour, thus making himself a sort of permanent privileged guest or ruler. Lord Raglan traces the ideas of kingship as well as of godhood to this sacrificial victim. The divine sacrificial victim, who had thus managed to become a permanent privileged guest of the community while his substitutes were slaughtered year after year, was the first king as well as the first living god. When later on his divinity came to be regarded as separate from him, though residing in him, he began to be worshipped as the incarnation of the invisible god, or as his son.

[Traditional narratives pertaining to ancient heathen cultures and nations and fabling about their gods, semigods and heroes are called mythology.] Lord Raglan believes that a myth is a story linked with a religious rite. Rites come first and myths are invented later on to "explain" the rites. Thus, following, this

---

[1] Ibid, Part 12, pp. 130-91.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

restoration rite, several myths of saviour-gods were invented. By their deaths and resurrection these saviour-gods brought new life and salvation to those who believed in them. The most important ceremony connected with the cult of the saviour-god was the symbolical eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, which was supposed to bring the partaker into union with the god. It enshrined the memory of the times when the sacrificial victim, the prototype of the saviour-god, was actually slaughtered and his flesh eaten and blood drunk.

"In the course of years the myth of the saviour-god became fused with the myth of the sun-god, and thus every one of them was believed to have been born at the time of Winter Solstice, which, according to the old Julian calendar, was 25th of December (the **Christmas** of the **Christians**). Each one of the saviour-sungods met violent death and came back to life at the time of Vernal Equinox (the Easter of the Christians). Edward Carpenter has pointed out the similarities between the myths of the various saviour-gods — Dionysus of the Greeks, Hercules of the Romans, Mithras of the Persians. Osiris, Isis and Horus of Egypt, Baal of the northern Semites, Tammuz of the Babylonians and Assyrians, etc. — and the story of Jesus. About all or nearly all of them it was believed that —

(1) They were born on or very near the Christmas day,

(2) They were born of virgin mothers,

(3) And in a cave or underground chamber,

(4) They led a life of toil for mankind,

(5) They were called by the names of Light-Bringer, Healer, Mediator, Saviour and Deliverer,

(6) They were, however, vanquished by the Powers of Darkness,

(7) They descended into Hell or the underworld,

(8) They rose again from the dead, and became pioneers of mankind to the heavenly world,

(9) They founded communion of saints and churches to which the disciples were received by baptism,

(10) They were commemorated by Eucharistic meals.[1]

"When Jesus was deified and made into a saviour-god, all these features of these older saviour-gods were included in his

---

[1] Quoted by Ehwajah Kamaluddin in *The Sources of Christianity, pp. 29-30.*

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

story and in the religion which flourished under his name. So much so that even the birthday of Jesus was fixed on 25th of December, more than five centuries after he was born. According to Wallace K.Ferguson, Professor of History, New York University:

'Christian celebrations were designed to replace pagan feasts and holidays. For example, the date of Christmas was set on the birthday of Mithras (the unconquered Sun), which had long been a day of joyous celebration in the pagan world. The assimilation by Christianity of so much of popular belief and practice was in no small degree responsible for its almost universal acceptance during this period, but it involved the sacrifice of its early purity and simplicity.'[1]

"Lord Raglan, who has made a detailed study of the stories of mythical heroes in another of his admirable books, **The Hero**, has tabulated the typical incidents, which occur in the majority of stories, into the following pattern:

(1) The hero's mother is a royal virgin;

(2) His father is a king, and

(3) Often a near relative of his mother, but

(4) The circumstances of his conception are unusual, and

(5) He is also reputed to be the Son of God.

(6) At birth an attempt is made, usually by his father or his maternal grandfather, to kill him, but

(7) He is spirited away, and

(8) Reared by foster-parents in a far country.

(9) We are told nothing of his childhood, but

(10) On reaching manhood he returns or goes to his future kingdom.

(11) After a victory over the king and/or a giant, dragon, or wild beast,

(12) He marries a princess, often the daughter of his predecessor, and

(13) Becomes a king.

(14) For a time he reigns uneventfully, and

(15) Prescribes laws, but

---

[1] Wallace K.Ferguson, A Survey of European Civilization, Part I, p. 112.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

(16) Later he loses favour with the gods and/or his subjects, and

(17) Is driven from the throne and city, after which

(18) He meets with a mysterious death,

(19) Often at the top of a hill.

(20) His children, if any, do not succeed him.

(21) His body is not buried, but nevertheless

(22) He has one or more holy sepulchres.[1]

"Out of these twenty-two points, Lord Raglan informs us that Oedipus scores full marks, Theseus twenty points, Romulus eighteen points, Heracles seventeen points, Prerseus eighteen points, Jason fifteen points, Pelops thirteen points, Dionysus nineteen points, Apollo eleven points, and Zeus fifteen points. The story of the Christian Jesus closely conforms to the pattern and he scores fifteen points. His mother, Mary, is (1) a virgin, and his father Joseph is (2) a descendant of the great king David, and is (3) closely related to her; but (4) he is conceived by the Holy Ghost, and so (5) he is regarded as the Son of God (6) Soon after his birth king Herod makes an attempt to kill him, but (7) he is spirited away, and (8) reared by Mary and foster father Joseph in the far-off country of Egypt. (9) We are told nothing of his childhood in the Gospels, but (10) on reaching manhood he comes out as a public preacher and finally enters Jerusalem riding on a colt and is greeted by the crowd with the shout 'Blessed is the King of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord' (John, 12- 13). Earlier, before beginning his public ministry, he had (11) gained victory over Satan. (18) He is crucified together with two malefactors, and (19) on the top of a hill (called Calvary/Golgotha. (21) Though he came back to life and ascended in his physical body to heaven to sit at the right hand of God, yet (22) he has a holy sepulchre near Jerusalem.

"This leaves no doubt at all in our minds regarding the sources of the Christian doctrine. [We shall give further examples later on, i.e. in the section **Proving the Falsity of Trinity by means of the Statements of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'**.] In the words of the well-known philosopher and historian, Winwood Reade:

'Christianity had conquered paganism, and paganism had corrupted Christianity. The legends which belonged to Osiris and Apollo had been applied to the life of Jesus. The single Deity of

---

[1] Lord Raglan, *The Hero.* pp. 178-79.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

the Jews had been exchanged for the Trinity which the Egyptians had invented and which Plato had idealised into a philosophic system, [and which had existed in Brahminism, too]. The man who had said "Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God" had now himself been made a god — or the third part of one.'[1]

"Gilbert Murray, the great Classical scholar, thus sums up the similarities between the pagan and Christian beliefs, showing Christianity's indebtedness to the pagan religions and philosophies for the most vital and essential features of its doctrine:

"The transition consisted largely in giving a new name and history to some old objects of worship which already had had many names and legends attached to it. Nay, more, in the metaphysical and theological doctrines formulated in the Creeds, except where they were specially meant to controvert the old system, he (the Levantine pagan) would at least recognise for the most part ideas which he had heard discussed.

"He believed in God as a 'Father' and would have no quarrel with a Christian as to the exact meaning of that metaphysical term; the attribute 'Almighty' he accepted, though both Christian and pagan theologians had the same difficulty in dealing with the implications of that term and explaining how the All-Good and Almighty permitted evil. The average Greek did not think of God as the 'maker of heaven and earth'; the thought was Hebrew or Babylonian, but was not strange to the Hellenistic world. The idea of an only begotten Son of God was regular in the Orphic system, and that of a Son of God by a mortal woman, conceived in some spiritual way, and born for the saving of mankind, was at least as old as the fifth century B.C. In a simpler and more natural form it was much earlier. That this Saviour 'suffered and was buried' is common to the vegetation or year religions, with their dying and suffering gods; and the idea had been sharpened and made more living both by the thought of Plato's 'righteous man' and by the various 'kings of the poor' who had risen and suffered in the slave revolts. That after the descent to Hades he should arise to judge both the quick and the dead is a slight modification of the ordinary Greek notion, according to which the Judges were already seated at their work, but it may have come from the Saviour religions.

---

[1] Winwood Reade, *The Martydom of Man*, pp. 173-84.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

"The belief in God as a Trinity, or as One substance with three *'personae'* — the word simply means 'masks' or 'dramatic roles'[1] — is directly inherited from Greek speculation. The third person was more usually feminine, the divine wisdom, or Providence, or the Mother of the Son; the 'Spirit' or 'Breath of God' comes from the Hebrews. Belief in the Holy Catholic Church was again not the pagan's own belief, but it was the sort of belief with which he was quite familiar. He accepted belief in some church or community, be it that of Mithras or Hermes-Thoth or some familiar Healer. If the 'communion of the saints' originally meant the sharing of all property among the faithful, that practice was familiar in certain congregations; if it meant, as is now generally understood, the existence of a certain fellowship or community between those who are 'pure', whether dead, living, or divine, it was an idea prevalent in Stoicism."[2] Here we end our quotations from the book of the Professor of Peshaver University.]

[As all these show, Christianity is not the Nasranî (Nazarene) religion that was taught by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and which was the continuation of the sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. It is an unreasonable and illogical religion, a mixture of idolatry lurking behind the name of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Many Christian men of religion, professors, scholars and scientists frankly write that such Christian ceremonies as Baptism and the Eucharist did not exist in the Îsawî religion but were adopted later from idolatry and inserted into it, and that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', who was a human being and a Prophet, was divinized afterwards. Instead of answering these writings and the questions directed towards them by Islamic scholars, priests choose to seize and destroy these books (containing such writings and questions), and publish books and pamphlets, adding a number of new lies, errors and absurdities to the old lot. And this shows us that by the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Christianity had gone entirely bankrupt, and it has been understood clearly that it is empty, void.]

Two Jesuit priests went to the city of Kanton for the first time in order to Christianize the Chinese people. [Jesuit is a missionary society founded by Ignatius Loyola in 918 (A.D. 1512).] They asked the governor of Kanton for permission to preach the

---

[1] Medieval English, Old French, 'Persone', from Latin, 'Persona', which means 'actor's mask', 'character in play'.

[2] Gilbert Murray *Humanist Essays,* pp. 134-135.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Christian religion. The governor took no heed of them. But when the Jesuits annoyed him by coming to him every day (and soliciting for permission), he said at last, "I have to ask the Faghfûr [Emperor] of China for permission for this. I shall let him know." So he reported the matter to the Emperor of China. The answer was: "Send them to me. I want to know what they want." Upon this he sent the Jesuits to Peking, the capital of China. This news caused great alarm among the Buddhist priests. [They begged the Faghfûr to expel the Jesuits from the country on the grounds that "These men are trying to imbue our people with a new religion which emerged under the name Christianity. These men do not recognize the Holy Buddha. They are going to misguide our people."] The Faghfûr said, "We must listen to them first. Then we will decide." He made an assembly of the eminent statesmen and clergy of the country. Inviting the Jesuits, he told them to explain to the assembly what the principles of the religion they wanted to promulgate were. Upon this the Jesuits made the following discourse:

"God, the Creator of heaven and earth, is one. Yet at the same time, He is three. God's only Son and the Holy Ghost, too, are a God each. This God created Adam and Eve and put them in Paradise. He gave them all kinds of blessings. Only, He commanded them not to eat from a certain tree. Somehow the Satan deceived Eve. And she, in her turn, deceiving Adam, they disobeyed God's command by eating fruit from the tree. Therefore God deported them from Paradise and sent them to the world. Here they had children and grandchildren. They were all sinful because they had been depraved by the sin committed by their grandfather. This state lasted six thousand years. Eventually God pitied human beings, yet He found no other way than sending His own son for the expiation of their sin and immolating His only son as an atonement of the sin. The Prophet we believe in is Jesus the Son of God. There is a city called Jerusalem in a region called Palestine to the west of Arabia. In Jerusalem there is a place called Jelîla (Galilee), which has a village named Nâsira (Nazareth). One thousand years ago there lived a girl named Maryam (Mary) in this village. This girl was betrothed to her paternal first cousin, but she was a virgin yet. One day, as she was alone, the Holy Ghost appeared and put the Son of God into her. That is, the girl became pregnant, virgin as she was. [Then, as she and her fiance were on their way to Jerusalem, she had a child in a stable in Beyt-i-lahm (Bethlehem).

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

They placed the Son of God into the manger in the stable. The monks in the east, who knew that he was born when they saw that a new star suddenly emerged in the sky, set out for him with presents in their hands, and at last they found him in this stable. They prostrated themselves in front of him. The Son of God, called Jesus, preached to God's creatures until he was thirty-three years old. He said, 'I am the Son of God. Believe in me. I came to save you.' He displayed numerous miracles, such as resuscitating the dead, making the blind see again, making the lame walk, curing the leprous, stopping sea-storms, feeding ten-thousand people with two fish, changing water into wine, withering a fig tree with one (hand) signal because it did not yield any fruit in winter, and so forth. Yet very few people believed in him. Eventually, the treacherous Jews betrayed him to the Romans, thus causing him to be crucified. However, three days after dying on the cross, Christ resurrected and showed himself to those who believed in him. Then he ascended to heaven and sat on the right hand side of his Father. And his Father left all the matters of this world over to him. And He Himself withdrew. This is the basis of the religion we are going to preach. Those who believe in this shall go to Paradise in the hereafter, and those who do not shall go to Hell."

Listening to these words, the Chinese Emperor said to the priests, "I shall ask you some questions. Answer these questions." Then he began asking his questions, "My first question is this: You say on the one hand that God is one and on the other hand that He is three. This is as nonsensical as saying that two and two make five. Explain this theory to me." The priests **could not answer.** They said, "This is a secret that belongs exclusively to God. It is beyond the human comprehension." The Faghfûr (Emperor) said, "My second question is this: God is the almighty creator of the earth, heaven, and all the universe, and yet, on account of a sin committed by one person, He ascribes the blame on all his progeny, who are completely unaware of the (sinful) deed (committed by their forefather); is this possible? And why is it that He did not find any other way than sacrificing His own son as an atonement for them? Is it worthy of His Majesty? How will you answer this?" The priests, once again, **could not answer.** "This, too, is a secret peculiar to God," they said. The Faghfûr said, "And my third question: Jesus asked the fig tree to give fruit prematurely, and then withered it because it would not give fruit. It is impossible for a tree to give fruit out of season. Despite this

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

fact, would it not be cruelty for Jesus to get angry with the tree and wither it? Could a Prophet be cruel?" The priests **could not answer** this, either. Instead, they said, "These things are spiritual. They are God's secrets. The human mind cannot comprehend them." Upon this, the Chinese Emperor said, "I give you the permission (you want). Go and preach in any part of China." When they withdrew from the Emperor's presence, the Emperor turned to those who were present, and said, "I do not presume that anyone in China would be so stupid as to believe in such absurdities. I therefore find nothing wrong in allowing these men to preach these superstitions. I feel certain that, after listening to them, our compatriots will see that there are such idiotic tribes over the world and think even more favourably of their own faith." In order to remind the fact that the priests could not answer any of the questions, we have titled our book **Could Not Answer.**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 10 —
PROVING THE FALSITY OF TRINITY BY MEANS OF THE STATEMENTS OF ÎSÂ 'alaihis-salâm'

The Gospels contain many verses proving the fact that the belief of trinity is wrong.

[Before citing those verses, it will be useful to give brief information on the origin of the belief of trinity [three gods], which was inserted into Christianity afterwards. In all the religions that have been revealed since Âdam 'alaihis-salâm', Allâhu ta'âlâ has been the [only] creator and owner, and His name has been (ALLAH) in all these religions. Everybody with common sense will know that it is wrong to believe in trinity, three gods. The fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one is stated also in the Gospel written by Barnabas, one of the Apostles. The Gospel of Barnabas was published in Turkish in 1987, in Istanbul. As the Bible was being translated into Greek and Latin, the Romans, who had had hundreds of gods till that time, were not satisfied with one God, and wanted to multiply the number. They inserted this (theory) into the Gospel of John first. The original copy of the Gospel had already been lost, and they changed it for good this time. This doctrine was validated by force in the council (the ecclesiastical assembly) which was convoked by Constantine the Great in 325. Its reason was that the Greeks adhered to the Platonic philosophy. The Platonic philosophy is based on three principles: Morals, mind, and nature. And nature is divided into three: plants, animals, and human beings. According to Plato, the Power that created the world is one, but He may have two assistants. This theory gave birth to the doctrine of trinity. Though the doctrine of trinity was first seen in the Gospel of John, the same Gospel contains verses proving the fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one. We shall mention some of them.]

The third verse of the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

John states: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, who thou hast sent." (John: 17-3) This verse announces clearly that Allâhu ta'âlâ is **(ONE),** who is the owner of real, eternal life, and that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is a Messenger sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ.

By commanding through this verse to have belief in the eternal life, i.e. life in the hereafter, in the existence and unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and in Prophets, the Gospel of John enjoins that a doctrine running counter to this, i.e. trinity, is an everlastingly inadmissible falsity. [This verse of John's declares that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is a Messenger, a Prophet. Thinking and believing otherwise afterwards means apparent aberration that will annihilate the eternal life, the everlasting felicity in the hereafter. In the beginning of the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of John Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is quoted as praying as follows on the cross: "And this is life eternal, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent." [Verse: 3]. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' announces here that Allâhu ta'âlâ is the only being who is to be worshipped, who is worthy of being worshipped, and he himself (Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm') is His born slave and Messenger. He informs that eternal life, life in Paradise is impossible unless it is accepted and believed that Allâhu ta'âlâ is the one Rabb and he (Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm') is the Prophet. This is the very fact taught by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and all the other Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm' alike. That is, it is to believe in the existence and the unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ and to confirm His Prophets.] Islam, alone, comprehends this belief of the eternal life to come in its entire and correct sense. Since Christians have fallen into the abyss of trinity; Jews do not believe in Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', [and sordidly traduce that immaculate Prophet, and do not believe in Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', either]; idolaters, [those who do not believe in any religion, atheists] deny all Prophets; there cannot be a real life of felicity, life of Paradise for them. [As a punishment for their denial of Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Prophets and their slanderous and inimical attitude, they shall remain forever in Hell. They shall lead a grievous, torturous life in Hell.]

It is written in the twenty-ninth and later verses of the twelfth chapter of the Gospel of Mark that when a Jewish scholar asked Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' what the first and the most important commandment was, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said, "... The first of all the commandments is, Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is one Lord:" "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment." "And the second is like, namely this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself, There is none other commandment greater than these." "And the scribe said unto him, Well, Master, thou hast said the truth: for there is one God; and there is none other but he:" "And to love him with all the heart and with all the understanding, and with all the soul, and with all the strength, and to love his neighbour as himself, is more than all whole burnt offerings and sacrifices." "And when Jesus saw that he answered discreetly, he said unto him, Thou art not far from the kingdom of God. ..." (Mark: 12-29 to 34)

In the thirty-sixth, thirty-seventh and thirty-eighth verses of the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel of Matthew when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was asked, "Master, which is the great commandment in the law?" "Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind." "This is the first and great commandment." (Matt: 22-36, 37, 38) And it is stated in the fortieth verse that all Sharî'ats and Prophets are dependent on this commandment. [The fact that Allah is One is written clearly in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. The word 'Father' means 'Rabb', 'Owner', and 'Lord'. It does not mean biological father.]

[Furthermore, the epistles that have been annexed to the Bible and are therefore considered to be its components contain statements expressing that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one.

The twentieth verse of the third chapter of Paul's epistle to the Galatians states: "... but God is one." (Gal: 3-20)

The fourth, the fifth and the sixth verses of the fourth chapter of Paul's epistle to the Ephesians state: "There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling;" "One Lord, one faith, one baptism," "One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in you all." (Eph: 4-4, 5, 6)

The seventeenth verse of the first chapter of I Timothy states: "Now unto the King eternal, immortal, invisible, the only wise God, be honour and glory for ever and ever. Amen." (I Tim: 1-17)

The third, fourth and fifth verses of the second chapter state: "For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Saviour;" "Who will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth." "For there is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus;" (ibid: 2-3, 4, 5) The twenty-fifth verse of the Epistle of Jude states: "To the only wise

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

God our Saviour." (Jude: 25)]

The first commandment, the first injunction in the Taurah, [in the genuine Injîl (the Bible in its pristine purity)], in all the heavenly Books, [and in the Sharî'ats of all Prophets], is tawhîd, which means to believe in the existence and unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Had the first and the most important commandment been trinity, Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' and all the succeeding Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm' would have announced it overtly. None of those Prophets stated anything like that. This is another proof testifying to the fact that the doctrine of trinity did not exist originally but appeared afterwards.

[These verses from the New Testament definitely rescind the Christian doctrine of (belief in three Gods). Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' overtly commands here to believe in Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is one, and to love Him more than anything else. Paul also wrote in every occasion in his epistles that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one. If Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' were a God as Christians believe, he would have said that the primary commandment was to love him and that there were three Gods.

The Taurah, too, announces the unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ in many places.

The thirty-ninth verse of the fourth chapter of Tesniya (Deuteronomy) states: "Know therefore this day, and consider it in thine heart, that the Lord he is God in heaven above, and upon the earth beneath: there is none else." (Deut: 4-39)

The fourth and fifth verses of the sixth chapter state: "Hear, O Israel: The Lord our God is our Lord:" "And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thine soul, and with all thy might." (ibid: 6-4, 5)

The thirty-ninth verse of the thirty-second chapter states: "See now that I, even I, am he, and there is no god with me: I kill, and make alive; ..." (ibid: 32-39)

The twenty-fifth and twenty-sixth verses of the fortieth chapter of (the Book of) Isaiah state: "To whom then will ye liken me, or shall I be equal? saith the Holy One [Allah]." "Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, ..." (Is: 40-25, 26)

The tenth and later verses of the forty-third chapter state: "Ye are my witnesses, saith the Lord, and my servant whom I have chosen; that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

after me." "I, even I, am the LORD; and beside me there is no saviour." "... saith the Lord, that I am God." (ibid: 43-10, 11, 12)

The fifth verse of the forty-fifth chapter states: "I am the LORD, and there is none else, there is no God beside me, ..." (ibid: 45-5)

The tenth verse of the second chapter of Malachi states: "Have we not all one father? hath not one God created us? ..." (Mal: 2-10)

Again, in Isaiah, the eighteenth verse of its forty-fifth chapter reads: "For thus saith the Lord that created the heavens; God himself that formed the earth and made it; he hath established it, he created it not in vain, he formed it to be inhabited: I am the Lord; and there is none else." (Is: 45-18)

The twenty-first and twenty-second verses state: "... have not I the LORD? and there is no God beside me; a just God and a Saviour; there is none beside me." "Look unto me, and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else." (ibid: 21-22)

The ninth verse of the forty-sixth chapter states: "... I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me," (ibid: 46-9)

Inasmuch as the Old Testament section of the Holy Bible is included in the Christian belief, it must be interesting to know what Christians will do about these verses. For these verses reject belief in any god, no matter what it be called, son or holy ghost or whatsoever, except (ALLÂHU TA'ÂLÂ). They declare definitely that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one and He has no partner or likeness. Believing in trinity, Christians deny these verses.]

In the thirty-second verse of the thirteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' says, "But of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father." (Mark: 13-32)

It is written as follows in the twentieth and later verses of the twentieth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: "Then came to him the mother of Zeb'e-dee's children with her sons, worshipping him, and desiring a certain thing of him." "And he saith unto her, What wilt thou? She saith unto him, Grant that these my two sons may sit, the one on thy right hand, and the other on the left, in thy kingdom." "But Jesus answered and said, Ye know not what ye ask. ..." "... but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Father." (Matt: 20-20, 21, 22, 23)

[As is stated in the Gospel of Mark, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' declared that he did not know when the end of the world will come, and that Allâhu ta'âlâ, alone, knows its time. He did not refrain from saying this publicly. Mustn't a person who is believed to be the son of Allah or Allah himself know this? Some Christians tried to explain this (contradiction) in various ways, but they were not convinced by their own explanations.]

The verses we have cited from the existing Gospels and from the Old Testament cry out the fact that the doctrine of trinity is wrong. For these verses take knowledge and power away from Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and assign them to Allâhu ta'âlâ.

The sixteenth and seventeenth verses of the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew state: "And, behold, one came and said unto him, Good Master, what good shall I do, that I may have eternal life?" "And he said unto him, Why callest thou me good? There is none good but one, that is, God: ..." (Matt: 19-16, 17) This verse extirpates trinity.

[These statements of Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' are written textually in the Holy Bible which was published in Istanbul in the lunar year 1303 [A.D. 1886] by British and American Bible corporations.[1] On the other hand, this seventeenth verse is written as, "Jesus said unto him: Why do you ask me of goodness? There is one (who is) good," in the Holy Bible published in 1982 by the united Bible societies.[2] As it is seen, the expression, The phrase 'none... but one' in the statement "There is none good but one," has been excised. The statement about the unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ has been detoured. Thus a new mutilation has been added to the changes that have been exercised on the Bible throughout centuries.]

In the forty-sixth verse of the twenty-seventh chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', as he was on the cross, cried out: "... E'li, E'li, la'ma sa-bach'tha-ni? that is to say, My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" (Matt: 27-46) On the other hand, it is written in the forty-sixth verse of the twenty-third chapter of the Gospel of Luke that he cried, "... Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit: ..." (Luke: 23-46) These verses announce without any doubt that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is not divine.

---

[1] The Holy Bible, 1978, National Publishing Comp., U.S.A.

[2] Turkish Bible, UBS-EPF-1982-7 M-53, N.T., p. 21

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

[If Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had been the same as the Rabb, he would not have asked for help from anyone. He would not have said, "I trust my soul to Thine hands." Will a God die? Will a God ever ask for help from others, or become sorry or aggrieved? A God must be eternal, permanent, alive [hayy], immortal, and must not need anyone. It is written clearly in the Old Testament that this is so.

It is written in the twenty-seventh and twenty-eighth verses of the fortieth chapter of Isaiah: "O Israel, ..." "Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard? that the everlasting God, the LORD, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? There is no searching of his understanding." (Is: 40-27, 28)

It is stated in the sixth verse of the forty-fourth chapter: "Thus saith the LORD the King of Israel, and his redeemer the LORD of hosts; I am the first, and I am the last; and beside me there is no God." (ibid: 44-6)

And it is written in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth verses of the tenth chapter of the Book of Jeremiah: "But the LORD is the true God, he is the living God, and an everlasting king: at his wrath the earth shall tremble, and the nations shall not be able to abide his indignation." "... The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens." "He hath made the earth by his power, he hath established the world by his wisdom, and hath stretched out the heavens by his discretion." (Jer: 10-10, 11, 12)

As is concluded from these verses in the Old Testament, Allâhu ta'âlâ is one and has infinite power. He is Allah, to whom Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' entrusted himself and asked for help as, according to the Christian cult, he was being crucified [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us against saying or believing so]. While believing in the divinity of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', Christians not only acknowledge at the same time that he died, but also believe that after death he will enter Hell as an atonement for people's sins. They put forward the eighteenth and the nineteenth verses of the third chapter of Peter's first epistle as an evidence for proving that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' will enter Hell.

Rahmatullah Efendi 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' explains this Christian belief and priests' writings and answers in this respect in his book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq,** and states: In a meeting the famous priest Martiros said: "No doubt, Jesus had accepted to be human like us. For this reason, he would have to put up with all the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

calamities and afflictions that have and would come unto human beings. As a matter of fact, he did put up with them all. To this effect he entered Hell and was tormented. As he went out of Hell, he took along all of those who had entered Hell before him out with him." There are credal differences among Christian sects in this respect. A person in whom they believe as such is at the same time, according to them again, an omnipresent God who dominates over and owns all.]

It is stated in the fourteenth and later verses of the twentieth chapter of the Gospel of John: "Jesus showed himself to Mary of Magdala. And he said unto her: Do not touch me. For I have not ascended near my father yet. But go to my brothers [Apostles] and tell them: I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God." (Paraphrased from John: 20-14 to 17)

It is understood from these verses that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' uses the terms son and Father not only when he is concerned. They are a metaphorical pair used as special expressions in the dialect or language he spoke. According to the literal meaning of these words Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is the son of Allâhu ta'âlâ, yet by saying, "my God and your God," in the same verses, he acknowledges that Allâhu ta'âlâ is ilâh. Moreover, he considers the Apostles on the same status as he is and makes them his partners.

[After saying, "to my Father and your Father," he adds the phrase, "to my God and your God," in order to explain the former phrase and to say that they are the born slaves of one Allah. Thus the Apostles become partners to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in being born slaves (of Allâhu ta'âlâ). If Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' were to be accepted as a God on account of his saying "to my Father" about Allâhu ta'âlâ, then it would be necessary to accept each of the Apostles as a God partner to him because he says "to your Father." During the life time of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' none of the Apostles accepted him as a God or called him the son of God. This epithet was given to him a long time after his death — according to Christians — ascension to heaven. And this shows that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is not Allah. He is not ibn-ullah, that is, the son of Allah, either. He is only abd-ullah. That is, he is the born slave of Allah.]

It is written in the twenty-eighth verse of the fourteenth chapter of John that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said, "... for my Father is greater than I." (John: 14-28) Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' states that Allâhu ta'âlâ is greater than he is. Christians' calling Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' 'God' means denying a very obvious fact, [which is also

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

acknowledged even by today's Gospels despite all the interpolations including trinity].

[The Bible's translations into Greek and Latin were rendered without understanding and therefore with many mistakes. This fact is quite conspicuous in trinity. For the word 'father', in Hebrew, does not only mean 'one's own father'. It also has the meaning 'great, respectable person.' For this reason, Qur'ân al-kerîm uses the expression, "His father called Âzer," about Âzer, who was the paternal uncle of Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm'. For his father, Târûh, was dead. He had been raised by his uncle and called him 'father' as it was customary in his time. It is written in the Old Testament part of the Bible also that the father of Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' was Târûh.[1] In English as well, originator or designer of something as well as any person who deserves filial reverence is called 'father.' By the same token, the word 'Son', in Hebrew, is more often than not used to mean a person who is younger than or inferior to another person and who is at the same time attached to him with excessive affection. As we have stated earlier, it is written in the ninth verse of the fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." (Matt: 5-9) As it is seen, the word (Son) means (beloved born slave of Allah). No Christian has used this verse or many other similar verses as grounds for the divinization of the people for whom these terms are expressed. Then, in the original Bible the word (Father) was used to mean a blessed being, i.e. Allâhu ta'âlâ, and the word (Son) was used to mean His beloved born slave. A great majority of Christians, who have come to their senses only recently, have been saying, "All of us are God's born slaves, children. God is the Rabb, the Father of us all. The words (Father) and (Son) in the Bible should be construed as such." It is a proven fact that when the original Hebrew version of the Bible was translated, many a word was given a wrong meaning, like the words (Father) and (Son). Details pertaining to this fact are soon to follow.]

In the twenty-fourth verse of the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of John, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is reported to have said: "... and the word which ye hear is not mine, but the Father's which sent me." (John: 14-24) And the tenth verse: "... the words that I

---

[1] "And Te'rah took Abram his son, and Lot the son of Ha'ran his son's son, and Sa'rai his daughter in law, his son Abram's wife; ..." (Gen: 11-31)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

speak unto you I speak not of myself: ...” (ibid: 14-10)

The twenty-second verse of the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles states: “Ye men of Israel, hear these words; Jesus of Nazareth, a man approved of God among you...” (Acts: 2-22)

The twenty-sixth verse of the third chapter states: “Unto you first God, having raised up his Son Jesus, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from his iniquities.” (ibid: 3-26)

The thirtieth verse of the fourth chapter states: “... and that signs and wonders may be done by the name of thy holy child Jesus.” (ibid: 4-30) It becomes apparent through these verses that Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ is a Prophet and he spoke the wah’y of Allâhu ta’âlâ.

It is written in the eighth, ninth, and tenth verses of the twenty-third chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ stated: “But be not ye called Rabbi: for one is your Master, even Christ; and all ye are brethren.” “And call no man your father upon the earth: for one is your Father, which is in heaven.” “Neither be ye called masters: for one is your Master, even Christ.” (Matt: 23-8, 9, 10) As these verses indicate, the word ‘Father’ has been used in its figurative meaning and Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ is not a divine being, but a teacher, educator, and corrector, that is, he is a Prophet.

The thirty-sixth and later verses of the twenty-sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew state: “Then cometh Jesus with them unto a place called Geth-sem’a-ne, and saith unto his disciples, Sit ye here, while I go and pray yonder.” “And he took with him Peter and the two sons of Zeb’e-dee, and began to be sorrowful and very heavy.” “Then saith he unto them, My soul is exceeding sorrowful, even unto death: tarry ye here, and watch with me.” “And he went a little further, and fell on his face, and prayed, saying, O my father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: nevertheless not as I will, but as thou wilt.” “And he cometh unto the disciples, and findeth them asleep, and saith unto Peter, What, could ye not watch with me one hour.” “Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation: the spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak.” “He went away again the second time, and prayed, saying, O my Father, if this cup may not pass away from me, except I drink it, thy will be done.” “And he came and found them asleep again: for their eyes were heavy.” “And he left them, and went away again, and prayed the third time, saying the same words.” (Matt: 26-36 to 44)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Did the Gospels contain no other evidence to disapprove Christians' slandering Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' by divinizing him, the above-given statements of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' saying that he himself is a born slave and the Father is Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is one, would suffice to do it. If Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had been the only son of God and had come to save humanity as Christians presume, would he have been grieved, sad with the fear of death? Would he have prostrated himself, prayed and invoked, "Let this cup pass from me"? [Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in the Gospels calls himself **'human'.** Christians, while knowing this fact on the one hand, have fallen into such an illogical belief as (human=God) on the other.]

Christians have deduced the doctrine of trinity from the words (Father) and (Son), and fabricated such a wrong belief as unprecedented in history. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' never called himself 'son of God'; on the contrary, he called himself 'ibn-ul-insân (human)' in many places. [If he had really been the son of God, he would not have called himself 'human.' For a person says his own name, not another name, when he is asked.]

Christians' fallacy of trinity was a result of some vague expressions in the Gospel of John. As it is widely known, the Gospel which is ascribed to John was written a long time after the other Gospels, and it was written in Greece. There are many spurious statements in the Gospel of John. In fact, Rahmat-ullah Efendi states in the introductory section of his book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq** that the Gospel of John is full of metaphorical expressions, and that it contains very few parts that one could understand without explanation. Besides, most of the statements of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' are written in forms of succinct metaphors and exemplifications like enigmas. They are such statements that even his disciples could hardly understand without interpretation or explanation. On the other hand, the thirty-ninth verse of the fifteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark reads as follows: "And when the centurion, which stood over against him, saw that he so cried out, and gave up the ghost, he said, Truly this man was the Son of God." (Mark: 15-39) Now let us see Luke's account of the same event: "Now when the centurion saw what was done, he glorified God, saying, Certainly this was a righteous man" (Luke: 23-47) This statement in Luke shows that the statement, "Truly this man was the Son of God," in Mark, means, "Indeed he was a pious man."

It is written in the ninth verse of the fifth chapter of the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Gospel of Matthew that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' stated: "Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called the children of God." (Matt: 5-9) On the other hand, in the forty-fourth and forty-fifth verses he is quoted to have said, "... pray for them which despitefully use you, and persecute you." "That ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven: ..." (ibid: 5-44, 45) [In these verses, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' uses the expression 'children of God' for those who make peace and forgive and the word 'Father' for Allâhu ta'âlâ. It is obvious that these expressions are figurative. Likewise, the Holy Bible (The Old and New Testaments alike) uses such expressions as 'the son of the devil', 'the son of Satan' for wicked and sinful people.]

The thirty-ninth and later verses of the eighth chapter of the Gospel of John state: "They answered and said unto him, Abraham is our father. Jesus saith unto them, If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." "But now ye seek to kill me, a man that hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God: this did not Abraham." "Ye do the deeds of your Father. Then said they to him, We be not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God." "Jesus said unto them, If God were your Father, ye would love me: for I preceded forth and came from God; neither came I from myself, but he sent me." "Why do ye not understand my speech? even because ye cannot hear my word." "Ye are of your father the devil, and the lusts of your father ye will do. ..." (John: 8-39 to 44).

In this context, the Jews' saying, "We were not born from fornication. We have a father. And he is God," does not mean, "our father is God." Their purpose is to object to the fact that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' does not have a father by stating that they are the descendants of Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm'. Since the Gospel of John is documentary according to the Christian faith, we use it as testimony [for our argument]. With respect to these verses of John, i.e. that the Jews claim to be the sons of God and Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' rejects their claim and calls them 'sons of the devil", these expressions are apparently metaphorical.

The ninth verse of the third chapter of the first epistle of John reads as follows: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; ..." (1 John: 3-9) The tenth verse states: "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of devil: ..." (ibid: 3-10) And it is stated at the beginning of the fifth chapter: "WHOSOEVER believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God: and everyone that loveth him that begat loveth him also that is begotten of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

him." "By this we know that we love the children of God, when we love God and keep his commandments." (ibid: 5-1, 2)

The fourteenth verse of the eighth chapter of the epistle to the Romans reads as follows: "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." (Rom: 8-14)

The fourteenth and fifteenth verses of the second chapter of Paul's epistle to the Philippians read as follows: "Do all things without murmurings and disputings:" "That ye may be blameless and harmless, the sons of God, without rebuke, in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, among whom ye shine as lights in the world;" (Phil: 2-14, 15)

[The sixth and seventh verses of the forty-third chapter of the Book of Isaiah state: "I will say to the north, Give up; and to the south, Keep not back: bring my sons from far, and my daughters from the ends of the earth;" "Even every one that is called by my name: for I have created him for my glory, I have formed him; yea, I have made him.' (Is: 43-6, 7)

The expressions used in these verses of the Holy Bible, such as (son of God), (sons, or children, of God) are metaphors, and Allâhu ta'âlâ cannot be called (Father) by giving these expressions their literal meanings. Christians also interpret the word (Son) in these verses as (beloved born slave of God) and do not attribute divinity to any of the people mentioned in them. So far, all Christians accept the fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ is the only Ruler. Yet when it comes to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', they swerve from the right way.]

Misunderstandings have taken place not only concerning the word (Father), but also in the word (Son). As a matter of fact, the Gospel of Luke, while mentioning the genealogy, fathers of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from believing or saying so) in the twenty-third and later verses of its third chapter, states that he was the son of Joseph, and lists the fathers of Joseph, finally saying, "... the son of Seth, which was the son of Adam, which was the son of God." (Luke: 3-23 to 38) Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' is not the son of Allâhu ta'âlâ in the actual sense of the word. Luke attributes Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' to Allâhu ta'âlâ because he was created without parents and Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to Joseph the carpenter because he was born only without father. [Christians accept Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as a god because God's spirit was breathed into him. Nevertheless, they attribute Joseph the carpenter as a father to him. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was born without a father. On the other hand, Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' was created

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

without any parents at all. Accordingly, they ought to accept Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' as a god greater than Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. No Christian has ever said 'god' about Âdam 'alaihis-salâm'.]

The word (Son) exists in the Old Testament section of the Holy Bible, too. For instance, it is written as follows in the twenty-second verse of the fourth chapter of Exodus: "And thou shalt say unto pharaoh, Thus saith the LORD, Israel is my son, even my firstborn:" (Ex: 4-22)

It is written as follows in the ninth verse of the thirty-first chapter of the Book of Jeremiah: "... for I am a father to Israel, and E'phra-im is my firstborn." (Jer: 31-9) [If the word 'son' entailed godhood, Isrâil and Efrâyim would have become a god each a very long time before Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Furthermore, they have been attributed the appellation of 'the first son', which means that they should have attained divinity long before another son who came later.]

The fourteenth verse of the seventh chapter of Samuel II states as follows about Dâvûd 'alaihis-salâm': "I will be his father, and he shall be my son. ..." (2 Sam: 7-14)

The first verse of the fourteenth chapter of Deuteronomy states: "You are the children of the LORD, your God: ..." (Deut: 14-1) The nineteenth verse of the thirty-second chapter reads: "And when the LORD saw it, he abhorred them, because of the provoking of his sons, and of his daughters." (ibid: 32-19) The second verse of the first chapter of the Book of Isaiah states: "Hear, O heavens, and give ear, O earth: for the LORD hath spoken, I have nourished and brought up children, and they have rebelled against me." (Is: 1-2) The first verse of the thirtieth chapter reads: "Woe to the rebellious children, ..." (ibid: 30-1) The eighth verse of the sixty-fourth chapter reads: "But now, O LORD, thou art our father; we are the clay, and thou our potter; and we all are the work of thy hand. (ibid: 64-8) The tenth verse of the first chapter of Hosea reads: "Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them, Ye are not my people, there it shall be said unto them, Ye are the sons of the living God." (Hos: 1-10)

Here, [and at many other places we have not mentioned, all the Israelites, and also many other people, are called (sons of God). If the expression (son of God) actually meant, (son of God), that is, if it were not a metaphor, the Israelites and] the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Israelite Prophets, such as Israîl [Ya'qûb], Efrâyim, Suleymân, and others 'alaihimus-salâm', and Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' should have been gods. But Jewry, being fully cognizant of their native language, Hebrew, understood very well that such expressions as (son of God), (the first son), (sons) and (daughters) were metaphorically used, and thus they did not fall into error [by divinizing these Prophets]. After the Hawârîs (Apostles), however, copies of the Bible and preachings and admonitions of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', in pages here and there, were obtained by this person and that haphazardly, and were translated into other languages. And the translators, in their turn, being ignorant and unaware of the subtleties and the stylistic registers in the Hebrew language, translated whatever they saw, word for word without understanding (the message). Those who saw these translations afterwards did not dare to use the words in the translations in connotations other than their literal meanings. All these eventuated in void arguments, wrong, absurd theories, entirely unreasonable, implausible and bizarre doctrines.

Some hundred years after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' there appeared a different creed, a different sect with a different Gospel in every country. While rewriting the codices of the Bible, fanatics affiliated with each sect, with a view to propagating their own sect and disproving other sects, inserted some words suitable with their purposes. So many copies of the Bible, and so many resultant controversies among Christians, appeared that in the Nicene Council alone fifty different copies of the Bible that were being read by Christians were rescinded. Hence, none of the four Gospels have the documentary capacity. Yet, as the Christian faith is based on these four Gospels, we, too, base our argument on their testimony in order to convince Christians.

The Taurah, the part of the Bible called **Old Testament,** contains no document to testify to the Christian doctrine of trinity. [This fact is also avowed by some priests we have met.] Their strongest proof, the Gospel of John, which is the most dubious and complicated of the Gospels, consists of a few ambiguous statements in the details contained in the other Gospels. For instance:

They deduce divinity from the twenty-third verse of the eighth chapter of the Gospel of John, where Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' states: "... ye are of this world. I am not of this world." (John: 8-23) They give such explanations as, "He descended from heaven and changed into a body," for their attributing godhood to Îsâ 'alaihis-

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

salâm'. The meaning of this verse is: "You are busy with worldly connections. I am not." This statement cannot be interpreted as divinity. Besides, the Gospels contain verses contradicting this verse.

The nineteenth verse of the fifteenth chapter of the Gospel of John states: "... ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world." (ibid: 15-19) The sixteenth and eighteenth verses of the seventeenth chapter state: "They are not of the world, even as I am not of the world." (ibid: 17-16) "As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world." (ibid: 17-18) These statements contradict the verse, "I am not of this world," in the eighth chapter of John (verse: 23).

In these verses, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' holds himself and his disciples equal. And the statement, "You are of this world," means, "You aspire after this world." Such figures of speech and idioms are used in every language. (In fact, the English language teems with similes, metaphors, synecdoches, metonymies, allegories, symbolisms, hyperboles, litotes, ironies, innuendos, rhetorical questions, etc.) The Arabic language, on the other hand, has the expressions (Ibn-ul-waqt), (Eb-ul-waqt), (ebnâ-i-zamân), and (ebnâ-i-sebîl), which mean, respectively, (son of the time), (father of the time), (sons of the time), and (sons of the way). [Time or way cannot have a son. These are all symbolic expressions.]

Another evidence which Christians put forward in their endeavour to validate trinity is the thirtieth verse of the tenth chapter of the Gospel of John. This verse quotes Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as having said, "I and my Father are one." (John: 10-30) This statement cannot be interpreted as divinity or identity, either. For, supposing that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' really made this statement, he was a human being with a (self) when he said it, so it is impossible for him to have united with God. [Christians, who indicate this verse as an evidence to prove the divinity of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' ought to read on to see what comes after the verse. It is written as follows in the thirtieth and later verses: "I and my Father are one." "Then the Jews took up stones again to stone him." "Jesus answered them, Many good works have I shewed you from my Father; for which of those works do ye stone me?" "The Jews answered him, saying, For a good work we stone thee not; but for blasphemy; and because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God." "Jesus answered them, Is it not written in your law, I said, Ye are gods?" "If he called them gods, unto

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

whom the word of God came, and the scripture cannot be broken;" "Say ye unto him, whom the Father hath sanctified, and sent into the world, Thou blasphemest; because I said, I am the Son of God?" "If I do not the works of my Father, believe me not." "But if I do, though ye believe not me, believe the works: that ye may know, and believe, that the Father is in me, and I in him." "Therefore they sought again to take him: but he escaped out of their hand." (ibid: 10-30 to 39) People who saw Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' himself did not say be was a god. On the contrary, they attempted to kill him on account of this figurative word. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', whom Christians accept as a creative god who always has existed and will exist eternally, flees from the Jews. What kind of a god is he who runs away from his creatures?

Another point here is the thirty-fourth verse, "I said, Ye are gods," which Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' quoted in order to prove his statement, "I and Father are one." It is written in a footnote of the copy of the Bible we have that this verse is the sixth verse of the eighty-second chapter of the Zebûr (Psalms) in the Old Testament. The final part of this verse reads as follows: "... and all of you are the children of the most High." (Ps: 82-6) According to the facade meaning of this verse and the statement made by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', in addition to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', people who are addressed as, "You are gods", become gods. We wonder if any Christian has ever accepted them as gods. Christians, who have posed the statement, "I and Father are one," of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as a testimony for his divinity, reject the gods who are declared in the continuation of the discourse, thus becoming sinners and rebels by disagreeing with Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', whom they recognize as a god. Will a god lie? If you ask Christians why they do not accept that part, they will say, "Well, that statement is figurative. The statement, 'You are gods,' cannot be taken in its literal sense." If you ask, "Isn't the statement, 'I and Father are one', of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' figurative?", they will answer, "Jesus the Lord is divine. This is the basic doctrine of Christianity."] Another explanation which Christians make of these statements in the Gospel of John is that "Jesus Christ is not only a perfect human being but also a perfect god." Yet, since the human properties cannot be separated from man, actual unity of man and god is out of the question. Moreover, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' uses this expression not only for himself, but also for the Hawârîs (Apostles).

Here are some verses from the seventeenth chapter of the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Gospel of John: "... as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, that they also may be one in us: ..." (John: 17-21) "And the glory which thou gavest me I have given them; that they may be one, even as we are one." (22) "I in them, and thou in me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me." (23) The expression 'being perfect in one' in these verses means 'stringent obedience to religious commandments and doing pious deeds,' in which case nothing pertaining to divinity will even occur to one's mind.

Another document which Christians have recourse to as an evidence for trinity is the following episode narrated in the eighth and later verses of the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of John: "Philip saith unto him, Lord shew us the Father, and it sufficeth us." "Jesus saith unto him, Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip? He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; and how sayest thou then, Shew us the Father?" (John: 14-8, 9)

This argument is false from two different points of view:

Firstly: It is a fact admitted by Christians as well that it is impossible to see Allâhu ta'âlâ in the world. In fact, this ma'rifat (of seeing) is interpreted as 'knowing' in the introduction of the book **Iz-hâr-ul-haqq.** Knowing the Messiah does not mean knowing physically. Hence Christians deduce that it is knowing the Messiah as regards divinity and unification. This deduction is mandatory according to Christians who believe in trinity. Yet this deduction is wrong, too. For deduction should not be contrary to logical proofs and authentic narratives. This deduction is contrary to logical proofs. For, as we have mentioned earlier, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' holds the Hawârîs equal to himself.

As it is known by historians, the doctrine of three hypostases, or trinity, is not something new; it is a credo adopted from polytheistic cults. As the number of gods increased so as to attract the attention of the nescient populace and stir up feelings of alertness in them, notables of a polytheistic community would arrange the gods in order of superiority, appointing some of them as chiefs and others as their inferiors. They decided to keep the investigation of this arrangement as a secret among themselves. Zerdusht (Zoroaster or Zarathustra), [the founder of magi, the basic religious system of ancient Persia], chose two of their idols, Yezdân (Ormuzd or (Ahura Mazda) and Ehremen (Ahriman), as two hypostases, and established an unprecedented system of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

belief which was based on a curious conflict between Yezdân the god of light and good and Ahriman the god, or spirit, of darkness and evil.[1]

Maz-hâr Jân-i-Jânân,[2] a great Indian savant, states in his fourteenth letter: "Brahminism was a heavenly religion. It was degenerated afterwards." The expression 'three hypostases' was first heard from these people (Brahmins).

[It would be more correct to call it a philosophy, or a doctrine, instead of a religion. It is understood that it was founded by the mutilation of a heavenly religion seven hundred years before Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. The agent of this mutilation is Brahma. (In Sanskrit) Brahma means holy word. This expression has been used for Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in Christianity. When Christians are questioned about the divinity of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', their first evidence to prove it is some verses in the first chapter of the Gospel of John, which are, "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God" [John: 1-1], and "And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only begotten of the father,) full of grace and truth." [ibid: 1-14] An exact analogue of Brahminism.] Likewise, members of the Brahministic caste believe in a deity who became a reality in the name of **(Brahma).** According to their doctrine, a most perfect, ever silent god is the real essence of all. Yet this god does his work through two other gods: **Vishnu** and **Siva** (or Shiva). They say that they are one god manifesting in a triad.

According to Brahmins, **(Brahma)** is the creator of all and the world. He does all the work of creating, and his symbol is the sun. Vishnu is reason. He is a god protecting all. He rules over the time lived in. His symbol is water. And Siva is the god of life and death. He rules over the time lived in and future. Justice and vengeance are his responsibility. His symbol is fire. [Brahmins believe that their god Vishnu lives in heaven. The other gods tell Vishnu that some demons have appeared on the earth and deranged the quietude and order of the earth, and therefore he must be born incarnate on the earth for the chastisement of those demons. Vishnu accepts this suggestion and incarnates as Krishna, the warrior, being born from a virgin of a warrior family in order

---

[1] This corrupt religion is still followed by Pharisees, who read the Zoroastrian book Zend-Avesta.

[2] Jân-i-Jânân was martyred in 1195 [A.D. 1781] in Delhi.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

to purge the earth of evils and demons. The virgin has dreamt of this event beforehand. Krishna learns all knowledge in sixty-four days. He works as a shepherd. He travels far and wide. He displays wonders in places where he travels. Upon seeing this, Brahmins accept him as a deity that has descended to earth in a human figure. Many other myths are told about Krishna by the votaries of Brahma.

Likewise, Buddhists accept Buddha as a deity. According to Buddhists, Buddha lived in heaven before descending to earth. He looked for a place to appear on earth and eventually decided to be born as a member of the Sudhodana family. (The myth is as follows:) His mother, fasting as she is, falls asleep on the roof of the palace, and has a dream. In her dream a white elephant emitting haloes all around itself descends from heaven and, to her astonishment, enters her womb from her right flank. Many symptoms are seen towards Buddha's birth. His mother leaves her town and delivers her divine son under a tree. Buddhism teems with things which reason or logic could never accept. Brahminism, Buddhism, and the Christian credo, trinity, are analogous, similarities between them, such as a god's entering a virgin and being born from her and people's accepting him as a deity. Here are some of them.

1 — According to Christians, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' died, and resurrected three days after death. Krishna, too, resurrected after death, and ascended to heaven.

2 — Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' resurrected from his grave, and Buddha from his coffin.

3 — Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said beforehand that he would be killed, saved the souls in dungeons, that is in Hell, and after resurrecting from his grave sat on the right hand side of God. And Buddha said he would withdraw from the world and go to nirvana.

4 — When Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' went up to heaven, he took over and began to control all the matters of the universe. Likewise, Buddha established the sultanate of heavens and began to dominate over the universe.

5 — The Gospels unanimously enumerate the fathers of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' up to Dâwûd (David) 'alaihis-salâm', whom they call the first Melik (King, Ruler). Likewise, Buddha's genealogy is said to begin with Makavamat the first Ruler.

Trinity and metempsychosis, i.e. belief in the transmigration of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

a dead person's soul into a new body, existed not only in Indian religions, but also in the ancient Egyptian religions. The best known of the Egyptian deities is **(Amonra).** His symbol is the sun. He was believed to have created this world with his will and speech. **(Osiris),** his assistant, is their second deity. Osiris came down to earth, underwent various afflictions, and was killed. He resurrected and ascended to heaven with the help of **(Isis),** their third deity. Thus Osiris became the god of the dead. Also, in ancient Egypt, kings, or Pharaohs, were believed to be the sons of Amonra (the sun).

Ancient Egyptians believed that when a person died he was called to account by Osiris.]

The inventor of the doctrine of three hypostases in the west is the philosopher Time (Timaios), who lived in the city of Lokres some five hundred years before the Christian Era. He was one of the pupils of Pythagoras. He learned this doctrine of three hypostases [beings, bases]. [Pythagoras was born on the Island of Samos in 580 B.C. It is narrated that he died in Metaponte in 500 B.C. There are differing narratives as to the dates of his birth and death. He came to the Kroton city of Italy when he was young yet. Thence he travelled to various places, having long stays in Egypt and the Middle East. During his stay in Egypt he acquired extensive knowledge about the ancient Egyptian religions and cults. Learning the belief in three gods and metempsychosis from the Egyptians, he accepted them. Another thing he learned in Egypt was Hendese (geometry). The theorem known as Pythagoras' proposition (theorem) today was known pragmatically in Egypt in those days. They (such pieces of information as this theorem) had come to Egypt from Babylon, which was at that time very advanced in 'ilm-i-nujûm (astronomy), mathematics and astrology. And Babyloneans, in their turn, had been taught these branches of knowledge by the great Prophet Idris[1] 'alaihis-salâm'. Pythagoras went to Babylon and learned them well. On his returning to the city of Kroton he opened a school, and established a new way, or a new sect, named after him. His votaries have fabled many myths about him and claimed that he was a prophet, and some of them have professed his deity.

Pythagoras said that the essence of being was numbers

[1] The name of this great Prophet is mentioned in Qur'ân al-kerîm. Christian scholars mostly equate his name with Enoch.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

(arche). He accepted numbers up to ten as sacred. He accepted the numbers of one, two and three as the three essences. Pythagoreans claim that the number one is the unchangeable and eternal source of the universe and therefore the first hypostasis, the number two is feminine and all the world has come into existence through her and she is the second hypostasis, and the number three is the third hypostasis representing the eternal triad in the universe. They assert that these three hypostases are the essence of the world and of the universe. They interpret the essence of universe as (body, life and soul). They say that the universe consists of three worlds, namely (the natural, the human, and the divine worlds). According to the Pythagoreans, as everything is made up of three, creation originates from this triad, which is made up of the creative will, the current of stars, and the ever improving universe. There is detailed information in the book **(La Pensee Grecque)** by Gomperz about Pythagoras' numbers and other philosophical views. According to Pythagoras, the first hypostasis, i.e. God, who is able to do whatever He wishes, cannot be comprehended mentally. The Pythagoreans, who believe that soul is eternal [immortal] and that a dying person's soul may transmigrate into an animal, do not eat meat. Time, an outstanding disciple of Pythagoras', followed his master's way.]

Time states in his book **Rûh-ul-âlam** (Essence of the Universe): "First of all, creatures have a fikr-i-mithâl-i-dâimî (the eternal ideal pattern), which is the first word, the first hypostasis, which is spiritual, not substantial, and therefore, cannot be comprehended by mind. The second grade is the madde-i-ghayr-i-muntazima, which is the second word pronounced, the second hypostasis. The third grade is the world of son, or meaning, which is the third hypostasis. All the universe consists in these three classes. The son wanted to make a beautiful god, and made a god which was a creature." These statements, complicated and incomprehensible as they were, reached Plato. [There is a narrative stating that Time was one of Plato's teachers. For Plato says that his great master Socrates and Time had been together in a gathering. Time had three works, namely **(Mathematics), (Life of Pythagoras),** and **(Essence of the Universe)**. Two of them were lost. His book **(Essence of the Universe)**, the one which was not lost, should have busied philosophers very much. For there is not much difference between the idea derived from the first six chapters of this book and the idea in Plato's speech on Time

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

(Timeios).]

Plato modified this idea coming from Time. Plato proposed existence of three gods. He said:

The first one is Father. He is the highest one and the creator; he is the father of the other two gods. He is the first hypostasis.

The second one is the primordial, visible god, who is the representative of Father, who is invisible. It is named (Logos), which means word, reason, (account).

The third one is the Universe.

According to Plato, the essence of beings is meanings [ideas]. [The word idea, which Plato refers to, means entity, conception, archetype. In Platonic philosophy it means the unchanging, eternally existing pattern of which all classes of beings are imperfect copies. Plato divides the universe into two worlds. The first one is the perceptible world of senses. The other one is the real world, that is, the world of ideas. While the real world, or the world of ideas, is eternal, the world of senses continuously changes.] The existence of ideas is not dependent upon our mind or imagination, but they exist in an immaterial life peculiar to them. Plato refers each reality or idea to higher realities. Thus all realities and ideas are referred to the absolute (ONE). This ONE, which is *(goodness)* consisting of many high realities, is God himself. Other high ideas or realities are in His command. Lower ideas are *(evils)* and are the devil himself. Other low, evil ideas are in His command.

[Plato said that what he accepted as (ONE), who comprised ideas in Himself and whom he called 'goodness' and believed to be identical with God, was the (Father god), who had motion and life and who was the father of the universe. This is the first hypostasis. Father god, that is, the unity of ideas, created a spirit, which gave matter its systematic order and which was quite different from matter. This is the son of Father. This spirit is a being which intermediates between the creator and the creature, and is the second hypostasis.

Plato, as well as all the other ancient Greek philosophers like Pythagoras and Time learned their views and observations about the spirit which they called 'the second hypostasis' by reading the books of (the Prophets) Âdam and Shiet (or Shis) 'alaihimus-salâm', or from religious scholars who had read and knew those books, and attempted to explain them with their insufficient knowledge and short range mentalities, thus distorting them.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Plato states in his Menon speech that the soul is immortal, that it has come to earth various times, and that it has seen everything in this perceptible *(world)* and in the imperceptible *(hereafter).* In his Phaidros speech he divides the soul into three parts: The first is mind, which has been inclined towards ideas. The second and the third are the parts pertaining to aspirations and sensations. One of them follows the mind and leads to goodness, i.e. to God, and the other leads to evil corporeal desires.] Carcass, or body, is a dungeon wherein soul has been hurled after a preliminary sojourn in the incorporeal world of ideas. [Thus mankind, composed of soul and body, came into existence.] The goal of ethics is to free the soul from the shackles tethering it to the dungeon of body, Seframk says that the way to happiness is in attaining virtue and perfection. Plato says, "Perfection of happiness fully exists in virtue. Virtue and perfection are the health, salvation and balance of soul. For attaining happiness, it will be enough to endeavour only for attaining virtue without thinking of worldly advantages or aspiring for the rewards in the hereafter.

According to the philosophy of **(Rawâqiyyûn),** "Goodness alone is virtue, and evil alone is sinful. Health, illness, wealth, poverty, and even life and death are neither good nor bad. It is up to man to make them good or bad. Man has to believe in the preordination of Allâhu ta'âlâ, that is, in destiny, and commit his will to the will of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Humanity is like a flock (of sheep). Their shepherd is the common reason, or (Logos), which is the creative power of nature. All men are brothers. Their common father is (Zoz), or (God). Zoz is the soul of all universe. He is eternal, one. Other gods are his component parts. [Philosophy founded by Zeno and followed by some Greek philosophers is called **Rawâqiyyûn** (Stoicism).]

Followers of the philosophy of **(Ishrâqiyyûn)** inculcate peace and mercy; so much so that the pleasure that a person takes in doing good to someone else is more than the pleasure felt when one is done good to, they say. [This philosophy is called (Illuminism), which is an extension of the way followed by Pythagoreans and Platonists. The founder of neo-Platonism is Plotin, who adopted Plato's theory of ideas.] The statement, "The flavour in giving is more than the flavour in taking", which the existing copies of the Bible attribute to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', is identical with the main principle of the philosophy of Ishrâqiyyûn. [This means to say that stoicists and illuminists present the pieces

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

of information they acquired from religious books and religious scholars in a manner as if they were their own views and findings. The great Islamic savant Imâm-i-Muhammad Ghazâlî 'rahmat-ullâhi 'aleyh'[1] expounds this fact in detail in his books **(Al-munqizu min-ad-dalâl)** and **(Tahâfut-ul-falâsifa).**

The philosophical school founded by Plato lived for seven or eight centuries together with its tenets. The views of this school of philosophy extended beyond Italy, having its most dramatic impact on the Alexandrian school in the third century.] Plato's doctrine of three hypostases, along with his other philosophical views, had made its way into the schools of Alexandria and was being taught there, when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' appeared. In fact, even Philo, a renowned Judaic scholar in Alexandria at that time, wished to see this doctrine of trinity among the other tenets of the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. With this desire he said, "The Taurah declares that the world was created in six days; it is true. For the number three is half of six. And the number two is one-third of six. This number is both masculine and feminine. God married reason and had a son by reason. This son is the world." Philo called the world 'kelima-i-ilâhiyya (divine word)', which was a name he ascribed to angels, too. This was an effect of Platonic philosophy. [Platonic philosophy, which was later renamed as neo-Platonism and went on its way, dealt the severest blow on the Nazarene, or Îsâwî, religion. In other words, the third century of the Christian era, when neo-Platonism was at the zenith of its power, was at the same time the period in which Christianity was the religion of the Roman Empire. Adherents of that philosophy defiled this religion of tawhîd (unity), which was based on the existence and oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ and the prophethood of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Later on idolatry, too, was inserted into this religion. Saint Augustine, who lived in the fourth century of the Christian era, (354-430), tried to Christianize Plato. Augustine's views about God, soul, and the universe, which he proposes in his book (de Trinite), which he wrote with a view to proving trinity, are quite identical with Platonic philosophy. Using Plato's statement, "Reason, will, and sensation make up a human being," as a testimony for proving trinity, he says, "Though the Three Persons in Trinity seem to be disparate, they make up one God." He alleges that Plato and his disciples realized the true God. Taking Plato's philosophy of ideas as a fulcrum, he argues that the

---

[1] Ghazalî passed away in Tûs in 504 [A.D. 1111].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Word is creative and that the Word is Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Augustine, who is esteemed and accepted as a saint amongst Christians, acknowledges that such Christian tenets as trinity, good, and evil exist in their exact identities in Plato's philosophy. In addition, he cites Plato's views as a document for proving trinity. The views of a person who died 350 years before the Christian era are identical with the tenets of Christianity: a hard question for Christians to answer. This concurrence shows that Plato was contemporary with Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', which is the truth. And this truth is explained in the 266th letter of the book **(Mektûbât)** by the great Islamic 'âlim Imâm-i-Rabbânî Ahmad Fârûqî[1] 'rahmatullâhi aleyh."

Furthermore, Saint Thomas, one of the ecclesiastical personages of the eighth century of the Christian era, endeavours to prove the Christian tenets, particularly trinity, by taking the philosophy of Aristotle, who was Plato's disciple. This book of ours is too small for us to mention all the ecclesiastical saints who were the true defenders of the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. Yet we shall touch upon an illuminatory fact, which will give our readers a more realistic insight into the matter: Throughout the Middle Ages, even after the realization of the Renaissance in Europe, opposing the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, or refusing it, or even slightly contradicting it was requited with penalty of death by the ecclesiastical tribunal called Inquisition. We wonder how today's trinitarian Christians should explain this? It is certain that philosophy of Plato **(Platonism),** philosophy of Rawâqiyyûn **(Stoicism),** philosophy of Ishrâqiyyûn **(Gnosticism),** and other Greek schools of philosophy had a major role in the formation of the tenets of Christianity. This fact is explained in detail and with proofs in the book titled **(The Influence of Greek Ideas on Christianity),** by Dr. Edwin Hatch.]

As is understood from the above statements, such concepts as purging the heart of wicked traits, attaining happiness by adopting beautiful moral habits, acquiescing in destiny, having tawakkul (putting your trust in Allâhu ta'âlâ), accepting human beings as the sons and children of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and Allâhu ta'âlâ as the common father of all, do not belong exclusively to the Gospels. Hundreds of years before the Gospels they were being discussed among Greek philosophers, [and various philosophers were trying to explain them in various ways. For they had been taught about

---

[1] Imâm-i-Rabbânî passed away in Serhend in 1034 [A.D. 1624].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

heavenly religions by Prophets]. It is certain that the statements referring to trinity did not exist in the former heavenly religions or in the genuine copies of the Bible, but they were fabricated by Greek philosophers and were inserted into the Gospels that were written after the spreading of Christianity in Greece and Alexandria.

Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was born in a place where people lived up to the principles of the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Until his Ascension,[1] he acted upon the sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. The commandments that were assigned to the Israelites he observed with them. He preached in Synagogues and instructed the tenets in the Taurah (Torah). To those who had wandered from the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' he preached the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and taught them the manners of observance as prescribed in that religion. He cherished those Israelites who held fast to that religion. Like Jews, he was baptised in the river of **Erden** (Jordan) by Yahyâ 'alaihis-salâm' (John the Baptist). [The river of Jordan is in Palestine and is 250 kilometres long.] He was circumcised when he was born. He did not baptise anybody. He fasted. He did not eat pork. He did not say, *"God entered me, I am the son of God eternally in the past and eternally in the future. My person is composed of two components; a mature human being; and the son of God, which is divine."* Nor did he say, *"The Holy Spirit acts upon the common commandment of my Father and me. Believe in three deities, who are Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit."* He said, "I came to consolidate the Sharî'at (the canonical law of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'), not to change it." All books of history agree to the fact that there was no such notion as trinity among the Nazarites; neither during the lifetime of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', nor in the Apostles' Creed.

It was towards the termination of the second century of the Christian era that the expression 'Three Persons' emerged among Christians. Because this doctrine was thoroughly at loggerheads with the religion preached by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', those who believed in Three Persons concealed their belief from Christians for some time; but they strove to disseminate it in a clandestine way. Meanwhile, upholders of trinity [three gods], with a view to popularizing the course they had taken, published the Gospel of John and the so-called Apostolic epistles, e.g. the Pauline epistles,

---

[1] Until Allâhu ta'âlâ raised him, alive as he was, up to heaven.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

which were written after the Apostles. This gave birth to a number of controversies, disputes, and strifes amongst Christians. Both the unitarian Christians, i.e. those who believed in the oneness of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and the trinitarians embarked upon an assiduous endeavour to popularize their own credo and to get the better of the opposite side, and scribes on both sides daily wrote Gospels and innumerable pamphlets and epistles that were attributed to the Apostles. Eventually the contentions escalated to their zenith, and the Christian world was divided into two major groups by the beginning of the fourth century of the Christian era. A number of Christians professed that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was God Himself without a dissimilitude. Their leader was St. Athanasius, the Bishop of Istanbul. Other Christians, on the other hand, asseverated that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was the most elevated of creatures, a Prophet sent down by Allah, and yet a born slave of Allah. Their leaders were a monk named Arius and Eusebius, the Bishop of Izmit (Nicomedia). [Before them Yûnus Shammâs, the Bishop of Antioch, had declared that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one, and many people had come round to the right course. But later trinitarian priests had begun to worship three gods and tried to spead this doctrine. Thus the number of trinitarians had increased.] The clashes between trinitarians and those who retained their belief in the fact that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is the born slave and Prophet of Allâhu ta'âlâ caused mental disturbance among the populace. State administration, on the other hand, could no longer be carried on properly. Upon this, the Emperor, Constantine the Great, decided to put an end to these tumults and convened an ecumenical council in Nicea in 325 (A.D.) Eminent Christian clergy joined this council. After many long debates, the Athanasians gained ascendancy. Three hundred and nineteen priests concurred with full divinty of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', which meant that he was the unique son of God, the offspiring of God, a God from God, a Light from Light, a true God from the true God. The following statements have been derived and paraphrased from the twenty-third chapter of the eighth book of the history of **(Nîsfûr)** and from the fifth volume of the history of **(Baruniyus),** which give an account of the Nicene Council: "During the debates between the Arians and the Athanasians, two members of the assembly, i.e. two bishops named Karizamet and Mizuniyus, passed away. When the Council ended, they resurrected from their graves, signed under the written decision of the Council, and died again." In those times, when it was easy to

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

resuscitate the dead with the point of a pen, even the ecclesiastical historians, who are expected to be trustworthy, succumbed to the zeal of telling such lies as this one. Inserting a multitude of other similar oddities into the Nazarene [Îsewî] religion, they beat about these mockeries in order to, so to speak, popularize such a religion in the name of truth.

[At the end of the Council of Nicea, with the efforts of Alexander, the Bishop of Alexandria, and Athanasius, Arius was declared to be a heretic and was condemned. Arius was born in Alexandria in 270 A.D. [There is a narrative stating that he was born in Binghâzî.] He lived several years after his condemnation. In the meantime, by the intercession of Eusebius, the Bishop of Nicomedia, and the coercion of Constantine, the Emperor, he was forgiven by the church. He was invited to Istanbul by Constantine, who had now become an Arian. He was about to overcome the trinitarians despite the adamant obstructions by the Bishop Alexander, when he suddenly died of a vehement pain, in 336 A.D. After his death his sect spread a great deal and was officially accepted and protected by Constantine's son Constance and his successors.

St. Athanasius was born in Alexandria in 296. He achieved fame with his views on trinity, which he proposed during the Council of Nicea in 325. He became the Bishop of Alexandria in 326. He was passionately opposed to the Arian sect and to the fact that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was human and Prophet. He was condemned by the supporters of Arius in a Council held in Sur city (Tyre) in 335. Four years later he was made Bishop again at the Council of Rome. He died in Alexandria in 373. He wrote books against Arianism. St. Athanasius' day is celebrated on 2 May.]

According to the minutes of the Council of Nicea, in that century there were numerous Gospels everywhere and it was impossible to tell which ones were correct and which ones were false. In this Council various discussions were made on fifty-four of these copies of the Bible. Upon reading these copies of the Bible, the priests who were present at this Council saw that fifty of the Gospels were unfounded and rejected them. It was decided that four copies were genuine and the others null and void. Since then [325 A.D.], no copy except these four Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, John) has been credited, and those others that had existed, have been done away with. More than two thousand clergy attended this Council, and most of them agreed with Arius

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and believed that Allâhu ta'âlâ is One and Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is His born slave and Messenger; yet because Athanasius was the Bishop of Istanbul, most of those who occupied Bishoprics sided with Athanasius, [for fear of losing office]. Thus Arius and his adherents secured themselves against the jeopardy of being deprived of their posts at the cost of defeat, in such a highly important area as religion, where matters must be settled correctly after minute examinations. Upon this, Arius was excommunicated. Later, Athanasius was deposed from the Bishopric, and Arius was invited to Istanbul. [However, as we have stated earlier, he died before arriving in Istanbul. Constantine the Great had already accepted the Arian sect.] After Constantine's death in 337 A.D., extensive conflicts broke out between the Athanasians and the Arians. The winning side was the Arians after these commotions. Arianism remained prevalent for a long time. Afterwards, however, the Athanasians attained ascendancy. They subjected the followers of Arius to various persecutions and torments.

[According to the book **(Qâmûs-ul-a'lâm),** "Emperor Theodosius absolutely prohibited Arianism. He ordered that the adherents of this sect be killed."]

The doctrine of trinity was established and adopted in the Council of Nicea; yet **Rûh-ul-Quds** (The Holy Spirit, or Ghost) was still an uncertain issue. The Holy Spirit, too, ought to be given an import. So this issue also was settled in the Council that was held in Istanbul in 381 A.D.. The principle, "The Holy Spirit as well is a God to be loved. [It has the same essence as Father and Son.] It carries out the Son's orders. It is to be worshipped like the Son," was added to the decisions taken at the Council of Nicea. Later on, the Roman Church forwarded the concept that the Holy Spirit carried out the commands of Father, thus establishing the tenet "the Holy Spirit carries out the commands of Father and Son." This decision was sanctioned first in 440 A.D. by Spanish clergy and then in 674 [A.D. 1274] by the Council held in Lion city.

The position of the Holy Spirit having been thus decided upon, it was now hadrat Maryam's turn. The Council that assembled in Ephesus in 431 A.D. decided that she was truely the mother of God and therefore Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' embodied two natures, i.e. divinity and humanity, in one person. Nestorius, the Patriarch of Istanbul, who was present at the Council, proposed that hadrat Maryam (Mary) be called "The Mother of Jesus

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Christ", which won him the infamous nickname 'Esharyûtî Yehûdâ (Judas Iscariot)'.

[Nestorius was a Syrian priest. He was appointed the Patriarch of Istanbul by Theodosius II. He was extremely cruel to the followers of Arius. He had the houses they used for their assemblages burned, together with their inmates. He was opposed to the expression 'Mother of God=Theotekos', which was used to mean hadrat Maryam. He knew a monk he could trust. His name was Anasthasius and lived in Antioch. He invited this monk to Istanbul and had him make speeches everywhere. Anasthasius said, "Let no one call Mary the Mother of God, for Mary was a human being, and it is impossible for God to be born by a human being." His speeches exasperated his adversaries, Cyrillos (Lucaris) and his adherents. Cyrillos reported the speeches of Nestorius and his adherents to the Pope, Celestine I. The Pope, already jealous of Nestorius's aggrandized influence, and indignant for not having been asked what his opinion was concerning hadrat Maryam, convoked a Council in 430 A.D., whereby he issued a decision in favour of the expression 'The Mother of God' about hadrat Maryam and threatened Nestorius with excommunication. This event augmented the agitations all the more. Consequently, the Council of Ephesus, attended by several renowned clergy, was held in 431 A.D.. Priest Cyrillos and his colleagues asked Nestorius to explicate his thoughts in the church called Theotokos. Later, by the unanimous decision of 159 bishops, Nestorius and his credo were excommunicated and condemned. Nestorius was banished to various places. Eventually, he died in the wilderness called Great Oasis in upper Egypt in 451.

Nestorius had three assertions:

1 — Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' embodies two distinct personalities: divine and human.

2 — These two qualities do not unite physically. Their unity is incorporeal.

3 — Hadrat Maryam is the mother of the human Jesus, not of God (Word).

The Christian sect founded by Nestorius was called Nestorianism. Today most of the Nestorians live in Syria.

So the tenets and most important principles of a religion which Protestants and other Christians claim has been sent by God can be established by the concourse of a few hundred clergy. These

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

clergy can freely accept or reject a theory propounded as a religious tenet, or make the changes or alterations they think necessary in their religion. Thus Christianity has become a religion that no one with common sense could accept. It is for this reason that many European men of knowledge and science renounce Christianity and a great majority of them are honoured with Islam.][1]

After these convulsions, there arose the question whether it was permissible to worship pictures, statues and idols. For the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had forbidden to worship pictures or statues. Therefore, during the early days of the Îsâwî religion all the Apostles and their disciples avoided worshipping pictures and statues. [Christianity spread over European countries such as Italy and England.] Having been heathens before, the aboriginals of those countries were inclined to worshipping idols. [For they used to make idols and icons for each deity they believed. So the most common and the most improved art among them was making statues, that is, sculpture.] As Christianity spread over these countries, some priests gave permission to revere and worship [spurious] pictures which were made and ascribed to hadrat Maryam the mother of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Other Christian societies were opposed to this for being incompatible with the essence of religion, and thus disputes and contentions started. The tumults lasted until the 787th year of the Christian era. In 171 [A.D. 787], in the Council that assembled in Nicea, it was decided to worship sham pictures and icons [that were mendaciously posited as pictures of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and hadrat Maryam]. Those who did not approve worshipping or revering pictures, idols [or statues], on the other hand, did not acquiesce in this decision. Controversies and conflicts continued till 842 A.D., when another Council was convoked in Istanbul by the Emperor Michael and his mother. It was decided in this Council that worshipping icons, statues and pictures was one of the Christian principles of belief. It was proclaimed that should anyone be opposed to the practice of worshipping pictures and icons, they would be a heretic.

[Ever since the adoption of Christianity by the Roman Empire, the Roman Church, taking pride in the fact that Rome was the place where Peter and Paul had been killed, had

---

[1] Please see our book **Why Did They Become Muslims**, available from **Hakîkat Kitâbevi**, Fâtih, Istanbul, Turkey.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

maintained its braggadocio as the kernel of the entire Christendom.] In 446 [A.D. 1054], the Eastern Church unleashed itself from the Roman Church, thus pioneering a new sect disparate from the Roman Catholic Church. The Eastern Church disagreed with the Roman Church in most of its principles. For instance, the Eastern Christians reject the Pope's spiritual position, that is, that he is the successor of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and Peter's representative, that the Holy Ghost carries out the orders of Father and Son and the grade of i'râd in the hereafter. They perform the Eucharist with leavened bread. They approve priests being married. The hatred that the Eastern Christians felt against the papacy and their consequent disunion was an alarm loud enough to wake the popes from their apathy; but they were too conceited and too vain to take any warning. On the contrary, the popes' arrogance and vanity and the cardinals' unawareness and indifference kept on increasing. Thus Protestantism emerged in 923 [A.D. 1517], which meant a second splitting of the Roman Catholic Church. In the year 1510 (A.D.), the Pope, Liyman X (Julius II), following the old custom, gave the duty of hearing the German people's confessions to the Dominican monks. This predilection nettled the Augustinian monks. They chose a Catholic priest named Luther as their leader. [Martin Luther is German. He was born in 1483, and died in Eisleben in 953 (A.D. 1546).] Luther rejected the Pope's hearing confessions, and proposed ninety-five principles, which formed the Protestant tenets. Most of the German Rulers followed Luther. Protestantism, as founded by Luther, acknowledges no source except the Gospels. It does not accept the Pope, either. It rejects such things as entire withdrawal from the world, matrimonial prohibition for the clergy, and hearing a confession.

Some time after Luther, Calvin came into the limelight and effected some reforms in Protestantism. He established an altogether novel Christian sect. [Jean (John) Calvin is French. He was born in 1509, and died in 1564, in Geneva.] The sect founded by Calvin is called **(Calvinism).** There is no place for overt (physical) worship in this sect. Nor are there such orders as papacy, bishopric, or priesthood. Calvinists do not believe that the leavened bread consumed in the Eucharist is exactly the same as the body or flesh of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. They give permission to worship the past Christian saints, [especially the Apostles]. They totally strip man of his irâda-i-jüz'iyya (partial will), and hold the belief that whether he will go to Paradise or Hell has already been

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

predestined.

Afterwards, the sects founded by Luther and Calvin were disunited into various subsections. At least five hundred different Christian sects holding the name Protestantism exist in Germany and England today.

As these historical details show, today's Christian tenets, such as trinity and three hypostases, making worships matters pertaining to the heart and soul alone, and consequently not worshipping in a manner as prescribed by the overt commandments of the Bible, are not true, dependable Biblical commandments. They are things fabricated afterwards because of various doubts or for differing purposes or established by the clergy at ecclesiastical assemblies. Great credal discrepancies have come into existence between Catholics and Protestants in the essentials of Christianity, such as the sacrament of **(the Eucharist),** the Pope's being caliph of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and the representative of Peter, sacredness of the past saints, i.e. the Apostles, various diets and feasts, bogus pictures of Mary with, as it were, Jesus in her arms, worshipping portraits and icons, priests' redeeming sinners from their sins and selling people places in Paradise [in return for a certain amount of money]. The disparities between them have reached such an extent that each party deserves Hell according to the other. According to some other priests, on the other hand, inasmuch as the allegation of deserving Hell made by each party against the other is an inspiration of the Holy Spirit as is believed by both Protestants and Catholics, both parties are true to their allegation. [Both Catholics and Protestants deserve Hell.]

The controversies about the Three Hypostases that started two hundred and fifty years after the beginning of Christianity and which have continued among various churches up to our time are beyond calculable numbers. Nevertheless, all Christian sects agree in the doctrine that God is an Essence composed of Three Persons, which are (Father, Son, and Holy Spirit). Each sect holds a different belief as to the natures of these three Essences, the nature of their unity and how they are related with one another. According to some of them, by 'three hypostases', 'three attributes of One Essential Person' is meant, not 'three distinct Persons'. According to some, the hypostasis of knowledge is (Logos), which has united with Christ's body. It is a perfect unity, like the uniting of water with wine. According to the Melekâniyya (Melchite) sect, it is like the shining of the sun on crystalline glass.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

According to the Nestorians, God has changed into flesh and blood and become Christ. According to the Ya'qûbiyya (Jacobite or Monophysite) sect, it is God's appearing in man. This sort of appearing is like the appearing of an angel in human guise. According to other sects, God has united with man like the uniting of the nafs (self) with the body. Thus, things that could never be accepted by reason or logic have been inserted into the [Nazarene] religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. It has been proven by the 'Ulamâ (savants) of Islam's knowledge of Kalâm and by owners of sagacity that these creeds are wrong. Those who need more scientific details about the matter may have recourse to the books of those savants. Being unable to answer the responses and objections directed to them in the knowledge of Kalâm, Protestants have had no other way than saying, "This is one of the divine secrets which the human mind falls short of comprehending." It goes without saying what this answer would be worth in the eyes of reasonable people.

Notwithstanding all these facts, some outstanding Protestants have asserted that Qur'ân al-kerîm (May Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from believing or saying so) is not a true heavenly book because the doctrine of trinity does not exist in Qur'ân al-kerîm. It is like the case of a hashish addict who enters a jeweller's shop and asks for some hashish. Upon the shopkeeper's answering that they do not hold any sort of narcotics and that all their wares are precious articles like jewels, he says, "Then you are not a real tradesman." This statement of Protestants, like their other statements, is of no value.

It is being noticed that this doctrine of trinity is being spread systematically among Muslims by Christian missionaries. And it is being seen with regret that some unlearned Muslims are being deceived by them; for instance, especially when they want to discipline their children by intimidating them, they use such expressions as 'Allah the Father' and 'Allah the Grandfather', pointing to the sky as if Allâhu ta'âlâ were in the sky. It is declared clearly in the Ikhlâs sûra of Qur'ân al-kerîm that it is never permissible to call Allâhu ta'âlâ Father or Grandfather. Allâhu ta'âlâ has not been procreated or begotten. He is free from being a father, a son, or a grandfather, and from place. Allâhu ta'âlâ is not in the sky, so one should not point to the sky when mentioning His name. Allâhu ta'âlâ is always Omnipresent and Omnicompetent. He governs and owns all. The credo that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' went up to heaven and sat on the right hand side of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Allah and that Allâhu ta'âlâ is in heaven is a doctrine that has been interpolated into Christianity later. We Muslims must be extremely vigilant in this matter, and in all such matters alike. We must refrain from words and deeds that may damage, and even destroy our îmân (belief). We must teach about belief and disbelief, words and deeds that cause disbelief to our children and relations, and help them refrain from such acts and words. We must not let them see television programs or motion pictures propagating Christianity or read books of that nature. We must tremble, shudder with the fear lest our most valuable belonging, îmân, may be marred. We must teach our children our blessed religion, Islam, in its pristine purity, as it was handed on to us by our forefathers, who detained it at the sacrifice of their lives, their blood. We must train and educate believing youngsters who will protect this religion and, when necessary, will sacrifice their lives for its sake, and we must entrust Islam only to such youngsters who have îmân.

Before terminating our discourse on trinity, we shall give information about Paul, who is accepted as one of the greatest saints in Christendom. Paul had the most prominent role in separating Christianity from Judaism and converting it into a religion mixed with Greek and pagan elements. H.G. Wells states in the hundred and twenty-ninth and the hundred and thirtieth pages of his book **(A Short History of the World)** that Paul is the most outstanding figure in the establishment of Christianity. His account of Paul can be paraphrased as follows: "This man had not seen Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; nor had he heard his preaches. [Being a Jew of Tarsus], his name was Saul formerly. Then he converted to Christianity and changed his name to Paul. He had an extremely earnest interest in the religious trends of his time. He was perfectly informed with Judaism, Mithraism, and all the religious and philosophical schools of Alexandria. He inserted many philosophical and religious terms and tenets peculiar to them into Christianity. He pretended to be striving to promulgate the way, the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', which was called God's Spiritual Kingdom of Heavens and which God liked because it guided to Paradise. He did not accept Jesus as the Messiah promised to Jewry. Instead, he considered him to be a sacrifice whose death would be the expiation for the salvation of mankind. This belief originated from heathen cults, wherein the salvation of humanity depended on human sacrifice."

Being a horrendous enemy of the Nazarenes, Paul gathered a

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

horde of rovers around himself, and with them raided the houses of the Nazarenes in Jerusalem, dragging out whomever they caught inside, men and women alike, and imprisoning them in dungeons. He asked the Jewish rabbis to write letters (of permission) that the Nazarenes living in Damascus and in neighboring cities be caught and sent to Jerusalem. The rabbis gave him letters authorizing him to do so.

All sorts of persecution and torture, including massacres, proved futile in the Jews' efforts to hamper the spreading of the Nazarene religion. Luke says in the ninth chapter of Acts of the Apostles, "And Saul, yet breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest," "And declared of him letters to Damascus to the synagogues, that if he found any of this way, whether they were men or women, he might bring them bound unto Jerusalem." "And as he journeyed, he came near Damascus: and suddenly there shined round about him a light from heaven:" "And he fell to the earth, and heard a voice saying unto him, Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" "And he said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest: ..." (Acts: 9-1 to 5) After these verses, Luke narrates how the voice told a certain disciple, (namely An-a-ni'as), that he (Paul) would render great services to the Nazarene religion. Then Paul declared his conversion to the Nazarene religion. He changed his name from Saul to Paul. He feigned to be a fervent Nazarene, thus taking up an internal position to change, defile the Nazarene religion, which he had not been able to annihilate by means of all sorts of persecution and oppression. Wherever he went, he said that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had given him the duty of guiding non-Jewish people to the Nazarene religion. By telling many other lies, he attached the Nazarenes to himself. He was accepted as the apostle for non-Jewish people. He began to spoil the creeds and worships of the Nazarenes. Up until that time the Apostles and other Nazarenes had been following the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and doing their worships as prescribed by his canon. Paul asserted that by the killing of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' on the cross, [which is a Christian belief], the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had been nullified, and so it was no longer valid. He announced that from then on salvation for all people depended on believing in Jesus the Son of God. He called Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' Son of God and Prophet alternately. He withstood Peter, the most prominent of the Apostles of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Peter, who had continuously

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

accompanied Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', was saying that the Nazarene religion had not abrogated but perfected Judaism. As a proof for this fact, he indicated Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' statement, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill," which is quoted in the seventeenth verse of the fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew. Paul made all sorts of food and drink permissible for the Nazarenes, and caused them to cease from many sorts of worships, such as circumcision. This fact is written clearly in the New Testament. Paul states in the seventh verse of the second chapter of the epistle which he wrote to Galatians, "But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter;" (Gal: 2-7) This means to say that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', as he is alive, intimates the injunction of circumcision to Peter, his companion, and says that this is a commandment of the Bible. Peter obeys this commandment and teaches it to everybody who accepts the Nazarene religion. And Paul, too, confirms that Peter has been told so. But he changes this after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' leaves the world.

A person named Paul who has never seen Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' appears, and rejects a commandment of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' transmitted by another person who has seen Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm. He states in his epistle that Peter, the first caliph of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', was with two other Apostles, James and John, who, too, heard Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' enjoin circumcision. He states that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', after ascending to heaven, has shown himself to him and enjoined uncircumcision. And afterwards this statement of his is accepted as a religious injunction by all Christians. On the other hand, the injunction transmitted unanimously by Apostles who have seen Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in person and who have been his companions is rejected. A single person makes a statement and asserts that it was inspired to him, in his dream or as he was awake, and then this statement of his is accepted and practised as a religious tenet. What a rational basis for Christianity: it depends on reported inspiration from Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'!

Dr. Morton Scott Enslin accepts that Paul's credo is quite disparate from the creed of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. His account of the matter in the hundred and eighty-second page of the second part of his book **(Christian Beginnings)** can be paraphrased as follows:

"It has been understood definitely that Christianity, as established by Paul, greatly differs from the Îsâwî (Nazarene) religion as taught by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Later, Paul and his

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

colleagues who had interpreted the Bible erroneously were censured harshly. The inner meaning of movement of **(Back to Jesus)** was (getting away from Paul). Many old Nazarenes and Jews joined this movement and reprehended Paul, but this movement did not yield much fruit. If Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had seen all the things that were being done in a church in the city of Corinth fifty-four years after his departure from the world, he would have said, 'Is this the result of my endeavours, of my invitation in Galilee?' Had Paul not done those changes in the Îsâwî (Nazarene) religion, there would be no Christianity." [Corinth is a city in Greece.] Paul not only made a discrepancy between Jews and Christians by rendering Christianity a disingenuous credo and Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' a savior god, but also declared the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to be (accursed). This case is entirely counter to the rule that not even a letter of the Sharî'at can be changed, which is written in the Gospels, [e.g. Matthew: 5-19].

Christianity, founded by Paul, spread to various countries and was accepted by Jewish communities and by non-Jewish pagan nations alike. For Paul had brought Christianity extremely close to Paganism. The demolition of Mesjîd-i-Aqsâ in Jerusalem and the evacuation of the true Nazarenes and Jews living there in the seventieth year of the Christian era delivered the Îsâwî (Nazarene) religion a blow from which it never recovered again.

Another noteworthy fact here is that Paul could never get along well with most of the Apostles and often quarrelled with them. Paul was apposed to Peter, who is called the greatest saint in Christendom by all Christians. He professed this in the eleventh verse of the second chapter of his epistle to Galatians. And in the thirteenth verse he accused Barnabas of having been taken in by hypocrites. Nevertheless, of the Apostles, he liked Barnabas best. According to the final part of the fifteenth chapter of Acts of the Apostles, Barnabas suggested that they (Paul and Barnabas) visit the Nazarenes in the other cities taking John along with them, but Paul refused. This issue caused a fiery dispute between Barnabas and Paul, which ended up in Paul's abandoning Barnabas.

A close examination of Paul's life and statements will clearly reveal his recurrent efforts to revile, downgrade, and contradict the Apostles. Many Christian clergy have looked upon Paul as the founder of Christianity. For according to these clergy Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and his Apostles adhered to Judaism, that is, to the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', with respect to belief and worship. Paul assailed this bitterly. He separated Judaism and Christianity from each other and discarded all the Judaic acts of worship. Thus a religion quite different from the teachings of the Apostles came into being. This religion, being based on Paul's ideas, was quite extraneous to the Nazarene religion which the Apostle Peter tried to preach. Priests, while accusing us of false charges on account of our stating these facts, accept Paul as a Christian (Saint). As a matter of fact, Paul's epistles, which are at the final section of the New Testament of the Holy Bible, constitute a component part of the Holy Bible. The Book of Acts of the Apostles, written by Luke, consists of Paul's biography. When this and Paul's epistles are taken into consideration, it will be seen that the space allotted for Paul in the Holy Bible is not smaller than the space allotted for the four Gospels. And Christianity is essentially based on the things which Paul wrote in these epistles of his. An example of these is this belief: "Wrongdoing and death for soul and body are the consequences of Âdam's 'alaihis-salâm' eating from the forbidden fruit. All people, who are the descendants of Âdam 'alaihis-salâm', came to the world smeared with the depravity of this (original) sin. God has sent a part of His Essence, His only Son, to the world, thus redeeming (people) of the sin which they had since Âdam 'alaihis-salâm'." We spoke with a priest on this subject, and asked him, "If God had sent His only Son earlier, millions of people would have been purified of the innate depravity caused by the original sin and come to the world in an extremely pure state; would it not have been better?" The priest answered, "Then the divinity of Jesus Christ would not have been realized, nor would his value have been appreciated." This answer of the priest's reminded us of the paradox that Christians, who on the one hand are said to have appreciated the value of Jesus Christ, have on the other hand held the belief that "He shall enter Hell (for the expiation of people's sins)." We asked him about it. He denied it. We showed him several passages from the New Testament, which another priest had shown to us and told us that they were evidences to prove it. He read them. Yet he **(could not answer).** He thought for a rather long time. At last he said that he was the deputy bishop and did not understand Turkish well, adding "This verse is a medjâz (allegory)." We knew then that he understood Turkish well enough to know such a (technical) word as medjâz.

Paul wreaked vengeance on the Nazarene religion by turning

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

the Nazarene religion, a true religion, into Christianity, a false religion. Yet Christians still call him (Paul the Apostle) and accept him as one of the most prominent Christian saints. They build their religious tenets pertaining to belief and worship on the words of a person who never saw Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and never sat in his blessed presence. And they profess that such a religion is the latest and the most perfect religion sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ. On the other hand, Muslims, who are well aware of Paul's acts of treason against the Nazarene religion, call surreptitious, double-faced, perfidious people 'Paul the Serpent'.

"Why should we blame the sun if the blind do not see."

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 11 —
PRIESTS' ATTACKS ON ISLAMIC WORSHIPS AND REFUTATIONS AGAINST THEM

Protestants refer to forms of worship in Islam and in Christianity in the second chapter of the book **Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât.** Therein they try to prove that Christianity is superior to and more meritorious than Islam. According to them, *"Forms of worship in the Islamic religion consist in a certain number of certain actions and modes at certain places at certain times. Christianity, on the other hand, is based on essentials instructing how to do worships soulfully and heartily, to have belief in salvation, which will take the place of superficial and formal worships, to improve yourself, to purify your heart of vices, and to beautify your moral habits. Qur'ân al-kerîm does not contain any clear and true information concerning the forgiveness of the sinful by their having belief and repenting. Whereas the Gospel of Matthew declares, in the twentieth and later verses of the first chapter, that the Angel of God showed himself to Joseph the Carpenter in his dream, gave him the glad tidings that Mary would have a son, and enjoined him, 'You shall name him Jesus, which means, he who redeems his people of sins', Qur'ân al-kerîm, while shelving the notion that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is the redeemer from sins by hushing up the matter, downgrades him to prophethood and equates him with other Prophets. If a person's sin were no more than ignorance and erring, a Prophet's guidance would suffice for him. Yet, alongside the human deficiencies such as ignorance and being prone to error, man is by his nature vulnerable to wrongdoing and is under the slavery of the devil, which is augmented by his innate depravity, [a consequence of the original sin committed by Âdam 'alaihis-salâm'], a teacher or Prophet's coming afterwards would not suffice [for the salvation of human beings]. Freeing the everlasting human soul from slavery and from the burden of sinfulness would certainly require the advent of a savior. Whereas the Bible has announced that*

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

mankind could be saved from the dirt of sinning and from the temptations of the devil only at the sacrifice of the blessed blood of Jesus Christ, the one and only Savior, Qur'ân al-kerîm has disignored this redemptive capacity of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and has made getting rid of sins dependent upon some principles such as uttering the kalima-i-tawhîd and kalima-i-shahâdat, suffering some chastisements, and obeying the religious commandments. The Bible, while encouraging people to do true penance, to have perfect, superior belief, and to thank and laud Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is able to change what is in any heart, has presented reasonable and admissible forms of worship and religious duties by eradicating all forms of worship and custom that were being observed among the Jews in the time of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. None the less for this fact, Qur'ân al-kerîm has re-established the physical and outward worships and customs of such a religion as Judaism, which is far from perfect and deprived of spirituality. Such physical worships as namâz, abdest (ablution), facing the qibla (during namâz), hajj, and fasting have no effect on the heart, and since it is onerous and arduous to observe these worships, the religion of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is not suitable for every community on the earth. In short, Qur'ân al-kerîm's not confirming the fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ had no other way than shedding the blood of His only Son for the forgiveness of His sinful born slaves and for their salvation from the pestering of the devil, proves the fact that Qur'ân al-kerîm has not been revealed by Allah. The rules stated in Qur'ân al-kerîm refer to physical worships only, and there is no injunction pertaining to the purification of the heart of vices or betterment of moral qualities. The commandments in Qur'ân al-kerîm, that is, those injunctions that are termed farz and wâjib, are unnecessary."

ANSWER: This impugnment [and these slanders] of the priestly author of the book **Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât** clearly evince the fact that, either he has never read Qur'ân al-kerîm or the books of the Islamic savants and therefore is vulgarly incognizant of Islam, or he is bluntly lying though he may know better. This priest likens Qur'ân al-kerîm, which was revealed to our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' through the wahy of Jebrâîl (Gabriel) 'alaihis-salâm', to those books that are ascribed to Matthew or John and which were compiled and fabricated by a number of anonymous priests. Writing sophisms quite contrary to facts, he insolently attacks Islam. This priest, [and all other priests and also the entire world] have to know that Qur'ân al-kerîm is

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

the Word of Allah. It contains no lie, no human interpolation. If Qur'ân al-kerîm contained falsifications like various Christian beliefs, such as that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is the Son of God [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so], that Allâhu ta'âlâ, having no other way to forgive the sins of people whom He created, sent him through hadrat Maryam, left him helpless in the hands of a few Jews, who treated him with insults, slapped him on the face, and then crucified him, and that finally He made him accursed by burning him in Hell, it would not be the Word of Allah. Like today's existing Gospels, it would lose its quality of being the Word of Allah. Furthermore, if this priest had read only a few books of Tafsîr and Hadîth-i-sherîf and thus acquired only a smattering of the styles and technicalities in those books, he would think it shameful to propose an ambiguous statement derived from a book which was written by Matthew and which is full of insertions as a proof against Muslims in his argument that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' were the Savior for all nations. If he were reasonable and did not mean harm as he professes in the preface of his book, he would not be annoyed to see that Qur'ân al-kerîm does not contain any preposterous statements like today's copies of the Bible. He would not have the daring to say, *"Qur'ân al-kerîm hushes up the fact that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is the Savior for all mankind"*, as if it were a fact and Qur'ân al-kerîm concealed it. As for the expression in the Gospel of Matthew which we have mentioned earlier; the word 'Savior' used here is not used in its full sense. [The absolute Savior is Allâhu ta'âlâ, when the word is used in its full sense. The word 'Savior', which is used about Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in the Gospels, is a hyperbole which denotes through overstatement that he, being a Prophet, shall intercede for his sinful ummat and cause them to be saved in the hereafter. As a matter of fact, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' told his companions time and again that he was not a 'savior' but a humble born slave, and that power and authority belong solely to Allâhu ta'âlâ, who has no partner or likeness and whose existence is absolutely necessary, that is, who is wâjib-ul-wujûd. For instance, it is written in the twenty-third verse of the twentieth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said about the sons of Zebedee, "... but to sit on my right hand, and on my left, is not mine to give, but it shall be given to them for whom it is prepared of my Father." (Matt: 20-23) On the other hand, in the thirtieth verse of the fifth chapter of the Gospel of John, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is quoted as having said, "I can of mine own self do nothing: as I

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me." (John: 5-30) And again, it is written in the twenty-eighth verse of the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of John that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said, "... for my Father is greater than I." (John: 14-28) What on earth could be so ignorant, so blasphemous and so devious as saying, "He is the only Son of God, and is the same as God Himself. He redeemed the sins by shedding his own blood", about Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', whose statements we have quoted above? Supposing the purpose of Allâhu ta'âlâ were, as Christians allege, to forgive His sinful born slaves; what, then, was the point in first creating His only Son through a mother and displaying many miracles through him throughout his prophethood, and then making all the Israelites except five to ten humble devotees enemies, and him fleeing here and there of their fear and then at last succumbing to the Jews' chase and, after being subjected to various insults, being killed yelling with pain on the cross, and after all, scorching him for three days in Hell and tormenting him in other ways? Who was there for Him to fear? If all human beings were by their nature kneaded with wrongdoing and sedition and therefore definitely needed such a (Savior), why did Allâhu ta'âlâ postpone sending him for six thousand years? Would it not have been much better if, for instance, He had sent him as a brother to Cain, the (eldest) son of Âdam 'alaihis-salâm', in which case Cain, who had been predestined to commit homicide, would have killed God's only Son, thus saving millions of people from Hell? Is it compatible with the justice and compassion of Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is the most merciful of the merciful, to put into Hell and torment so many pious people, among whom were Prophets who were visited by the Rûh-ul-quds, for thousands of years till the advent of His "only Son" Jesus Christ, on account of a sin that had been innate in them [since Âdam 'alaihis-salâm'], though they had no share in the sin? If what is meant by the 'original sin' is Âdam's 'alaihis-salâm' peccadillo of eating the fruit of the forbidden tree, did he not have his deserts by being sent out of Paradise? Was that not enough? What is the contribution of all his descendants to this sin? What other penal code or system of justice imposes retribution on the son for a guilt committed by the father? So many cruel and barbarous rulers lived on the earth. Is there any record in history telling that any of them punished a newer generation for an offence committed by an older generation? Is

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is the most compassionate of all the compassionate, more cruel than all those tyrants and barbars (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so)? According to this logic (of Christians), the Jews who (are said to have) killed Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' should have attained the fortune of causing forgiveness for all people. For when these Jews are bid to enter Hell on the Day of Judgement they may say, "O Lord! Since Thou would not have forgiven the sins of Thine human creatures unless someone had shed the blood of Thine only Son, whom Thou had sent unto the earth to this end only, we killed him to fulfill this decree of Thine. If we had not killed him all these people created would not have been saved. We killed him only in order to execute Thine will and to save people from Hell. Doing this atrocious deed of manslaughter, we evoked general hatred. Is it worthy of Thine justice to castigate, let alone rewarding, us for this self-sacrifice of ours?" If they say so, will they not elicit the compassion or at least the sympathy of even those people gathered for the Judgement? Moreover, being the first man, Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' was not aware of Satan's adversity and turpitude, and it never occurred to him that Satan, who had been dismissed from the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ, would enter Paradise to mislead him. As is written in the Taurah, Satan first deceived hadrat Hawwa (Eva) by using various stratagems [and hadrat Hawwa, in her turn, inadvertently caused Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' to commit an error. Now, (the Christian paralogism takes up the matter at this point), this error, being aggrandized in the view of Allâhu ta'âlâ, spread beyond Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' and infested all his descendants up to God's only Son. Thus it became inevitable that all should go to Hell and would not be pardoned unless God's only son came to the world and his blood was shed. [For pardoning that sin, Allâhu ta'âlâ had no other way than shedding His only Son's blood (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so). According to the reasoning of some priests we have talked to, "In past religions Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded to make a sacrifice for each sin committed and declared that requital for sinning was shedding blood, dictating the number of animals to be sacrificed for each sin. Expiation for each sin was shedding blood. This fact is written in the Old Testament. Yet animal blood would not suffice for the original sin; human blood would be necessary." On the other hand, as has been mentioned above, according to the Bible, "Allâhu ta'âlâ, having no other way than (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so) sacrificing His only

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Son, sacrificed His only Son, thus shedding human blood and forgiving the original sin, which had been inherited from the first father."]

Following (today's existing copies of) the Taurah and the Bible, Christians believe that a Christian who has committed one of the forbidden acts, such as murder and fornication, will attain forgiveness by giving a certain amount of money to a priest, who in his turn will say that he has forgiven him, or by uniting with the Lord by consuming his flesh and blood, or by standing bare headed and gazing at the sky. [Since it is so easy to attain forgiveness, would it not have been better if God's only Son, instead of being sacrificed, had begged God, so that God would have forgiven that sin for the sake of His divinized Son?]

Furthermore, sacrificing one's life for something is optional and is therefore dependent on one's full assent. Had the consent of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' been obtained for killing him? There is sufficient evidence to prove to the contrary; as is written in the Bible, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' prayed to the Father, "O Father, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me: ..." (Matt: 26-39); fearing a possible danger, he said (to others), "Do not tell anyone where I am"; and he supplicated on the cross, "E'li, E'li, la'ma sa-bach'tha-ni (My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken me)?" (ibid: 27-46); all such events show that his blood was shed, that is, he was sacrificed regardless of his option. For instance, if a person willingly spends some money for the sake of his religion or nation, his case will be an example of self-sacrifice. But a person who has had to give something or has been forced to do so cannot be said to have done self-sacrifice. [Then, how can Christians, who believe that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so) killed and that he made the above-quoted statements, hold the belief at the same time that he sacrificed himself for the sake of sinful people? This latter belief of theirs and the statements quoted from Îsâ 'alahis-salâm' in the Gospels are contradictory. "Two opposite facts cannot coexist."]

It is written in the existing copies of the Bible that if a person blasphemes the Holy Spirit he shall never be forgiven. There are no prescribed punishments for other sins in the Gospels. On the other hand, Catholic priests deliver from sins in return for a certain amount of money, depending on the gravity of each sin.

According to the âyat-i kerîmas in Qur'ân al-kerîm, there are three kinds of sins:

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

1 — Ṣirk:[1] means to worship something other than, or besides, Allâhu ta'âlâ. It means disbelief, unbelief, atheism. Disbelief is forgiven only if the concerned person repents and believes by heart. The hundred and sixteenth âyat of Nisâ sûra purports: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ will not forgive those who attribute a partner** (or partners) **to Him, that is, disbelief."** [Of all the sins and vices, disbelief is the worst. A person who slights one of the commandments and prohibitions of Allâhu ta'âlâ becomes a disbeliever. None of the goodnesses, pious and charitable deeds of a disbeliever will do him any good in the hereafter. If a person does not have îmân, none of his goodnesses will be rewarded. There are kinds of disbelief. The worst, the gravest kind is **(Ṣirk).** It has been a generally accepted rule that when several subjects are to be referred to under one common nomenclature, the gravest one is mentioned. For this reason, the word (ṣirk) used in âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs comprehends all sorts of disbelief. So it is understood from the âyat-i-kerîma cited above that disbelievers will be scorched everlastingly in Hell. A Muslim who abandons the Islamic faith and becomes a disbeliever is called **murtad** (apostate). All the former worships and thawâbs (all pious deeds that deserve to be rewarded in the world to come) of an apostate will come to naught. Unless an apostate repents and ceases from his behavior that has made him a disbeliever, he shall not become a Muslim by saying the **Kalima-i-shahâdat** or by performing namâz. Therefore, one should be very much afraid of disbelief. It is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Always say what is good and useful. Otherwise keep quiet."** One should shy away from words and behaviors that are not compatible with Islam. It is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Beware from ṣirk. Ṣirk is more stealthy than the sound of an ant's footsteps."** Because disbelievers would remain disbelievers if they lived forever, the punishment for their disbelief is to be tormented in Hell forever. Therefore, it cannot be asserted that it would be cruelty to torment disbelievers forever.]

2 — Grave sins: are the acts of violating the prohibitions of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Homicide, theft, lying, arrogance, i.e. conceit, are only a few examples. He who has done these, that is, who has committed a grave sin, if he has not made tawba[2] (before dying)

---

[1] The first letter of the word, i.e. the Turkish letter (Ṣ), is an equivalent for the English (sh).

[2] Tawba means to repent for having sinned, cease from the sin or sins one has committed or has been committing, beg Allâhu ta'âlâ for forgiveness, and to be resolved not to commit the same sin(s) again.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and if he does not attain shafâ'at (intercession) in the next world, shall be scourged with Hell fire as long as he deserves on account of his sins, and shall attain forgiveness by Allâhu ta'âlâ owing to the îmân he has had.

3 — Not to do the worships that are termed (farz) and (wâjib) and which have been enjoined by Allâhu ta'âlâ.

There are two kinds of tawba:

Firstly: Tawba for the sins that involve violating the rights of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Examples of sins of this sort are neglecting the worships termed (farz) and (wâjib) and committing the acts forbidden by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Not performing namâz (which is farz) and not giving the prescribed alms termed zakât (which is farz under the conditions dictated by Islam) are sins of this category. Those Muslims who have committed sins of this sort shall be pardoned by Allâhu ta'âlâ when they make tawba-i-nasûh. The eighth âyat of Tahrîm sûra purports: **"O Believers! Repent for your sins and make tawba-i-nasûh to Allâhu ta'âlâ."** Tawba-i-nasûh means to repent for one's sins, supplicate Allâhu ta'âlâ for forgiveness, and to be determined not to sin again till one dies. The two hundred and twenty-second âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ loves those who make tawba."** As it can be inferred from these and other glad tidings in Qur'ân al-kerîm and from the hadîth-i-sherîf which announces the good news, **"A person who makes tawba for his sin is identical with one who has never sinned at all,"** sinners who make tawba shall attain forgiveness by Allâhu ta'âlâ.

Secondly: Tawba for the sins in which rights of the born slaves, e.g. people, are involved, too. Examples of these sins are usurpation, oppression, backbiting, etc. People who have committed one of these sins, [if they have not repaid the wronged person his right or settled the matter with him somehow or obtained the wronged person's consent or renunciation], shall never attain Allah's forgiveness and shall be punished in the hereafter, unless the plaintiff withdraws his action on the Day of Judgement. However, being Believers, they shall be tormented as long as they deserve, and then they shall enter Pradise. Or, Allâhu ta'âlâ, the most merciful of the merciful, shall offer such gifts to the wronged party as will wheedle him into agreeing to the waiver. Thus, the wronged party attaining these gifts and renouncing their right willingly, the wrongdoer shall be pardoned.

As it will be understood from the information given above, contrary to the suppositions and calumniations of the demurrant

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

priests, pardoning of Muslims' sins is not possible only by their saying the Kelima-i-tawhîd or the Kelima-i-shahâdat. Islam has clearly declared that there cannot be a likeness, a partner or a deputy of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Therefore, in the hereafter, sinners will be interceded for only with the permission and decree of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Muslims, putting their trust in the âyats of good news expressed in Qur'ân al-kerîm, look forward to the infinite blessings of Allâhu ta'âlâ in a state of (beyn-al-khawfi wer-rajâ), which means 'midway between fear and hope.' Christians, on the other hand, expect that their sin, regardless of its kind, will be pardoned only by the priest's saying, "I have forgiven thee," and thus they will attain God's kingdom, that is, Paradise. Now, it only takes honest reasoning to decide which of the two creeds is worthy of the Honour of Divinity and compatible with the humility that born slaves must endue themselves with.

The book **(Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât)** traduces Qur'ân al-kerîm, especially in its hundred and forty-fifth page, as follows:

"Qur'ân al-kerîm demotes Christ to Prophet by not referring to his grade of Savior. It denies the fact that he is the Savior, the man who fulfilled the desire of his heavenly Father by sacrificing his life for the sake of other people and thus saving men from the slavery of the great sin. Instead, it states that the true and the latest Savior is Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', who, as is written by the scholars of Siyer,[1] approved of others' being sacrificed for protecting his life and carrying out his commandments."

ANSWER: The dogma that people have been born sinful since Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' and are therefore under the slavery of depravity, is a Christian fabrication. The Gospels do not contain such a statement. It would be futile to cudgel the brain trying to solve this enigma.

Islam not only guides people in their outward behaviour, [such as deeds and worships], but also teaches them how to cleanse their hearts and souls. The eighty-eighth and the eighty-ninth âyats of Shu'arâ sûra purport: **"On the Judgement Day, neither property nor progeny shall do good. Yet one who comes to Allâhu ta'âlâ with qalb-i-selîm,** [with a heart purified of vices], **is an exception,** [that is, he alone shall be saved]." This âyat-i-kerîma and hundreds of hadîth-i-sherîfs commending and advising purification of the heart, doing good and having beautiful moral

---

[1] Branch of knowledge teaching facts about our Prophet, Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

habits, in addition to manners and actions of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' and the kindnesses he did even to his enemies, are in the open. When these facts are known, it will spontaneously be seen how mendacious and how illiterate the priestly author of this book is. We have already explained by giving quotations from the Bible that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' did not sacrifice his life in order to fulfill the desire of his heavenly father. That is, it is written in the Gospels that before he was crucified he prostrated himself with anxiety and said, "O Father, let this cup pass from me." [This event is told in detail in the fourteenth chapter of Mark and in the twenty-second chapter of Luke. It is written in the forty-fourth verse of the twenty-second chapter of Luke: "And being in an agony he prayed more earnestly: and his sweat was as it were great drops of blood falling down to the ground." (Luke: 22-44) All these things are derived from the Christian creed. According to the Islamic creed, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was neither crucified, nor killed at all. It was his hypocritical betrayer Judas Iscariot that was crucified. The Jews mistook him for Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and crucified him. Allâhu ta'âlâ elevated Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to the third heaven. He prayed very earnestly so that he could be one of the Ummat of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', the only comforter, whose good news is given even in today's copies of the Bible and whom Christians call Paraclete, which is translated into English as encourager (or admonisher). Towards the end of the world Allâhu ta'âlâ shall send him (Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm') down to earth again. Then Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' shall follow the Sharî'at of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' and shall say halâl (permitted) for whatever he said halâl, and harâm (forbidden) for whatever he said harâm. Paraclete means Ahmad. And Ahmad, in its turn, is one of the names of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is one of the Prophets called Ulul'azm (the highest Prophets). He is not the son of Allah (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so). He was not a God from God, or a light from light. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was a human being. He cannot be worshipped.]

This slanderous priest, by his statement, *"who approved of others' being sacrificed for protecting his life"*, implies our Prophet's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' ordering hadrat Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' to lie in his (the Prophet's) bed during the Hijra (Hegira). Explaining in the next page that this event is what he means, he essays to demonstrate, as it were, that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is the last Prophet and therefore superior to and more

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

virtuous than Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâm’. However, his argument seems to prove to the contrary. For he says in the twenty-ninth page of the same book, *“Jesus Christ appeared among the Israelites and found them ready to accept him.”* And further ahead, from the hundred and twelfth page to the hundred and thirteenth page, he endeavours to prove that the Arabs, being heathens, were not ready to accept a new religion.

According to a narrative, people who believed in Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ were no more than twenty men, and a few women who had been cured of epilepsy. Supposing these believers had at the same time confirmed, as Christians presume, that he was divine; then why is it that none of these believers complied with his admonitions, such as, “If you had a streak of belief, you should lift up a mountain,” which he asseverated in order to instill a mature belief and trust in Allah into them, and “If one of you sacrifices his life for my sake, he shall attain eternal life,” the good news he had given them a few days before his (supposed) crucifixion? On the contrary, one of the Hawârîs who are looked on as Messengers, [Apostles, that is], by Christians, namely Judas, let alone sacrificing his life, showed the Jews the place where Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ was in return for a bribe of thirty pieces of silver. The other disciples, who occupied the position of Apostleship, “forsook him, and fled” when Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ was caught [Matt: 26-56]. Peter, who was the highest of all, had sworn an oath to Christ and said, “Though I should die with thee, yet I will not deny thee, ...” [Matt: 26-35]. Amongst those tumults, as Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ was being taken away, he followed him afar off [Matt: 26-58]. Then, when the rooster crowed, he denied three times with imprecations that he knew Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ [Matt: 26-74].

[On the other hand, all the As-hâb-i-kirâm, who belonged to the Arabic nation that this priest asserts were not ready to welcome a new religion, confirmed the Prophethood of Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâm’ and did not hesitate to sacrifice their lives and property willingly for the sake of Muhammad ‘alaihis-salâm’. Here are a few examples:

The Ghazâ (Holy War) of Uhud[1] is one of the greatest and most important holy wars in the history of Islam. This holy war was about to end in a victory of the As-hâb-i-kirâm, when the heathens, making a detour of the valley, circumvented the As-

[1] Uhud is pronounced as /Uhud/, according to the IPA.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

hâb-i-kirâm ‘alaihimur-ridwân’ and attacked them from behind. The Islamic army disintegrated. Many of the As-hâb-i-kirâm attained the rank of martyrdom. The valour and bravery of the As-hâb-i-kirâm who took part and were martyred in this war made up the most honourable legend of heroism in the history of Islam. We shall relate the states in which some of the Sahabîs were:

That day Talha bin Ubaidullah ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’, seeing that Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ was surrounded by the heathens, was at a loss as to where to run, which way to turn. He was now fighting back those who attacked from the right, then grappling with the assailants from the left. Meanwhile he was shielding Rasûlullah with his own body and shuddering with the fear that Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ might be injured. Keeping close to Rasûlullah, he was fighting, turning about, and fighting on. Among the heathens there was a skilled archer who hit whatever mark he aimed at. This villain, Mâlik bin Zubair by name, aimed at our Prophet ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ and threw his arrow. It was just about too late to stop the arrow whizzing towards Rasûlullah’s blessed head, when Talha ‘radiyallâhu anh’, seeing there was no other way to stop it, swiftly opened his hand and held it against the arrow. The arrow pierced his palm.

Umm-i-Umâra ‘radiy-Allâhu anhâ’, one of the female Sahabîs, together with her husband and her son, was fighting beside Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’. Her son, her husband, and she herself were shielding Rasûlullah ‘sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam’ with their bodies. Meanwhile she was bandaging the wounds of her son and the other Sahabîs, and fetching water to the thirsty Sahabîs. Then, snatching a sword, she began to fight. An unbeliever named Ibni Kâmia had sworn an oath to kill Rasûlullah. When he saw Rasûlullah he assailed. Umm-i-Umâra stood before his horse, stopped his horse, and charged against him. The heathen being armour-clad, her blows did not have much effect. Had not he had his armour on, he would have joined the other killed heathens. The heathen made vehement counter-attacks and finally delivered her a fatal wound on the throat. Here is Rasûlullah’s blessed remark about her: **“On the day of Uhud, wherever I looked I always saw Umm-i-Umâra, and Umm-i-Umâra again.”**

Mus’ab bin Umeyr ‘radiy-Allâhu anh’ was carrying the banner of Muhâjirs in the Holy War of Uhud. He had two sets of armours

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

on him. The wicked unbeliever Ibni Kâmia set upon Mus'ab 'radiy-Allâhu anh'. For Mus'ab 'radiy-Allâhu anh' was shielding Rasûlullah with his body. With one stroke of his sword, Ibni Kâmia cut off Mus'ab's 'radiy-Allâhu anh' right arm. So he held the banner with his left hand. In the meantime he was soliloquizing and saying the fourteenth âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra, which purported: **"Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah alone."** A second stroke, and this time his left arm was cut off. Upon this he pressed the banner on his chest, using what remained of his mutilated arms and at the same time reiterating the same âyat-i-kerîma. He did not let go the Banner of Islam. At last he succumbed to a spear that was thrust into his chest, and attained martyrdom. Yet he was still in possession of the Islamic Banner.

Hubeyb bin Adiy and Zayd bin Desinna 'radiy-Allâhu anhumâ' had been entrapped, enslaved, and then sold to the polytheists of Qoureish by the sons of Lihyan, who were polytheists, too. Before martyring Hubeyb, they told him that they would set him free if he abandoned his religious faith. He replied, "I swear by the name of Allah that I shall not abandon my religious faith! I would not abandon Islam even if the entire world were given to me in return." Upon this the polytheists asked, "Would you rather put Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' in your place and have him killed, so that you may go home and live comfortably?" Hubeyb 'radiy-Allâhu anh' answered, "I would sacrifice my life even to prevent a thorn from stinging the blessed foot of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' in Medina. The unbelievers marvelled at this excessive love of Hubeyb's. Then they martyred him.

These events and hundreds of other examples that could be written here bear witness to the fact that all the As-hâb-i-kirâm and all the other Muslims that have come to the earth for fourteen hundred years were and have been willing to sacrifice their lives for the sake of Rasûlullah and for attaining love of Allâhu ta'âlâ. The Apostles, on the other hand, who are accepted as Messengers by Christians, not only deserted Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and ran away at his most grievous time, but also swore afterwards that they did not know him. These cases are written in today's Gospels.]

Every truth is fully known only by Allâhu ta'âlâ; our Prophet's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' enjoining this sacrificial act on Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' in the night of Hegira was intended to answer

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

any possible future question as to why the latest Prophet did not arise from a nation who were ready to welcome a new religion, thus silencing those Christians who might ask such a question once and for all. [For though he had arisen among a nation not ready for a new religion, an injunction given to a person who believed in him was carried out willingly despite the danger of losing his life. This fact is one of the greatest proofs demonstrating the superiority and virtue of our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. This priest contradicts himself.] Another very subtle point of hikmat here is this: it may be considered that Rasûlullah's 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' assigning this duty to one of his Companions must have been one of his admonitory miracles (mu'jizas), for this event makes up a good criterion by which to compare the Apostles and the Ashâb-i-kirâm, and gives a mortifying answer in advance to the objectors and adversaries who assert that **"Islamic religion spread through outward advantages and by compulsion."** [For Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' lay in Rasûlullah's bed without hesitation, as opposed to Peter and the Apostles' forsaking Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and running away.]

Oppugning Islam, Protestant priests say: *"The Bible exempted its believers from the worships performed by the Jews contemporary with Jesus Christ, and showed and taught its believers the most reasonable and acceptable forms of worship. However, Qur'ân al-kerîm relapsed into imperfection by commanding the soulless, physical and outward customs and worships of Judaism."*

ANSWER: We ask them: What is the meaning of Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' statement, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill." "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled," in the seventeenth and eighteenth verses of the fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew? Why was he circumcised as prescribed by the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'? What was the reason for his celebrating fully all the certain feast days peculiar to the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' all through his lifetime? Why were his disputes with the Israelites about the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and why did he rebuke them for not following that Sharî'at? All these facts show that the assertions of this Protestant priest are quite incongruous with the teachings of the Bible and with the practices of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Qur'ân al-kerîm is never dispossessed of perfection and spirituality. A person who does not

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

perform the physical worships of a religion cannot benefit from the spirituality of that religion. This subject will be dealt with in detail later.

The Christian priests' primary objection is Islam's tahârat (cleanliness). Their first target, therefore, is the matter of tahârat, where they make their major offensive.

This priest says, *"If Islam's ablution were intended for the cleanliness of the people and for the cleaning of the body of its dirt, nothing could be said against it. Yet the soundness of worships, which are performed for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ, has been made dependent on making ablution and thus ablution has been made one of the essentials of worship. The predication that 'Allâhu ta'âlâ will not accept a namâz without ablution' is something to be dwelt on. Since it is declared in the Taurah, 'The Rabb will not look as man looks. For man looks at the appearance, and the Rabb looks at the heart,' making ablution before namâz will have no effect on the purification of the heart or on the inner essence of namâz. Nor will it be of any use for the soundness and acceptability of namâz. Accordingly, Qur'ân al-kerîm has made the sincerity and the presence of heart, which is the inner essence of worship, dependent on useless norms and customs. Moreover, the washing of hands and feet is useful and suitable for people living in hot climates and going about bare footed. As for those delicate and civilized people who live in cold zones and therefore have to protect their feet by wearing socks and shoes; ablution is an unhealthy obligation for them, especially for people who live in the Arctic regions: how onerous and how enervating it would be for them to break the ice and make ablution five times daily, and how unfair it would be to enjoin this obligation on them. Furthermore, turning towards the qibla is imitating the Israelites."*

ANSWER: It should be known that the Islamic religion is the most perfect and the most consummate form of all the religions and sharî'ats. In other words, it is a religion of unity that has brought together the outward and spiritual perfections. It contains no principle that might give the slightest harm to men. Each of its principles comprises many substantial and spiritual benefits for mankind. An apparent proof testifying to the fact that Islam has been sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ is that all its seemingly outward and formal principles embody many inner ultimate causes and innumerable benefits to mankind. These benefits are coming to the open as scientific and technical progress is made. People with

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

eyes covered with the curtain of ignorance cannot perceive these ultimate truths and judge by appearanace only. The seventy-second âyat of Isrâ sûra purports: **"A person** [whose heart is so] **blind** [that he cannot admit the truth] **in this world, will be blind in the hereafter, too,** [and will not be able to see the way to salvation]." The people mentioned in this âyat-i-kerîma are the priests who make such statements as the ones quoted above. People who adapt themselves to Islam shall attain the rewards proportional to their sincerity and intention in the hereafter. High grades pertaining to the world to come have been promised to those whose eyes have been opened with the light of spiritual knowledge and who have gotten their shares from the heavenly blessings suffising the entire universe as far as their discernments and comprehensions would allow them. These promises, these blessings have been announced through âyat-i-kerîmas. What remains to be done on the part of the people of wisdom and sagacity, then, is to hold fast to the worships enjoined by Islam and at the same time, as is explained in detail in books of Tafsîr and Hadîth-i-sherîf, to purify their hearts of vices. How these will be done has been explicated in books written by thousands of 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna. In addition, those who wish to be guided spiritually should resort to the Awliyâ-i-kirâm, who are the sources and the helmsmen of the voyage leading to Allâhu ta'âlâ.

'Ulamâ of Tafsîr state that abdest (ablution) and tahârat, that is, cleanliness, being on the one hand very useful for physical health, as this averse priest also admits and acknowledges, are on the other hand a sign of the heart's purity and peace. Namâz is to stand in the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ. It is obvious that when you stand in the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ your heart will be purified of vices. You cannot enter the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ with a heart that has not been purified of vices. As a matter of fact, this case applies to wordly affairs, too.

Making ablution means physical cleanliness, which deterges the body of germs five times daily; this is an obvious fact, and everyone with reason and knowledge is aware of this fact. On the other hand, even priests know that ablution invigorates the heart and purges the soul of vices. For instance, while explaining the virtues of ablution, the book **(Riyâd-un-nâsihîn)** relates the following event: Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq[1] visited a monk in order to

---

[1] Ja'fer Sâdiq passed away in Medina in 148 [A.D. 765].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

give him a piece of advice. The door was opened rather late. When he asked why the monk said, "When I saw you through the chink, I was very much frightened by your awe-inspiring appearance. So I made ablution right away. It is written in the Taurah that when a person fears someone or something he should make ablution, for ablution protects against harms." When Imâm gave him some advice, he became a Muslim then and there. His heart was purified with the barakat of ablution.

A person wearing dirty clothes will not be admitted to enter the presence of a sultan. This indicates that, contrary to the antagonistic priest's supposition, ablution and tahârat are not inutile for (spiritual) peace and sincerity. People who live in northern countries, when they need ablution, make ablution with hot water only in the morning and then put on their socks and mests (soleless boots made of light leather). For the other four daily prayers of namâz, they may either keep their ablution or, if they cannot keep it, renew their ablution by making masah[1] on their mests. [Thus their feet will not be cold because they will not have to wash them, and at the same time they will be able to perform namâz. Those who cannot use cold water make tayammum by using soil in their snug rooms. The Protestant priest's allegation is out of place because there is no need to break ice five times daily. Do those people lose their health because they have to break ice three times daily for washing their hands before meals?] If a person is too ill to make ablution, that is, if washing with water may impair his health, he can make tayammum. For the real purpose is not only to wash the hands, the face and the feet, but to purify the heart, [that is, to get ready to stand in the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ, to remember Allâhu ta'âlâ]. In case of strong necessity, Islam never enjoins quandary. As a matter of fact, it is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf: **"There is no difficulty in the religion."** Qur'ân al-kerîm purports in the two hundred and eighty-sixth âyat of Baqara sûra: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ would not enjoin on man something he would be unable to do."** In other words, Allâhu ta'âlâ commands an individual what he will be able to do, not what is beyond his capacity. [The twenty-eighth âyat of Nisâ sûra purports: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ wishes your worships to be easy. Man is weak, frail by creation."** In Islam, there are two ways of worshipping. One of them is called

---

[1] There is detailed information about **masah** in the third chapter of the fourth fascicle of **Endless Bliss.**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

(Ruhsat), and the other is called **(Azîmet)**. Ruhsat embodies the facilities recognized and permitted by Islam. Choosing the easier way of doing something is acting upon the ruhsat. Preferring the difficult way is called azîmet. Acting upon the azîmet is more estimable than acting upon the ruhsat. If a person's nafs does not wish to utilize the facilities, it will be better for him to give up following the azîmet and to act upon the ruhsat. However, acting upon the ruhsat should not make way to searching for facilities.] The hadîth-i-sherîf, **"The most virtuous deed is the one which the nafs feels most averse to doing,"** makes it quite clear what way would be the most correct to follow in doing the Islamic worships. For this reason, those Believers who have îmân-i-kâmil (perfect belief) prefer doing things that sound difficult to their nafs in order to attain the approval and love of Allâhu ta'âlâ. By doing so, they wish to attain high grades in the hereafter.

Christians, who worship only by uncovering their heads and gazing at the sky, do not even touch on bodily cleanliness and go to church with stinking bodies and dirty clothes and shoes and then expect, in that dismal, noisome atmosphere, that their hearts will be cleaned and they will (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so) unite with Allâhu ta'âlâ only by consuming a piece of bread and a draught of wine. It must certainly be very difficult for people with such a stupid presumption to comprehend the inner essence of Islam's injunctions. Learning cleanliness from Muslims, they have saved themselves from being dirty, yet they are still maintaining those wrong beliefs and spurious worships of theirs.

Another objection raised by priests concerns namâz. They say, for instance, *"Tekbîr, qiyâm, rukû', and sajda are not appropriate outwardly; nor are they spiritual."*

ANSWER: They cannot seem to deliberate upon what the purpose of worshipping Allâhu ta'âlâ could be, from both physical and spiritual points of view. In whatever form, worship means to pay homage to Allâhu ta'âlâ, to thank, praise and laud Him for the countless blessings He has bestowed upon us out of His infinite treasury, to acknowledge your impotence, and to invoke the compassion of Allâhu ta'âlâ. If we are to investigate the elements of paying homage to Allâhu ta'âlâ (in namâz), all the rukns (rules, obligatory actions) in namâz, such as the qiyâm, during which one clasps one's hands, stands in khushû (deep, humble, submissive reverence) in the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ, thanks, praises and lauds Allâhu ta'âlâ by saying the Besmele-i-sherîfa and reciting the Fâtiha sûra, the rukû' (bowing in namâz)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and sajda (prostration), in which one makes tesbîh of Allâhu ta'âlâ, (that is, recites prayers praising Allâhu ta'âlâ), who is wâjib-ul-wujûd (being whose existence is indispensable), and affirming the greatness of Allâhu ta'âlâ by uttering the expression **(Allâhu ekber)** at each change of posture (during namâz); all these actions express homage to Allâhu ta'âlâ.

As it was informed by the Prophets of Benî Isrâîl (the Children of Israel), the qibla used to be in the direction of **(Beyt-i-muqaddes)** in Jerusalem. Later it was changed to **(Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama)**. Because Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama had been built by Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm', Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' wished to worship in the direction of Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama. Allâhu ta'âlâ, whose compassion is boundless, granted His beloved what he wished by changing the qibla from the direction of Mesjîd-i-aqsâ (Beyt-i-muqaddes) to Mesjîd-i-harâm (Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama). The hundred and forty-fourth âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"Now turn your face towards Mesjîd-i-harâm."**

The Islamic religion includes a number of the rules that existed in the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', such as sacrificing an animal (at a certain time of the year), circumcision, prohibiton of (the consumption of) pork and carcass (animal not killed as prescribed by the religion), prohibition of earning interest, prohibitions of fornication and homicide, lex talionis (retaliation), and many others. Many of the rules that were existent in the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' have been falsified in today's Christianity despite the admonitions of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; yet some of the principles of the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', e.g. the prohibitions of fornication and homicide and the obligation of turning in the direction of qibla, have held on so far. Christians do not follow the Taurah though they say, "All the principles of the Taurah are valid and confirmed." [When they are asked why they do not act upon the rules of the Old Testament (Taurah) though they believe its being a part of the Holy Bible, in which they believe as a whole, and say that the Old Testament also is a heavenly book revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ, they answer that its rules have been abrogated. On the one hand they believe in the Taurah as a book of Allâhu ta'âlâ and quote verses from the Taurah whenever they need evidences to testify to the trueness of the Christian cult, and on the other hand, when they are asked why they do not follow its principles, they answer that its principles have been cancelled.] However, although some Christians, following a priest named Luther, who appeared in 923

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

[A.D. 1517], ceased from turning in the direction of Beyt-i-muqaddes as their qibla, millions of Catholic Christians are still facing Beyt-i-muqaddes (in their worships). They take no heed of Protestants' ceasing from turning towards their qibla. For the purpose in worshipping is to pay homage to Allâhu ta'âlâ, to thank, praise, laud, pray and invoke Him. What could be in turning with a peaceful heart in a certain direction associated with a certain spiritual value that could be detrimental to the serenity and honour of worship? On the contrary, the heart will feel more placid when the direction to be faced is known.

Because their worships lack postures symbolizing servitude to Allâhu ta'âlâ, such as qiyâm (standing posture), rukû' (bowing down), and sajda (prostration), Christians only look at one another's faces in church services. Young boys and girls, notwithstanding the prohibition of visual fornication, cannot take their eyes off each other. Then, consuming the bread and wine which they believe have, by the breathing of the priest, become the flesh and blood of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', their supposed divinity, they celebrate the Eucharist and expect to unite with the Holy Spirit just by doing so. [Protestants celebrate the Eucharist as a memorial.]

The purpose of worship is to submit and pay homage to Allâhu ta'âlâ, the Creator of all. It is evident which one of the two religions contains this submission.

In the Islamic religion, first the azân (or adhân) and then the iqâmet is recited before the farz (compulsory) part of the five daily prayers of namâz. The muazzin announces the azân loudly, as follows:

ALLÂHU EKBER: Allâhu ta'âlâ is great. He needs nothing. He does not need the worships of His born slaves. Worships give Him no use. [This expression is repeated four times in order to establish it (its meaning) firmly in minds.]

ESH-HEDU EN LÂ ILÂHA IL-L-ALLAH: I certainly testify and believe that, though He is too great to need anyone's worship, no one other than He is worthy of being worshipped. Nothing is like Him.

ESH-HEDU AN-NA MUHAMMADAN RASÛLULLAH: I testify and believe that Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is the Prophet sent by Him and the instructor of the way of doing the worships enjoined by Him.

HAY YA 'ALES-SALÂH, HAY YA 'ALAL FELÂH: O

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Believers, run to salvation and happiness, run to goodness, i.e., to namâz.

ALLÂHU EKBER: No one can do the worship worthy of Him. He is far too great for any person's worship to be worthy of Him.

LÂ ILÂHA IL-L-ALLAH: He, alone, deserves to be worshipped, to mortify yourself before. No one can do the worship due to Him, nor is anyone except Him worthy of being worshipped. [Saying these words, he (the muazzin) invites Believers to namâz.]

[Allâhu ta'âlâ says about His beloved one, as is purported in the fourth âyat of Inshirâh sûra: **"I shall raise thine name** [in the east, in the west, all over the earth]." As you go westward the times of namâz become four minutes later at each longitudinal distance [111.1 kilometres]. At every twenty-eighth kilometre the azân of the same namâz is called again one minute after the one called at a place twenty-eight kilometres eastward. Thus azân is called every moment all over the earth, and the name of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is heard everywhere every moment. There is not a moment when his name is not mentioned within twenty-four hours.]

On the other hand, Christians' invitation to church is done with bells. It is clear which one of the two methods of invitation to worship is more reverential to Allâhu ta'âlâ and more spiritual; the Islamic method or the Christian method?

Muslims perform namâz after azân. Before beginning to perform namâz, there are conditions to be fulfilled so that namâz be acceptable. They are six. If one of them is not fulfilled namâz will not be acceptable:

1 — **Tahârat from hades:** Means for a person without ablution to wash his limbs (of ablution) well. [Or for a person who is junub, (in a state that necessitates ritual washing), to make ghusl (ritual washing).]

2 — **Tahârat from nejasat:** Means to clean one's body and clothes (or dress) and the place where one is to perform namâz of the dirt that can be seen. (What these dirts are, the amounts that will cancel namâz, ways of cleaning them have been dictated by Islam.)

3 — **Istikbâl-i-qibla:** To turn in the direction of Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama.

4 — **Setr-i-awrat:** Means for both men and women to cover the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

awrat parts of their bodies which Islam commands must be covered when performing namâz. These parts of awrat must always be covered when in company of others; it is farz.

5 — **Waqt:** Since there are certain times of worship in the religious cult of every community, by the same token, Allâhu ta'âlâ has allotted certain times for Muslims' prayers of namâz. It is a grave sin to call azân before the prayer time comes, and the namâz performed prematurely will not be acceptable.

6 — **Niyyet:** Means to intend, to know the name and the time of the namâz one is to perform, not for a worldly reason or purpose, but for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and because it is a command of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

Christians go to church without washing. They annoy one another with their dirty smells. Because they do not have a form of worship that can be performed with a serene heart by turning in a certain direction, they keep looking at one another.

A comparison of the conditions that are to be observed by Muslims and those which Christians observe will reveal which one is more spiritual and more compatible with servitude to Allâhu ta'âlâ.

Now, let us explain what the rukns of namâz are:

1 — **Tekbîr iftitâh:** For beginning to perform namâz, a Muslim first raises his both hands to his ears (and women to their breast), dispels all kinds of thought except that of Allâhu ta'âlâ out of his heart, imagines himself in the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and says, **(Allâhu ekber)**. Its meaning is, "Allâhu ta'âlâ is far from resembling any figure, any fancy, any creature, and greater than everything qualified with perfection."

2 — **Qiyâm:** Means to clasp the wrist at the navel (and for women on the breast) and to stand in the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ in a perfectly deep, humble reverence, that is, with **khushû'** and **adab.**

3 — **Qirâ'at:** Means to say the Besmele and recite the sûra Fâtiha-i-sherîfa, which consists of, as we have stated earlier, thanking, praising, lauding Allâhu ta'âlâ, paying homage to Him, and invoking Him for hidâyet and selâmet (guidance to the right way and salvation and happiness). [In qiyâm, an additional sûra or some âyats are recited immediately after Fâtiha sûra.]

4 — **Rukû':** Means to bow down once, gripping the knees with the hands and holding the back and the head level. The prayer to be recited during the rukû' is: **(Subhâna Rabbiyel azîm),** which

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

means, "I know my Rabb (Allah) is greater than everything, far from all attributes of deficiency and sacred." [This prayer can be recited three, five, seven, nine, or eleven times.]

5 — **Sajda:** Means to put your face on the ground with a realization of your incapability and in humility, supplication, submission and invocation, twice, and to recite, **(Subhâna Rabbiyel a'lâ).** Its meaning is, "I know my Rab is higher than everything, exclusively far from all attributes of deficiency."

In the Islamic religion, rukû' and sajda are made only for Allâhu ta'âlâ, whose existence is absolutely necessary. When performing namâz, a Muslim stands in the direction of Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama and makes sajda to Allâhu ta'âlâ. Sajda is made towards Ka'ba, not for Ka'ba. He who makes sajda for Ka'ba will become a polytheist. It is not permissible to make sajda towards a human being or any other creature. For man is the noblest of all the creatures of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and in being human no man is nobler than another. Worldly positions or ranks cannot change man's nature. [Even those people who professed themselves to be deities, i.e. Pharaohs and Nimrod, could not exempt themselves from eating, drinking or the other needs of human beings, or from death finally. Also Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm', the born slaves whom Allâhu ta'âlâ has chosen from among other people, are identical with other people in being human. That is, they, too, will eat, drink, and feel cold in cold weather. However, Allâhu ta'âlâ has endowed special blessings and various miracles on them. No pious born slave can attain the grade of a Prophet. Prophets are innocent; that is, they never sin. Some Prophets have committed venial faults called zalla. Zalla does not mean sin. It means not to do something in the most appropriate manner. It is a beautiful act, but not the most beautiful one.]

Putting the face on the ground, that is, paying homage by prostration, means to admit one's humility and inferiority and to acknowledge the greatness, the superiority of the person one pays homage to. Reverence of this kind is not justifiable to anyone except Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is the real Sustainer, the Creator of the universe. In fact, our master the Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' had, let alone reverence, prohibited the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwân' to stand up when he entered. Nor was there a special seat, a throne or a sofa allotted for him among the As-hâb-i-kirâm. Whenever our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' joined the As-hâb-i-kirâm, he would sit at a vacant and proper place. People who joined them afterwards, if they had not seen

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

him before, would not know who he was, and sometimes they would ask where Rasûlullah was. This behavior of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' could be taken as a good parameter to determine how we incapable people should act.

6 — **Qa'da** (sitting) **as long as** (to recite the prayer of) **tashahhud:** Means, after raising the head from the second prostration, to sit on both knees and recite the prayer of tahiyyât. The meaning of tahiyyât is: "All sorts of reverence and homage paid and all worships made belong to Allâhu ta'âlâ, and, O thou, Nebîy-yi zîshân (Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'), may salâmat (salvation, happiness, peace) and the Compassion and barakat of Allâhu ta'âlâ be on thee. May salâmat be on us and on all pious born slaves. I testify that there is no god but Allâhu ta'âlâ to be worshipped, and Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is the born slave and Messenger of Allâhu ta'âlâ." So these are the six rukns, essential principles of the prayers of farz (obligatory) namâz which Muslims have to perform five times daily. Since Âdam 'alaihis-salâm', namâz was enjoined on the ummats of all Prophets. And the most perfect form of namâz has been enjoined and bestowed upon the Prophet of the latest time.

Now, is there anything that would detract from the divinity of Allâhu ta'âlâ or from the reverence due to Him in these actions which are the rukns of namâz? It is so strange that Protestants, who assert that the Islamic worships are not spiritual with all their clearly stated principles and conditions, have no established types of worships save Baptism, the Eucharist, and gospelling. According to them, these Christian worships are spiritual, and Muslims' namâz is not (!).

The book **(Menâqib-i-chihâr-i-yâr-i-ghuzîn)** relates the following event in the ninety-third narrative about Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh': Whenever Imâm-i-Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' began to perform namâz, he would be quite unaware of what was going on around himself. During a holy war an arrow pierced his blessed foot and stuck into his bone. The surgeon said that it would be impossible for him to endure the pain it would cause while being taken out, and suggested anaesthesia. Alî 'radiy-Allâhu anh' answered, "There is no need for anaesthesia. You can take it out as I perform namaz.' So, as he was performing namâz, the surgeon incised his blessed foot, pulled the iron out of the bone, and bandaged the wound. The namâz being over, he (hadrat Alî) asked the surgeon if he had extracted the arrow. When the answer was positive, he remarked, "For the sake of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Allah, I felt no pain." There are many hadîth-i-sherîfs declaring that the namâz of pious Muslims is identical with this.

Now let us make a brief survey of Christians' worships:

1 — **Baptism:** [It is the primary Christian worship, or sacrament. Christians believe that baptism was imposed by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.] Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' did not baptize anyone throughout his life. Nor did he ever enjoin baptism. [Christians believe that baptism is compulsory when a person becomes a Christian or changes his church, and carry out baptism in the name of Father, Son, and the Holy Ghost. According to Christians, baptism is the unification of Jesus' spiritual body, that is, his divinity, with his physical body, and it means rebirth with the Holy Ghost. They believe that the original sin, which they believe to have come from Âdam 'alaihis-salâm', will be forgiven with baptism. Baptism is administered in church. Different churches hold different manners of baptism. Some of them administer baptism by immersion into water believed to be sacred, and others give it by sprinkling or pouring water upon the person. Also, the age of the person to be baptized differs in accordance with the church that will give baptism. Christians believe that a person who dies without baptism will remain sinful.] There is no spirituality in this.

2 — **The Eucharist:** We have already explained this sacrament in detail. [According to the Bible, in his last supper with the Apostles, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' broke the bread into pieces and gave a piece to each Apostle, saying, "Take, eat; this is my body." (Matt: 26-26) Then, holding out a cup of wine and saying that it was his blood, he made them drink it. Paul interpreted this and thus the Christian church established it as a sacrament. Formerly it used to be celebrated once a year. Later it began to be performed every week. We would like to ask priests: Could a worship be performed by drinking wine and eating bread dunked in wine? From what point of view would such a worship be apt to spirituality?]

3 — **Reading the Bible** (Gospelling): The pope reads a passage from the Bible and others listen to him without understanding the meanings. This could not be spiritual, either. For today's Gospels are not the real Holy Book that was revealed to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; they consist of human statements.

Christians are also opposed to Muslims' binding duty of hajj; they say, *"Their (worship) is a reminiscence of the Jewish custom of visiting Beyt-i-muqaddes (al-Aqsâ), which is in Qudus-i-sherîf*

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

(Jerusalem), three times a year. For Allâhu ta'âlâ had promised to manifest Himself at that sacred place. But later Jews were smitten by the scourge of Allâhu ta'âlâ on account of the massacres they had committed. Their government was annihilated, their enemies invaded their territory and demolished Beyt-i-Muqaddes. As a substitute for Beyt-i-muqaddes, Allâhu ta'âlâ appointed the body of Jesus Christ His Beytullah (The Home of Allah). To this end He sent Jesus Christ to His born slaves. And, reinforcing those who believed him with the Holy Spirit, He blessed each of them with the grade of living Beytullah. Thus there was no more need for a special manmade home for Allâhu ta'âlâ to manifest Himself at. Allotment of another such home would run counter to the hikmat (ultimate divine wisdom) of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Jesus Christ's statement, as is quoted in the Bible, 'There shall come such a time when you shall neither offer this worship to Father nor make sajda in Jerusalem. Yet those who make true sajda; let them make sajda with their souls and in devotion everywhere. For Father wishes them to make sajda for Him in this manner,' shall remain valid till the end of the world. This being the case, it would mean to reduce the high spiritual position of Christianity to a very low grade to fabricate a new home for all people to visit, to make the attainment of the infinite blessings of Allâhu ta'âlâ dependent upon that place alone, and to urge people to visit that place. And this, in its turn, would mean to relapse into the obsolete formal, outward Jewish customs."

ANSWER: These objections of theirs are, like others, groundless, as follows:

1 — For one thing, Christians have to specify the verse and the Gospel from which they have derived this argument that the body of Jesus Christ replaced Beyt-i-muqaddes. It is a plain fact that the statements of an ecclesiastic who is employed in the church service for a salary of five to ten gold pieces could not be bases for Christian tenets.

2 — As it is written in the Gospels, throughout his life Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' visited Beyt-i-muqaddes and even tried to clean the place by ousting the pedlars in it. As it is seen, if Beyt-i-muqaddes had been annulled and he had superseded it, he would not have visited it continually, nor would he have purged the place of people who had been there to earn their worldly needs. And he would have said to his disciples, "Do not give regard to this Beyt-i-muqaddes any longer. I possess its significance. And each of you is a home of Allah."

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

3 — Why should it be contrary to the ultimate divine wisdom of Allâhu ta'âlâ to choose another beyt (home) after the demolition of Beyt-i-muqaddes? According to the Islamic belief, Allâhu ta'âlâ does not have a partner or a likeness. He exercises His free will on His property. He appoints Beyt-i-muqaddes as the qibla for a certain length of time, then makes Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama the qibla. No one can meddle with Him.

In the days when the Gospels were being scribed, all the Nazarenes were acting upon the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and the Apostles and their disciples were visiting Beyt-i-muqaddes. There is no mention in the Gospels, therefore, as to the place to be visited.

4 — Also, the *statement, "Allâhu ta'âlâ has not made the attainment of infinite heavenly blessings dependent upon visiting Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama,"* is wrong. It is a prevarication fabricated by the priest in order to support his argument. If Qur'ân al-kerîm or hadîth-i-sherîfs contain any narrative purporting that "Attaining plenty of heavenly blessings depends only on visiting Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama," he must state it clearly.

5 — Visiting Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama is not an injunction upon Muslims in general. A person who is to make hajj has to fulfill the conditions for making hajj. For instance, he must be rich and healthy, the expedition must be safe, etc. The priest's prejudice and antagonism are palpable in this respect, too.

6 — A religion will not necessarily depreciate itself from a high grade and spirituality to the lowest grade simply by appointing a certain place for visit and for qibla. Nor is there any verse stating that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is the 'Beytullah (the Home of Allah)' in the Gospels. This detraction from merit and spirituality is the priest's personal vagary.

7 — The injunction of visiting Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama on Muslims is not a relapse into a void formal custom. For the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had not abrogated visiting Beyt-i-muqaddes. Both the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and the Islamic religion maintain many rules peculiar to the Sharî'ats of past Prophets. Maintaining them does not mean returning to the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Moreover, the priest exhibits his ignorance by qualifying hajj as 'a formal worship' without knowing its essential.

Let us give some brief information on hajj, one of Islam's commandments:

First of all, a Believer who intends to make hajj has to make

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

tawba truly and sincerely, (that is, with ikhlâs). If he owes anything to other people, he must pay them their dues. He must prepare the subsistence that will maintain his family during his expedition of hajj. He must take with him money enough to meet his needs during his journey to and from Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama, provided the money will be his halâl property, find meritorious fellow-travellers for himself, and he and his fellow-travellers must appoint the best-mannered, [the most knowledgeable and experienced] one among them as their emîr (leader), obey his suggestions and carry out his measures. [In addition, the journey must be safe, so that his life and property will not be at risk of destruction. If the journey is not safe, it will not be farz to make hajj.]

There are three farz (obligatory) acts in hajj:

1 — **To wear** (the garment called) **ihrâm:** Upon arriving at one of the places called mîkât which are at a certain short distance from Mekka-i-mukarrama, the hadjis (Muslim pilgrims) take off their clothes and assume the (garb called) ihrâm. They do not wear anything else. That is, like going to the place of Last Judgement, they disenthral themselves from worldly ornaments and garments and go, all in uniform dress, masters and slaves alike, with bare heads and feet (without wearing socks).

[It is farz to make hajj in ihrâm; a hajj done otherwise will not be sahîh (acceptable). **(Ihrâm)** consists of two white pieces of cloth like bath towels. One piece is wrapped around the part of the body below the waist, and the other piece is wrapped around the shoulders. It is not tied with threads or knotted. Certain things are forbidden for the person wearing ihrâm. Its details are written in books of fiqh and ilmihâl.][1]

2 — **Tawâf:** Means to go round Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama seven times to perform the sunnat-i-sherîfa of Ibrâhîm and Ismâîl 'alaihimus-salâm'. [Tawâf is done within the Mesjîd-i-harâm. It is farz to make a special niyyat (to intend) for tawâf. The tawâf which is farz is called **(tawâf-i-ziyârat).** It is sunnat to begin tawâf by the **(Hajar-ul-aswad)**.] During tawâf it is necessary to recite the prayers taught by Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Messenger. The blessed meanings of these prayers are to pay homage to Allâhu ta'âlâ in the most beautiful way and to invoke Him for His Compassion.

---

[1] There is detailed information about hajj in the seventh chapter of the fifth fascicle of **Endless Bliss**, which is available from **Hakîkat Kitâbevi**, Fâtih, Istanbul, Turkey.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

3 — **Waqfa on Arafa:** (To perform the pause on Arafat): All Muslims, young and old, rich and poor alike, with only their ihrâm on, like people gathering for the Last Judgement, gather on the hill of Arafat and invoke Allâhu ta'âlâ for forgiveness and compassion from immediately after the time of early afternoon prayer begins on the day of Arafa, which is the ninth day of Zilhijja month, till dawn of the following day. [If a person makes this waqfa (pause) on the hill of Arafat one day before or after this date, his hajj will not be sahîh.] Here, hundreds of thousands of Muslims recite the formula of Telbiya in Arabic with one accord. The meaning of Telbiya is: "I am Thine obediently, o my Allah, whose existence is absolutely necessary. I am ready for Thine command and I shall obey Thine Divine Will. Thou hast no partner or likeness."

As for the spiritual aspect of hajj; connoisseurs of this matter have cited innumerable meanings pertaining to the proprieties and essential principles of hajj. In past religions, for being close to Allâhu ta'âlâ, one would leave society and live alone in mountains. Instead of enjoining this monastic life on the Ummat-i-Muhammad, Allâhu ta'âlâ has commanded them to make hajj. When a person makes hajj, his mind retreats from worldly interests such as trade, and he thinks only of Allâhu ta'âlâ. When Muslims, far from ostentation or hypocrisy, leave their families and homes and fall into this valley and desert, they get out of this world and contemplate the place of Judgement and the hereafter. When they take off their clothes and assume the white-coloured ihrâm, they envisage themselves to be entering the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ in their shrouds. While reciting, **"Leb-beyk",** that is, "I am Thine obediently, o my Allah, I am ready for Thine command," between the hope that their prayer will be accepted and the fear that it may be refused, they beseech Allâhu ta'âlâ for mercy and forgiveness. When they attain to Hârem-i-sherîf [Mesjîd-i-harâm], they know by now that the efforts of those who have come to visit Beytullah shall not come to naught. Because they visit Beytullah (the Home of Allah) for His sake, they are secure from His torment. When they visit the Hajar ul-aswad, rub their faces and hands against it and kiss it, they promise themselves that they shall always abide by the oath of allegiance they have made to Allâhu ta'âlâ. When they hang on to the cover of Ka'ba-i-mu'azzama, they imagine themselves as a culprit trusting himself to his benefactor, or a lover surrendering himself to his beloved one. All these are the proprieties of hajj.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

On the other hand, Christians protest, *"Some pilgrims' hometowns are close* (To Mekka), *while others live in places far away. Therefore, the injunction of hajj upon all the Ummat-i-Muhammad runs counter to the justice of Allâhu ta'âlâ."* This statement can never be justified. For it is written in the Gospel of Matthew that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' stated, "The gate to the eternal life is extremely narrow, and the road leading to Hell is wide."[1] Its meaning is this: "The deed that will guide to Paradise comes extremely difficult to the nafs. And the deed that will lead to Hell feels very sweet to the nafs." Our Prophet "sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated, **"The most virtuous deed is the one that comes most difficult to the nafs."** The worse the difficulty, the better the reward; therefore, those hadjis who come (to Mekka) from remote places shall attain many rewards. And this, in its turn, is not injustice, but it is the very justice itself. The Islamic religion does not contain any injunction impossible for man to do. People for whom hajj is not farz will not be sinful for not making hajj. As it is stated in the hadîth-i-sherîfs, **"Deeds are dependent upon intentions"** and **"The Believer's intention is more virtuous than his deed,"** those who have not had the opportunity to make hajj though they have wished to do so shall attain the rewards their intentions deserve.

The priests, who are opposed to fasting in (the month of) Ramadân, too, assert that it has been adopted from the Israelite traditions and add, *"The Bible, which has no injunction pertaining to fasting, has conferred freedom upon people in this respect."*

Protestant priests allege, *"There is a kind of dietary fast among some Catholic, Byzantine, Armenian and other Christian communities; yet this is an imitation of Jewry. The Bible has no such commandment. Protestants avoid imposing such a heavy burden on mankind. They only advise people to refrain from evil intentions and superstitions. Thus, a religion that leaves people to their options with respect to outward and trivial worships such as these is certainly more virtuous than a religion which compels people to formal and outward worships. For worshipping of one's own accord is the habit of a child that obeys its father willingly. Compulsory obedience to canonical injunctions, on the other hand, is the attribute of a slave who has to obey his master. It is*

---

[1] "Enter ye in at the strait gate: for wide is the gate, and broad is the way, that leadeth to destruction, ..." "Because strait is the gate, and narrow is the way, which leadeth unto life, ..." (Matt: 7-13, 14)

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

extremely unhealthy, especially in summertime, to shift the habit of eating and drinking during the day to eating and drinking at night and to continue this one month. It is averred by medical doctors that it may cause many illnesses. Moreover, because the durations of days and nights differ from one country to another, performance of this binding duty takes a longer time in some countries of the world than it does in others. This, in its turn, is incompatible with the justice of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Daytime takes one month in countries with sixty-seven degrees of latitude, two months in those with sixty-nine degrees of latitude and three months on latitude 73°. For this reason, fasting is impossible for Muslims living in countries with these latitudinal degrees. It would obviously be incongruous with the ultimate divine wisdom and the absolute divine justice of Allâhu ta'âlâ to enjoin a religion which is not suitable in all cases and for people all over the world upon all mankind. On the other hand, thousands of people in such countries are following Christianity and performing its tenets without any difficulty. And this, in its turn, is a palpable evidence to prove the fact that Islam could not be more virtuous than Christianity."

ANSWER: All these objections [and vilifications] have been rebutted with innumerable evidences; as follows:

1 — Fasting existed in the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. It maintained its original form in the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', too. We shall explain this later. Existence of fasting in the Islamic religion cannot be censured.

2 — The statement, *"The Bible does not contain any commandment pertaining to fasting; it leaves everyone to his (or her) option,"* would be a bare lie. For there is no Biblical verse giving people the option between fasting and not fasting by clearly stating, *"Everyone is free to fast or not to fast."* If there is one, let the priests quote it.

3 — The diet existent in the tenets of Christians belonging to Catholic, Byzantine and Armenian churches was originally fasting. Yet later, along with the interpolations and abrogations pertaining to worships, which Paul executed [in order to sever the Nazarene religion from Judaism for good and to turn it into idolatry], it was brought into its *status quo.* To say that the Bible does not contain any commandment pertaining to fasting is to slander the Bible outright. It is written in the Gospels that "And when he (Jesus) had fasted forty days and forty nights, he was afterward an hungred." (Matt: 4-2); that he ordered, "Moreover

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

when ye fast, be not, as the hypocrites, of a sad countenance:" (ibid: 6-16); and that he said, "Likewise, fasting will take the devil out," to the astonished on-lookers when he exorcised the devil out of a paralytic person. Hence it is understood clearly that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' both fasted himself and commanded to fast with ikhlâs and only for Allah's sake. As Paul tormented, persecuted, and executed true Believers of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', fabricated a chimerical lie, which we have detailed above, established the so-called Christianity, either distorted or abrogated the rules of the Sharî'at of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', such as fasting and circumcision, now with the pretext that they would mean to follow Judaism, then likening them to inexplicable abstractions, Peter tried to prevent him. Yet Paul's men, being too aggressive for Peter, thwarted him. It is stated clearly in the Gospels and other books written by Christian dignitaries that Peter, though highly meritorious and virtuous, was weak-hearted enough to fear Jews and deny knowing Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

4 — Protestants have no right to say, *"Instead of imposing such a heavy burden as fasting on mankind, we advise all people only to keep away from depraved, evil intentions and superstitions."* For the principles of a true religion sent down by Allâhu ta'âlâ cannot be changed by people. It is for this reason that many priests objected to all the decisions taken in ecclesiastical assemblies. Also, Protestants refuse and rebut most of the decisions of these councils. Therefore, such pieces of advice given by the priestly founders of Protestantism such as the priestly author of the book (Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât), who are hired by Protestant organizations, cannot be of any value. Fasting is not only abstinence from eating and drinking. There are many spiritual virtues and uses in fasting. No one, a priest or otherwise, has the authority to change or interpolate a farz based on divine principles.

5 — Fasting is not an outward or trivial worship. As is known by people of sagacity, the body is the abode of the soul and the place where sensuous desires circulate freely. The more victorious the physical desires of the nafs, the fewer the spiritual manifestations. [In fact, no spiritual manifestations take place in such cases.] This rule applies to all religions and sects. In all of them, abridging sensuous desires, i.e. austere self-discipline, will bring one closer to Allâhu ta'âlâ. Ascetic discipline will mortify the carnality innate in the nafs. It is for this reason that all religions and sects have prized ascetic discipline.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Islam prescribes three standards for fasting:

1) **Fasting of Awâm** (the common people): It is the fasting of those who abstain from eating, drinking and sexual intercourse within the time dictated by Islam [in the month of Ramadân].

2) **Fasting of Hawâs:** It is the fasting of those people who, along with observing the obligatory requirements of fasting, perform all the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ involving the eyes, ears, tongue, hands, feet, and all the other limbs, and refrain from what He has declared to be harâm or mekrûh.

3) **Fasting of Hâss-ul-hawâs,** (that is, of the Awliyâ): It is the fasting of those who, in addition to observing all the conditions existent in the fastings of awâm and hawâs, which we have mentioned above, desist and protect their hearts from all sorts of mundane thoughts, even from any thought other than that of Allâhu ta'âlâ. In a hadîth-i-sherîf narrated by Imâm-i-Bukhârî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh',[1] our Prophet 'sall-allâhu alaihi wasallam' states, **"If the fasting person does not abstain from lying, Allâhu ta'âlâ does not need his ceasing from eating and drinking."** People of haqîqat (inner, real essence of worships) have already realized that defective fasting performed without observing these conditions would be an outward and trivial deed, and declared this fact. [Those who commit sins while fasting should not give up fasting with the qualm that their fasting is worthless. Instead, they should go on fasting, invoke Allâhu ta'âlâ for forgiveness, and turn away from sinning. In fact, going on with fasting will protect one against sinning.]

6 — Also, the comparison, *"Worshipping of one's own accord is the habit of a child that obeys its father willingly. Compulsory obedience to canonical injunctions, on the other hand, is the attribute of a slave who has to obey his master,"* is wrong for various reasons, such as:

a) Man has two great enemies: (his own) nafs, and the devil. Therefore, had it not been declared that those who ignored the religious commandments and prohibitions would be tormented, that is, if they had been made optional, it is doubtless that many people would not obey the injunctions.

b) While leaving all people to their options as regards fasting, why do not these Protestant priests give all people the same freedom in such tenets as Baptism and Eucharist? Why do they

---

[1] Muhammad Bukhârî passed away in Semer-kand in 256 [A.D. 870].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

compel people to follow their instructions?

The Islamic religion classifies worships in accordance with their grades:

First grade: The most valuable and the most virtuous worship is to avoid harâms (Islam's prohibitions). When a person turns his face away upon seeing something forbidden for him to look at, Allâhu ta'âlâ fills his heart with îmân. If a person intends to commit a harâm and yet does not commit it, he will not be recorded (by angels) as having committed a sin. Because committing a harâm means revolting against Allâhu ta'âlâ, avoiding it has been made the most virtuous worship. According to the Islamic religion, no one is born as a sinner or disbeliever. In addition, such a theory would be quite unreasonable.

Second grade: is to do the (commandments that are termed) farz. It is a grave sin to omit these commandments. Things that Allâhu ta'âlâ commands us to do are called farz. It is very meritorious to do the farz. It is all the more valuable to do these commandments at a time when they are being forgotten and the harâms are being spread far and wide. People who do the farz shall be rewarded greatly.

Third grade: is to avoid doing (those prohibitions called) mekrûh tahrîmî, which are virtually close to harâms. Avoiding the prohibitions called mekrûh tahrîmî is more meritorious than doing the wâjibs (explained below).

Fourth grade: is to do the wâjibs. Doing the wâjibs deserves much thawâb (rewards in the hereafter), though not so much as doing the farz does. Wâjibs are those types of worships about which there is doubt whether they are farz or not.

Fifth grade: is to avoid doing (those prohibitions called) mekrûh tenzîhî, which means mekrûh (action, speech, behavior, etc. not approved by our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam') which is closer to halâl (permission).

Sixth grade: is to do the sunnats (actions, words, attitudes liked and commended by our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam') that are (called) muekked. It is not sinful not to do the sunnats. Yet it is a venial sin to make it a habit to omit them without any good reason to do so. And it is kufr (disbelief) to dislike a sunnat.

Seventh grade: is (to do) the nâfila (supererogatory) and mustahab (recommended, laudable actions). Muslims are free to do or not to do the supererogatory, yet those who do them with good intentions shall be rewarded (in the hereafter).

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Since it is declared definitely by the âyats of Qur'ân al-kerîm that fasting is farz, it can never be optional. For the Islamic religion is based on the commandments and prohibitions of Allâhu ta'âlâ. No man can have the authority to change the form or the time of fasting. Christianity, on the other hand, was changed and interpolated very many times, and all these changes gave birth to other successive arbitrary changes.

c) We are not the sons of Allâhu ta'âlâ (may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so). We are His impotent born slaves. He is our Creator, Sustainer. Acting upon His commandment can never be embarrassing for us. Turning away from worshipping Allâhu ta'âlâ is an attitude that would become antagonistic, vain, conceited people.

The statements, *"It is extremely unhealthy, especially in summertime, to shift the habit of eating and drinking during the day to eating and drinking at night and to continue this one month. It is averred by medical doctors that it may cause many illnesses,"* are not vindicable, either. [They are quite contrary to facts, slanderous.] For one of the proprieties of fasting is not to fill the stomach at the time of iftâr (breaking the fast) and to stop eating as you still have appetite for food. All medical doctors unanimously acknowledge that those who observe this propriety will heal, rather than become ill. It is a definite fact that fasting in this manner is extremely hygienic. If these Protestant fallacies were true, all Muslims in Islamic countries would become ill, and most of them would die, in Ramadân. On the contrary, medical statistics indicate no adversities in the month of Ramadân. Moreover, for rational reasons, many people eat only twice daily, in the morning and in the evening. What sort of change may take place in one's body by making a few hours' change in one of the two meal-times? Perhaps one will feel somewhat perturbed for the first one or two days of the fasting month. Yet this will not cause any impairment to health.

[Fasting does not give birth to gastric ailments. On the contrary, it is conducive to gastronomical hygiene. This is an indubitable fact proven plainly by today's modern medical expertise. It is stated in medical books written in various languages by specialized doctors that dieting will cure, or at least help cure, many illnesses. A person suffering from a stomach illness, a pregnant woman, a nursing mother, a person who fears that his or her illness may become worse (in case he or she fasts), a soldier who is fighting, a person who is safarî, that is, who has

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

set out for a voyage that would take three days if he walked, [a distance of hundred and four kilometres according to the Hanafî madh-hab and eighty kilometres according to the other three madh-habs]: these people may not fast. It is obvious that these priests are utterly ignorant of Islam. Or, rather, they either do not know anything of Islam and have their own image of Islam or do not tell the truth though they know Islam.

Here are some examples to prove that fasting is not harmful, but useful to health.

It is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Fast,** (and) **be healthy."**

Fasting is reposing the stomach and the entire alimentary system after a whole year's work, and clarification of man's body. Ailment most commonly suffered by people is disorder of digestion. It causes fattening, heart and blood vessel diseases, diabetes, and high tension. Fasting not only protects against all sorts of disease, but also is a means of medical treatment. As we have mentioned above, diet is an indispensable method for recovering from many diseases.

It is doubtless that one will acquire a strong will power by fasting. It is for this reason that quite a number of people have rallied from harmful addictions such as alcohol and heroin owing to their fasting.

Fasting causes activation of carbohydrates, proteins, and especially fat stored in the body. Because of fasting, kidneys, relieved from their duty of excreting waste matter, have a day off during which to overhaul and reinstate themselves and to rest.

All these explanations strike the lies and falsifications of some priests to their teeth. Would they not attempt to use knowledge as a false witness for their mendacities.]

As for countries with different lengths of days and nights; this can never be incompatible with divine justice because people whose fasting continues a few hours longer than others' shall attain heavenly rewards in proportion to their deeds.

In polar regions, each night lasts several months, and so is the length of daytime. There is no hardship for people fasting in such countries. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares plainly in Qur'ân al-kerîm that there is no hardship in the Islamic religion and that a person is not commanded to do something beyond his power or capability. For instance, the number of limbs to be washed in ablution is four. If a person has lost his both feet, this number is reduced to three. If a person is not able to perform namâz standing, he may perform it

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

sitting. If he cannot manage this either, he may perform it by îmâ, (that is, by signs). It is farz for Muslims to fast in the month of Ramadân. Yet if a person becomes ill or sets out for a journey of more than three days' walk, obligation of fasting is temporarily deferred. Later, whenever he finds convenience, he makes qadhâ of the fasts which he could not perform in their proper time, (that is, he pays his debt of farz by fasting a day for a day).

As for people living in polar countries with days and nights lasting two, three, or more months; these people shall fast, too. In such countries, as well as in any country where daytime continues for more than twenty-four hours, times of beginning and breaking fast are set in hours. The criterion to be taken (for the length of each fasting period) is the duration observed by Muslims living in the closest city where daytime is not so long, (that is, shorter than twenty-four hours). [By the same token, a Muslim who goes to the moon, for instance, follows the same rule, if he has not intended to be safarî, or if he decides to live there. These priests apparently know nothing of Islam.]

As it is known, manifestations, blessings, injunctions of Allâhu ta'âlâ upon His born slaves are not equal on every individual. Giving riches to some of His believing born slaves, He commands them to make hajj. And giving poverty to some believing born slaves of His, He does not enjoin hajj on them. He bestows power, energy and health upon some, and commands them to fast. On the other hand, He grants permission that those who are not strong or healthy enough to fast (in Ramadân) may fast later. Bestowing the nisâb[1] amount of property upon some of His born slaves, He commands them to give zakât and to help with the subsistence of their needy relatives. He gives poverty to some born slaves of His, on the other hand, and enfranchises them to take zakât. [All these are thoroughly compatible with the divine justice of Allâhu ta'âlâ. He bestows many blessings upon some of His born slaves. And they, in turn, thank for these blessings, thus attaining the high grade of gratefulness. To other born slaves of His, He gives few blessings. And these people are patient, thus attaining the high grade of patience. Allâhu ta'âlâ does not nullify the good deeds of any of His born slaves.]

---

[1] Boundary between poverty and richness prescribed by Islam. Muslims whose wealth has reached this boundary have to pay the obligatory alms called zakât. Please see the fifth fascicle of **Endless Bliss.**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

The Protestants' statement which purports, *"In polar countries thousands of people follow Christianity and perform their religious rights without any difficulty,"* is quite mendacious. For the countries meant here are those which are close to the North Polar Circle, namely the northernmost part of America and the northern ends of Siberia. Eskimos, Samoids, and very few other primitive tribes live in those regions. They make their living by fishing and hunting. Because they cannot raise such crops as wheat and grapes, they do not know of bread or wine. We would like to know how the priest in charge for the performance of the Eucharist has been managing this out there. For, inasmuch as the bread and wine represent the flesh and blood of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', the Christians living there will not be able to consume their god. [Consequently, because they will not unite with their god, their sins will not be pardoned and they will not be purified of the depravity of the original sin. Poor Christians! We wonder if these priests, who assert that fasting and ablution will impair health while tolerating the dirty and filthy water used in Baptism, believe their own assertion? Or do they cast such abhorrent, irrational, unreasonable aspertions for the sake of the payments they receive from Protestant societies?]

Now, a fair comparison of the two religions will reveal clearly which one of them is more practicable. The Islamic religion is a dispensation that can be practised easily and without any sort of hardship by any society in any part of the world, [and which is the only guide to happiness in the world and in the hereafter.] It is a religion of tawhîd (unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ). That this religion is superior to and more virtuous than trinity-based Christianity is a fact as bright as the sun.

[I have said little, lest I should break your heart;

For I know you would be hurt, else I have much to say.]

One of the criticisms which Protestant priests direct to Islam concerns qirâat in namâz. They say, *"Qirâat, that is, reciting a passage from Qur'ân al-kerîm, which is one of the farz* (obligatory actions) *of namâz, is seemingly spiritual at some places; but a closer thought will reveal that it is not spiritual at all, like the other farz of namâz. In the five daily prayers of namâz, litanies called tekbîr* (saying Allâhu ekber), *Fâtiha* (the first chapter of Qur'ân al-kerîm), *et-tehiyyât* (the prayer said during sitting posture), *the tesbîhs of rukû'* (bowing in namâz) *and sajda* (prostration), *and other similar prayers are recited. They (Muslims) repeat these at certain times every day throughout*

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

their lifetime. One would be tired of this.

"The following two Biblical verses show that there is no use in carrying out all sorts of formalities or busying with a series of mortal and trivial deeds. These verses quote Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as saying: "But when ye pray, use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do: for they think that they shall be heard for their much speaking." "Be not ye therefore like unto them: for your Father knoweth what things ye have need of, before ye ask him.' " [Matt: 6-7, 8]

ANSWER: As will be granted by people of wisdom, like the body, which has a way of life and nutrition, the soul has its own peculiar way of life and a system of nutrition. The soul feeds on forgetting the mâsiwâ, that is, everything other than Allâhu ta'âlâ, and (thinking of Allâhu ta'âlâ alone and) mentioning His name. Raising the curtains between the Creator and the creature is possible only by weakening the carnal desires of the nafs by mortifications and reinforcing the soul by mentioning the name of Allâhu ta'âlâ. A person's love and affection for another will be seen in his remembering and mentioning him frequently. For it is natural for one to remember one's beloved friend or relative frequently. People who are ardently, zealously in love are sometimes so deeply absorbed in their love that they forget about themselves and always and only remember and mention their beloved one.

In the Islamic religion, the ultimate goal is **(Muhabbatullah=Love of Allah).** To this end the heart is reinforced by numerous reiterations of the name of Allâhu ta'âlâ in the five daily prayers of namâz. The reinforcement of the heart and soul, in turn, causes removal of the curtains in between and attainment of the end, i.e. approaching the beloved one. Since all the prayers uttered during namâz, e.g. tesbîh and tekbîr, are for the same essential purpose, they definitely nourish and reinforce the soul and the heart, let alone wearying or tiring a Believer. The 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna have made very many explanations on the esoteric meanings of Fâtiha-i-sherîfa, which is repeated at every rak'at (of namâz). (These explanations are so numerous that) it would take rather onerous work even to compile them or make a list of them. Sadr-ad-dîn Konawî[1] 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' wrote a splendid book titled **(I'jâz-ul-beyân),** which explicates the

---

[1] Sadr-ad-dîn Muhammad passed away in Konya, (a city in central Turkey), in 672 [A.D. 1272].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

occult meanings of Fâtiha-i-sherîfa. He acknowledges in this book of his that he has been able to state only very few of the inner meanings and preternatural subtleties in Fâtiha-i-sherîfa. [The âyats (verses of Qur'ân al-kerîm), the tesbîhs and prayers prescribed to be recited during the performance of namâz express greatness of Allâhu ta'âlâ and drill supplication to Him. Allâhu ta'âlâ declares that He "loves those who recite these prayers and shall give them much thawâb [many rewards]." Anything which is to be recited or done in order to attain love of Allâhu ta'âlâ and to acquire thawâb, hard as it may be, is easy, very enjoyable and delightful to those who have îmân. A person who has tasted sugar or honey knows its flavour. But one who has not tasted it may disbelieve its pleasing flavour, judging by its colour, which he sees from a distance and finds unattractive.]

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 12 —
ANSWERS TO A PRIEST'S DENIGRATIONS

A Protestant priest published a booklet, in which he reasons on the foundations of Islam and Christianity. We have considered it would be apropos to quote statements from that booklet and answer them. The quotations are italicized, within quotation marks, and the answers follow.

The booklet says, for instance, *"According to the teachings of Jesus Christ, Christianity, a volitional religion suitable for and adaptable to every nation and every community, to their forms of government and policies, to the regulations, systems and states of their social structures, and to the countries they live in, can be established in any country without detriment to the order and policy of that country."*

ANSWER: As a matter of fact, because the existing Gospels contain very few rules pertaining to mu'âmalât, [that is, laws and regulations of buying and selling, family matters, conditions, forms, rights of tenure, employment and payment, political laws, etc.], it will certainly not damage or impair a nation's order or policy, as the priest professes. [For they have no rules to make substitutions with. They have nothing in their repertoire to offer to others.] However, the world has seen no country as yet where Christians entered and yet did not make havoc of all its valid systems and states, homes, orders, lands and governmental organizations. Countless political law books existent in the libraries of Great Roman Empires, and books telling about Roman customs and traditions were all destroyed by Christians. [Christians exercised the same cruelty not only on non-Christian people, but also on their Christian co-religionists. Please see what Christian historians write about the cruelties and destructions the crusaders inflicted on the Byzantines when they entered Istanbul in the name of Christian religion. When they invaded Spain, they ruined and burned hundreds of libraries, destroyed thousands of works of art, slaughtered hundreds of thousands of Muslims and

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Jews; all these performances are tangible evidences exposing the innocent face of Christianity, which the priest alleges to be "a religion that does not interfere with other peoples' policies and customs and which is presently accepted by everybody."] It has never been easy for Christianity to settle in a country. Nor could it be expected to do so. [Even today, they are spending billions of pounds to Christianize people of poor and starving countries. They are helping them in various ways. They are doling out monthly payments to those poor people. Yet they have not been able to Christianize them so far. Is this priest so oblivious of this fact?]

He alleges in the same booklet, *"The kingdom of Christianity is unlike worldly kingdoms or sovereignties. It is a spiritual and genuine dominion. Owing to its religious essence, which is spiritual, real, and peculiar to itself, it is applicable to all sorts of situations and places natural for people. It neither stoops to Christianize the eminent and ruling people of a country, nor categorically rejects their inclinations or habits."*

ANSWER: When a religion is applicable to all situations and places natural for people, it will no longer be necessary to call people to that religion. For that religion will spontaneously promulgate itself. Therefore, since it is in the open how assiduously Protestants are endeavouring to spread Christianity, this claim of theirs lapses automatically. On the other hand, even if we were to accede to its being a merit not to stoop to Christianize the eminent and ruling people of a country, what good could be anticipated from not rejecting their inclinations and [atrocious] habits? Or, are all sorts of atrocity, in the view of this priest, innate in the natural spirituality of the Christian religion?

The priest proffers in the same booklet, *"The essential mission of Christianity in this world is not to widen the Christian nations' periphery of power, but to deposit the grandeur and sovereignty of Allâhu ta'âlâ into every individual's heart, and thus to spread it and make it acceptable among all communities in all countries."*

ANSWER: Unfortunately, the same priest, who counts on the decrepit position of Islamic countries versus the wealth and prosperity of Europe as an evidence to prove that Christianity is superior to and more virtuous than Islam, an argumentation which he deals with from the eighty-seventh through hundred and seventh page of the same booklet, now says here that it is not the purpose of Christianity to widen the periphery of power of a

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

nation. Could it be the case that the religion he commends in those pages is Christianity, and the one he advertises here is some other religion?

The same priest asserts, *"Those who admit the effectiveness and ascendancy of Christianity and value it will attain a lasting, sacred tie of brotherbood in addition to wisdom and policy. Being mature born slaves, on the other hand, they will attain divine blessings and delights in the hereafter."*

ANSWER: In accordance with this argument of his, it must be doubtful whether peoples of England, Austria and America are Christians. For these people have never been seen attached to one another with ties of brotherhood. They try to do utmost harm to one another for the sake of political advantages. The hostility between Lutherans and Calvinists or between any two other Protestant sects is no less vehement than the enmity between Catholics and Protestants. [Throughout history, Catholics and Protestants have looked on each other as enemies and disbelievers and ruthlessly destroyed each other. We have related a few examples earlier in the text. Those who read history know this fact very well. It is obvious that these statements of the priest are adoptions from goodnesses such as brotherhood, amity, generosity, etc., which exist in the Islamic religion and which are written in Muslims' books. He appropriates the good qualities that belong to Muslims and which he has read about in Islamic books, and affixes them on Christianity.]

The priest goes on, *"If it were true that Islam were superior to and more virtuous than Christianity, it would necessarily demonstrate Allah's dominion in a manner better, higher and more spiritual than the explanation given above. It would be more adaptable to the positions and countries of the nations on the earth. It would guide people to happiness, perfection and justice in the world and infuse into them better hopes of honour and eternal felicity after departure from his world."*

ANSWER: In the Islamic religion, the dominion of Allâhu ta'âlâ is the Sharî'at of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'. Those who act upon its rules shall attain infinite blessings in this world and in the hereafter. And those who do not adapt themselves to it shall be bitterly disappointed and tormented in Hell. This fact is demonstrated in the most beautiful manner in Qur'ân al-kerîm and in hadîth-i-sherîfs. If the blessings and felicities promised to be given to Believers in the hereafter were demonstrated exactly as they were, the human mind could not comprehend them.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Because this priest is not aware of what has been going on in the world but for the four Gospels and the epistles of Peter and Paul, this queer allegation of his signifies nothing but his nescience. We would like to remind him that realizing how powerful Islam is in guiding to happiness, peace and justice requires meticulous study of Islam and the history of Islamic states. Those who know the facts and events about these two religions are quite aware that the Christian religion, which is far from spirituality, have been altered quite a number of times, [e.g. by Paul, by Councils, and by other priests]. If a person reads literature on the historical facts about Islam and Christianity, he will see that the truth is quite contrary to the priest's allegation.

The priest goes on, *"Every Christian accepts Jesus Christ's resurrection and ascension after being killed as an atonement for his (or her) salvation. Christians' feeling of security against the fear of death has reached the belief that 'dying is similar to sleeping in a mosque.' Christians accept death not as harmful, but as useful. On the other hand, most Muslims fear death. According to their creed, many promised rewards are awaiting them in the hereafter, and therefore, especially those lunatics who rush themselves into battlefields with the zealous aspiration for martyrdom in a holy war expect that as they die houris will meet them and entertain them in Gardens of Paradise. All these things are not contrary to our belief. Nevertheless, the relief and delight seen on Muslims at the time of death are based on sensuous desires and pleasures such as delicious dishes of food and houris, which will be served to them in the hereafter. But Christians' delight at that moment originates from their full belief in that they will attain to the presence of Allâhu ta'âlâ in new bodies clarified from sins. This proves the fact that Islam is not so heavenly or so spiritual as Christianity."*

ANSWER: According to the Islamic creed [belief], after death people shall assemble at the place of Mahsher, where everybody shall be called to account, judged, and taken to Paradise or Hell, whichever they deserve. There shall be various degrees of thawâb [rewards] and torment [retributions], depending on people's deeds. The highest blessing in the hereafter is for us Muslims to attain to Allâhu ta'âlâ, not only to attain dishes of Paradise food or houris. [Indeed, whatever Believers do in the world, they do it for Allah's sake. The most virtuous deed is the one which is done with ikhlâs (for Allah's sake). Muslims never dislike death. They say, "We owe this life to Allâhu ta'âlâ, and we are ready to return

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

it anywhere." For they have definite belief in the hadîth-i-sherîfs which purport, **"If a person does not wish to attain to Allâhu ta'âlâ, Allâhu ta'âlâ will not wish to attain to him, either. If a person wishes to attain to Allâhu ta'âlâ, Allâhu ta'âlâ, in turn, will wish to attain to him,"** and **"Death is a bridge that will lead the lover to the beloved one."** Most great men of Islam and many Awliyâ yearned after death, whereafter they would attain to Allâhu ta'âlâ, to Rasûlullah, to their teachers, who were among the Awliyâ, and to other Awliyâ. As their disciples sadly waited on them during their throes of death, they would advise, "Do not be sorry! There is no weeping for a person who is going to attain to Rasûlullah and to Allâhu ta'âlâ or who is going from one room to another in a house." All these religious superiors left this world with a sweet, pleasant smile.] This aspect of the matter being unpropitious to the priest's wicked purpose, he mentions only the aspect pertaining to the physical blessings of Paradise, thus, so to speak, buttressing up his opposition. Yet, with all his adversity and bigotry, he somehow acknowledges that at the time of death Muslims and martyrs feel more relieved and happier than do Christians. The omnipotence of Allâhu ta'âlâ is so infinite.

The priest goes on, *"In the Bible, Jesus Christ does not threaten an unbelieving person or king, nor does he command to behave towards him in a manner as to be an example for others. He commands to obey a king even if he is an unbeliever."*

ANSWER: Yes, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' commanded to obey even a pagan king. For it was impossible to make jihâd or to resist against the Roman Empire and the whole race of Jewry with seventy to eighty followers. Islam, too, prohibits to oppose the state or laws.

The priest goes on, *"The Bible commands to obey all rulers. In fact, let alone non-Christian rulers, it preaches and advises to everybody to obey the worldly regulations and laws put by those emperors who are spiteful and hostile against Christianity."*

ANSWER: It is so astounding that Luther, the founder of Protestantism, was not aware of the existence of such a principle, which is known even by this priest. Or, perhaps, he completely disignored it because he followed no one. For Luther uses an utterly abusive language in his writings castigating the King of England, Henry VIII. For instance, a passage from the two hundred and seventy-seventh page of 1808 edition of his book can be paraphrased as follows: "I am speaking to the cuckold for the salvation of the people. Why should I not cram that cuckold's lies

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

down his throat while he, a king as he is, disregards the rights of his own honour and post. O you ignorant block-head! Why are you a mendacious liar, an extortioner, a thief, and an idiot, though you are the owner of the state. The administration of England, with all its superiority and abundance, has now fallen into your hands. ..." As it is seen, Luther, the leader and founder of Protestantism, let alone obeying or submitting himself to the authority of King Henry, did not hesitate to write the abovementioned foul words about him because he disregarded Luther's innovations although he was not hostile to Christianity. [After all these, whereabouts is the Biblical commandment, "Obey rulers even if they are unbelievers"? Why did Luther, the founder of Protestantism, ignore this Biblical commandment instead of obeying it?]

It is written in the same blooklet, *"By means of war, Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' established a political state, not a religious one. Islam permitted holy war only in Medîna-i-munawwara. Like Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' was charged with jihâd (holy war). He held religion and state in unity, and assumed both the task of Prophethood and the office of head of the state."*

ANSWER: Whereas the former half of this passage is completely wrong, the latter half is correct. The Islamic religion concedes domination or ownership to no one except Allâhu ta'âlâ. According to the Sharî'at of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', all Believers are free. For the principles of mu'âmalât (matters pertaining to buying, selling, etc.) in this Sharî'at are so immaculate that better ones could never be ideated. These principles are based on such steadfast and exquisite essentials that for thousands of centuries from now they would retain their validity and applicability to thousands of new colours that civilization might assume, and every possible new matter could be assimilated to one or more Islamic principles, no matter what the century, its improvements and requirements might be. Contrary to this priest's supposition, Islam does not permit an overpowering, irresistable sovereignty. No statement could be so ignorantly expressed as the one which purports, *"Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' allocated both Prophethood and sovereignty to himself."* For our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' was head of state throughout his lifetime. [He did not stock property like supreme rulers. What he had he always distributed to others, poor and rich alike. All through his lifetime,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

he was never heard to say 'No' for something asked from him. If he had what was asked for, he would give it; if he did not have it, he would be quiet. He lived in poverty. Yet his 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' poverty was his personal choice. When he took possession of a rather large amount of money, he would never even keep it overnight. He would always dispense it. Following his example, his As-hâb would do the same.] He led a life of contentment, so much so that it was discovered at his death that he had pawned his armour as a security for his debt. Before deciding about an important matter such as jihâd, if there was not wahy-i-ilâhî, he would not act upon his personal opinion, but would ask the opinions of his As-hâb and then act upon the best opinion, following the âyat-i-kerîma which purports, **"Consult** (with others) **about your matters."** Up until the times of Luther and Calvin, Popes were the only dominant authorities in Europe. In the tribunals called the Inquisition, they excommunicated even kings, brought whomever they liked to the throne, and dethroned and ruined those kings they disliked. With the interference of priests' personal interests and caprices, state administration was atrophied. Thus, they brought Europe into such a miserable state that all politicians and statesmen began to clamour that the state would not attain safety without laicization, that is, unless state administration was separated from Christianity. Later on, Protestants considered it would be necessary to sever state affairs from religious matters, and this they did despite the Papal government. So, freeing state administration from Christianity, they rendered a service to humanity. If Papal authority had held sway over those states, they would have perished by now.

On the other hand, history teems with the examples of the states which gained strength, power and grandeur by adapting themselves to Islam. The remnants of those celebrated civilizations, e.g. the works of art remaining from the Andalusian Umayyads in Spain, [whatever survived of the many which were burned, destroyed, and annihilated by the savage Spaniards], and the Ottoman[1] masterpieces of architecture, law and literature, still exist in the continents of Europe, Asia, and Africa.

The booklet writes, *"Islam commands Muslims to be strong and powerful. Therefore, instead of spreading among righteous people who wish to approach to Allâhu ta'âlâ, it has lured and*

---

[1] The Ottoman State was founded in 699 [A.D. 1299], and abolished in 1340 [A.D. 1922].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

captivated people who are fond of power and wealth. As a result, Islam's adherents are not impressive of the adherents of a spiritual religion. Islam has maintained its complicated state from the very beginning. Christianity, on the other hand, owing to its incorporeal sacredness, has cautioned its believers against pompous and temporal grandeur. Since the beginning of Christianity, Christians have encountered various difficulties and suffered subduing enemy aggressions. This has deterred the pursuers of worldly advantages and interests from joining Christianity."

ANSWER: The truth is quite the opposite of what the priest writes. Among the As-hâb-i-kirâm who became Muslims in Mekka-i-mukarrama before Hijrat (Hegira), there was not a single person fond of worldly pomp or wealth. Most of them were indigent, poor people. On the other hand, notables of Qoureish, who were Islam's enemies, were wealthy, powerful, and fond of the world. As is written in the twenty-sixth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, according to Christian creed, during the Jewish Passover Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', after having his last dinner with his Apostles on the evening previous to his death, told them that he would be killed and that one of them would betray him to the Jews. Upon this the Apostles were terrified with the feeling of suspicion as to which one of them could commit such treason. When Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was arrested by the Jews, his Apostles, who were with him, left him. That night Peter, who was the closest friend of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', denied to know Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' three times, that is, each time the rooster crowed.

During the lifetime of our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', there were chieftains, notable tribesmen, rich people among the As-hâb-i-kirâm. These people did not behave in such a manner as would risk their Islamic manners or belief. For their acceptance of Islam had not been for the sake of ephemeral worldly property. All the As-hâb-i-kirâm willfully sacrificed their property and lives for the sake of the Islamic religion. It is manifest which of them, Islam or Christianity, comprises more rectitude and spirituality. It is clearly understood from these examples we have given which of them allured those people who chased worldly power and interests.

The priest goes on, *"Islam's not distinguishing religion from State brings up several of its shortcomings. Each of these shortcomings, in comparison to Christianity, has held people in a chain of contradictions with respect to their religious needs. This*

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

sums up to mean that Islam is not an elevated religion. Now we shall begin to explain some of the dangers that may arise from mingling religion with politics."

ANSWER: As we have stated earlier, this protesting priest is continuously in error by confusing Islam with Christianity, which is a collection of the Gospels attributed to Matthew and John and a series of epistles ascribed to Peter and Paul. The dangers he is going to explain, therefore, originate from the same source.

The priest goes on, *"Christianity not only spread wider than Islam, but also it did not open wars against those who would not accept it, nor did it treat them so as to hurt their values of chastity and honour. Christianity has always guided its believers to goodness and abundance."*

ANSWER: Christians, after invading the Granada city, Christianized its Muslim and Jewish inhabitants by force, using the tribunals they named the Inquisition as a means of oppression. Even those who would change their faith were hurled into fires and burnt alive. [As those unfortunate people crackled in the furious flames and their lacerating cries and wails reached high up in the sky, the barbarous Christian Spaniards screamed and danced with joy, all of them, men and women alike.] If this priest had read about the savageries and cruelties recounted in the historical chronologies about Andalusians and the Inquisition, which were written by ecclesiastical historians, he would not have the daring to invent the false story that *"Christians did not treat those who would not accept Christianity so as to hurt their values of chastity and honour."* [Actually, the priest's statement is true in a way. For Christians did not leave any non-Christians under their administration, annihilating them after subjecting them to unthinkable, unimaginable methods of barbarism and torture. In fact, these same methods of annihilation have been applied by Protestants to Catholics, and by Catholics to Protestants. Thus, in countries under Christians' control, no member of any other religion was left alive. In countries where no one belongs to another religion, Christians' allegation that they *"did not treat those who would not accept Christianity so as to hurt their values of chastity and honour,"* is mendacity. For there was no one left for them to hurt the values of. Those who read the histories of crusades written by fanatical Christian historians will see clearly how mendacious these priests are. We asked a priest we know what his opinon was on these writings of ours. We wanted to know how come those Christians, who are alleged to belong to a

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

religion whose main principle is to do good to everyone and "When someone slaps you on one cheek, offer him your other cheek," did all those savageries. He **could not answer**.]

The priest goes on, *"Islam commands to always fight against its adversaries and non-Muslims. It subjects its defeated enemies to jizya* (wealth tax), *which means to insult them. Now, which of these two religions is more virtuous and fitter for the human nature with respect to mercy and compassion? Wise and reasonable people will see at once which of them is superior."*

ANSWER: History is in the open. [The priest's statements are quite contrary to facts. They are lies, slanders. Muslims fought against those enemies who assailed Islam and against tyrants and dictators who oppressed people. The Islamic jihâd is performed either as a defensive operation against disbelievers and tyrants molesting Muslims and Muslim countries, or as a rescue operation to save people ruthlessly oppressed under the tryranny and barbary of cruel dictators, or as a mission to let those unfortunate people hear about the justice and peace innate in Islam, and its principles guiding to happiness in this world and the next. In other words, it is performed in order to teach the religion of Allâhu ta'âlâ to the born slaves of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and thus to guide them to peace and happiness. In Islam, war is not a means of assailing other countries and plundering them in order to stock property. In places conquered after wars, Muslims cannot perpetrate massacres or cruelties like Christians. It is declared in many places of Qur'ân al-kerîm and in various hadîth-i-sherîfs of our Prophet that Allâhu ta'âlâ enjoins from these acts. People (in such conquered countries) cannot be forced to change their religions. Forcing them means to disobey Qur'ân al-kerîm. The two hundred and fifty-sixth âyat of Baqara sûra, which purports, **"There is no compulsion in religion,"** is a plain evidence of this. There have been numerous Christians in those countries where Islam has been dominant for fourteen hundred years as well as in countries that remained under the Ottoman sway for six hundred and thirty years. Most of the Christians living in Turkey today are their grandchildren. If the Ottoman Government had employed the slightest policy of compulsion, there would be no Christians left in Turkey today. When the Barbarous Christian Spaniards vanquished the Andalusian Omayyad State and invaded Spain, they perpetrated a genocide of the Muslims and Jews who fell into their hands, and then celebrated it as a day of feast, for according to them there were "no disbelievers left in Spain."

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

These are the cruelties exercised by Christians, who are claimed to belong to a religion of compassion and mercy that spread peacefully. When Fâtih Sultan Muhammad Khan[1] conquered Istanbul in 857 [A.D. 1453], he did not apprehend Byzantines' property. Nor did he forbid them from practising their religion. The people, who had been fed up with the tyrannies of the Christian Byzantine Empire, helped the Ottomans, not the Byzantine forces, in order to enjoy the Ottoman justice. After the conquest of Istanbul, Fâtih Sultan Muhammad Khan, let alone demolishing the churches, helped the patriarchate of Fener (Phanar). As for the Saint Sophia, which was then in ruins; he had it restored and enlarged, and changed into a mosque because of necessity. Muslims levied (the tax called) jizya on the non-Muslim inhabitants of the places they conquered. This (tax of) jizya, which was taken in return for the tremendous expenses Muslims defrayed in order to protect their property, lives, chastity and religion, was an insignificant amount, and it had its special contingencies. It was a (religious) commandment that the money taken in the name of jizya should be spent for charitable purposes. It was not as the priest asserts. As a matter of fact, in our day every government collects various taxes from their people.] These criticisms of the priest's are not intended to expose the truth. One must be an idiot not to apprehend that these statements of his originate from his bigotry and malevolence or are induced by his greed for money. However, since the savageries displayed during the crusades and in Andalusia are written in their own books, too, no person with reason and logic will believe these mendacities and lies of the priest's.

The priest goes on, *"In the time of Ottomans, who were the predominant Islamic nation, abusive terms were being used about the non-Muslim subjects. This went on until recently, when it was at last forbidden and the non-Muslims were granted the same rights as Muslims. This fact proves that my earlier statements are true."*

ANSWER: The rights which the non-Muslim subjects equally shared with the Muslims were valid and observed since the reign of Fâtih Sultan Muhammad Khan. What authority does he think compelled Fâtih Sultan Muhammad Khan to grant these concessions to the Byzantine church? All the Ottoman Sultans observed this justice and autonomy conceded to the church in

---

[1] Fâtih (the Conqueror) passed away in 886 [A.D. 1481].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

order to obey the commandment of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' which we have cited in the initial pages of our book. What was the State's need for employing the Byzantines, who were called Phanariots, as dîwân interpreters in the Ottoman Foreign Ministry or in the Wallachian and Moldavian princedoms? The law of equality, which was declared afterwards, was not the proclamation of something new, but the corroboration of what was already existent. As for the terms that are said to be abusive; they were being used from earlier times as rules of etiquette to label ranks and personages. As we have stated earlier, they were not intended to insult or scorn. Like any other state, the Ottoman State had its own nomenclature of protocol, and each Sultan had his personal usage of terminology in his firmans. No one ever thought of interpreting them as abusive.

The priest goes on, *"The Islamic States' improvement to equity and justice in this respect was not a commandment of Qur'ân al-kerîm, nor was it a natural outcome of being Muslims. It is a palpable fact that the latest Ottoman Sultans, who were clever and wise enough to apprehend that their country and people needed progress and reformation, executed the improvements in the wake of their Christian European counterparts."*

ANSWER: Such omnifarious equality as the censuring priest envisions does not tally with Qur'â al-kerîm, nor would it be agreeable to common sense. The Ottoman State established the equality prescribed by the (Islamic) Sharî'at not in the wake of European emperors, but by executing Islam's commandment, and declared the principles of equality [by writing the already existing injunctions item by item]. As of today, there has not yet been a European State to grant to its own people and put into practice the same extremely vast privileges as was granted by the Ottoman State to the non-Muslims.

[The cruelties, the barbarous and diabolical persecutions which Christian states have perpetrated in the Muslim countries they have invaded recently, are astoundingly gruesome. In the First World War, the English concentrated the slaves they had captured on the eastern front in huge camps in Egypt. They forced these Muslim slaves to bathe in large ponds, which had been impured with copper sulfate before. No sooner had the slaves returned to their homes than they became blind.

Another method Christians employ for annihilating Muslims and Islam is their policy of having Muslims kill other Muslims. In

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

the war of Çanakkale, African and Indian Muslims were made to wear British uniforms on the fronts of Egypt, Yemen and Syria to fight against the Ottomans, who were Muslims like themselves. Those Muslims were provoked to fight by the prevarication that they were being taken to help the Islamic religion and to fight against the enemies of the Islamic Khalîfa. Another method they employ is unbearably horrid for one to relate. For even cannibals have not attempted to kill a son, cut off and cook his head, and have his parents eat it. Please reread the second answer in the seventh chapter! It depicts the real personality of Europeans, who claim to be the civilized members of a religion dictating mild and amiable behaviour. It is so consternating that they have the face to assert, after all, that the Ottomans granted equal rights to their non-Muslim compatriots in the wake of Europeans.]

The priest goes on, *"The Ottoman reforms, which are generally known as the outcome of the virtuous Ottoman benevolence and wisdom, are, contrary to the prevalent supposition, due to the honour of Christianity, not of Islam."*

ANSWER: This passage is very well-written. The Ottoman transmutations, which were administered in the name of reformations by Reshîd Pasha, who was a freemason, were inculcated by Christians and masons. [For Christians, or rather, Protestants, coaxed Mustafâ Reshîd Pasha, the Ottoman Ambassador to London, to becoming a freemason by offering him brilliant advantages and money. Training him in masonic lodges, they sent him back to the Ottoman State as an adversary of Islam and Ottoman. They established masonic societies in big cities. By means of the heinous plans prepared by such perfidious people, the Muslim Turks, who were, (and are), the real owners of their country, were lowered to a secondary class of citizenship, and the non-Muslims were made privileged citizens. Whereas the Muslims were charged with too big sums of money for most of them to pay for exemption from military service, the amount demanded from their non-Muslim peers was no more than a perfunctory sample. While the pure lads of this country were suffering martyrdom for the sake of their faith, homeland and chastity, the non-Muslims and freemasons, who were the enemies of Islam, monopolized all the industries and trades of the country owing to the treacherous stratagems schemed by Mustafâ Reshîd Pasha and the freemasons trained by him in collaboration with English and Scotch masonic lodges. By levying heavy taxes for export and promoting import, Mustafâ Reshîd Pasha sabotaged

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

the Ottoman industry and arts. He had scientific education abrogated from schools. Europeans, who were the architects of all these impairments, were not yet satisfied with them; supplying money and weapons for the non-Muslim Ottoman citizens, they instigated them to rebellion, thus sowing the seeds of discord, hostility and hatred among the people who had been living together in peace for half a century. This instigation gave birth to horrendous, stupefying cruelties, savageries and blood-baths. If the Ottomans had perpetrated a thousandth of the barbarities they were subjected to by Bulgarians, Russians, Armenians and Greeks, there would be no Bulgarians, no Armenians, no Greeks, no Russians on the earth today. The so-called reforms, which were intended to annihilate the Muslim Turks, were all realized owing to the destructive plans of Christians.]

Here again, the priest asserts, *"In Islam, political laws and religious rules are not differentiated; both of the systems take their authorities from the same source. Therefore, an Islamic government has to keep the religious obligations as effective as individual rights by protecting them with powerful laws. This, in its turn, is an issue perilous and detrimental to Muslims' credal dispositions. For performance of religious obligations will be acceptable only when it is intended to attain His love, to approach towards Him, to obey Him. Otherwise, if religious duties are done because of compulsion, they will not be real obedience or piety; they will be perfunctory simulations, which can be, in a way, interpreted as hypocrisy and ostentation."*

ANSWER: It is written both in the Taurah and in the Gospels that there will be great substantial and spiritual rewards and prizes in return for doing the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ, i.e. actions called farz, and refraining from His negative injunctions, that is, prohibitions called nahy. In the twenty-third chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' warns the scribes and Pharisees about the divine torment and Hell, and reminds them of their own wrongdoings in an angry tone. At other places, he promises that those who believe in him shall be saved and attain blessings in the hereafter. Since Christians' worships are based on such threats of Hell and the promised blessings of Paradise, Christians' pure belief and unmodified thoughts must be in jeopardy. For such divergent intentions cannot be reconciled with worshipping only for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ and only in order to approach towards Him. Whatever answer the priest would give to this challenge of ours, he may retain it as our answer to him.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

And yet the priest goes on, *"The Islamic religion puts the apostate to death. Chastising those who violate the month of Ramadân by frankly not fasting in it, Islam compels people to remain adherent to the religion, and thus to hypocrisy."*

ANSWER: As we have stated earlier, the Islamic religion is not like Christianity, which was established by Paul and Peter. It is the most perfect religion, a sampler of all sorts of outward and spiritual virtues and superiorities. Therefore, the boundaries ordained by Allâhu ta'âlâ protect Islam's sublime and beautiful ethic against corruption and violation. Rules of apostasy are never applied to a Muslim, unless he frankly acknowledges that he is in a state of disbelief. If a Muslim publicly violates the month of Ramadân by not fasting, he will be chastised by the (Islamic) government, that is, he will be punished for publicizing his sin. Yet if he does not publicize his sin, that is, if he conceals his not fasting, he will not be chastised by the government. Qur'ân al-kerîm prescribes a certain punishment and expiation for this sort of sin. [There are cases which necessitate qadâ only as well as those requiring keffâret (expiation) also.] The chastisement inflicted by the (Islamic) government is the retribution for a Muslim's publicizing his sin and making a mischievous example for others. Such chastisements are for Muslims. The Islamic State does not interfere with Christians' worships. There is not any chastisement for them concerning their worships. Nor are they oppressed in any way. These chastisements protect Muslims' morals and unity against deterioration. The two hundred and fifty-sixth âyat of Baqara sûra, which purports, **"There is no compulsion in religion,"** informs that a person belonging to another religion cannot be forced to become a Muslim. And the eighty-ninth âyat of Nisâ sûra, which purports. **"If they turn away from tawhîd and hijrat, enslave or kill them whereever you find them,'** informs that those who, after accepting Islam, turn away from Islam and apostatize, are to be killed. The expression, *"Islam compels people to remain adherent to the religion, and thus to hypocrisy,"* is the priest's personal fabrication. This statement of his indicates that he interprets Qur'ân al-kerîm as he wishes. [Perhaps he considers Qur'ân al-kerîm to be similar to the Gospels he has been reading. Yet he is wrong. A person who interprets Qur'ân al-kerîm with his own views will become a disbeliever. Qur'ân al-kerîm is not a book to be read in a state of drunkenness and then to pronounce preposterous judgements. Interpreting Qur'ân al-kerîm requires first of all being a Muslim

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and then being an expert in a number of branches of knowledge and then being gifted with a special kind of enlightenment, which is a blessing of Allâhu ta'âlâ.]

The priest goes on, *"The following event shows that the Bible is opposed to chastising renegades or those who ignore fasting: One day a group of Jesus Christ's followers said that they wanted to part with him because they were offended at something. Jesus Christ turned to others and said, 'Do you wish to go, too?' Thus he gave them freedom of choice. One of them, speaking for them all, said, 'Who could we go to? You have the word for the eternal life.' "*

ANSWER: All the Prophets called Ulul-azm were personally entrusted with the task of establishing and executing the ahkâm-i-shar'iyya (canonical laws) which they brought from Allâhu ta'âlâ. The task which Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was entrusted with was the perfection and consolidation of the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', in addition to some outward worships and beautiful moral qualities. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' invited people who had been misled by the Israelites to obeying the rules in the Taurah and the Bible. The statements, "When Jesus was arrested by the Jews the Apostles left him and ran away. Peter, who was the most virtuous, denied Jesus three times in one night," show clearly how strong the belief of the followers of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was. It would be senseless to chastise the renegades among people whose belief was already so weak.

The priest goes on, *"The Islamic religion is composed of political laws and religious commandments. Therefore, many people accepted the victories and accomplishments of the earliest Islamic States as strong evidences for the rectitude of the Islamic religion. Should not the contemporary Muslims say, 'How can we believe in the rectitude of our religion despite the fact that as a result of our policy, which is a principal tenet of our religion, most of the countries and cities which were once under our control are now in the hands of Christians, and some forty million Muslims are under their domination?' "*

ANSWER: It is impossible for Muslims to say so. For, as we have explained earlier, Islamic States retained their power and grandeur as long as Muslims adhered fast to their religion and observed its commandments and prohibitions in the most perfect and beautiful manner possible. Later on, as they were alienated from the Islamic ethic, their national moral qualities gradually deteriorated, Islam's injunctions were ignored, and there began an

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

administration and execution based on personal inclinations. [This, again, was contrived by Christians and their masonic societies. Using all sorts of seduction including various promises and gratifications, they cajoled youngsters who were quite unaware of the Islamic religion, trained them as traitors hostile to their own religion and country, and then sent them forth to Islamic countries. These people, who were Muslims in name but Christians in personality, administered the Islamic States not as prescribed by Islam, but as they liked and wished. Thus, Islamic countries were broken and Muslims went under Christians' domination. In order to achieve their ends, Christians overtly supported all the enemies of Islam, including pagans. The pagan Mongol Emperor, Jenghiz Khân, the notorious cruel demolisher of the Islamic world, was gratified by the Pope, who sent him invaluable gifts and golds. The Pope's envoys shuttled back and forth between the Pope and Jenghiz Khân, and served him as his mentors. For Jenghiz Khân was ruthlessly slaughtering Muslims and endeavoring to annihilate Islam. Jenghiz Khân's grandson, Hulâghu, when he captured Baghdâd, massacred more then eight hundred thousand Muslims and burned Baghdâd, which was the world's most beautiful city and center of knowledge. All the Islamic works of art and religious books were destroyed, the Tigris River flowed in blood and ink for many days. What was the purpose of the Pope, the spiritual leader of Christians, who claim to be very merciful, for rewarding such an enemy of religion? It is blasphemy to help and encourage an unbeliever. Helping and encouraging a cruel tyrant, on the other hand, is cruelty itself. They have been striving to destroy and annihilate the Islamic civilization for thirteen hundred years. And now they are trying to put forth the stranded situation Islamic countries are in as a proof for Christianity's meritorious superiority over Islam. Even the insane would sneer at them. So, Muslims were alienated from Islam, and Islamic states, with the deterioration of their essential principles, collapsed and perished.] Inversely, as long as Christian states remained adherent to Christianity, they remained in confusion. When these states abandoned Christianity and inclined towards atheism, they began to imitate the Islamic religion in their policies and thus became strong and powerful. Histories, which are the open testimonies of this state, will continue to show this fact to the whole world till doomsday. No matter how dexterous Islam's enemies may be in mendacity, misrepresentation and calumniation, these equitable witnesses

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

will refute them and publicize their lies all over the world.

The priest goes on, *"The appearing of Jesus Christ is a very important turning point in God's dominion. This dominion abrogated some rites peculiar to past religions, e.g. circumcision. Disregarding circumcision, it valued consecration of the heart and beautification of morals, that is, extermination of wicked qualities. Muslims, on the other hand, are still practising circumcision, thus trying to keep up a custom which God annulled through the Bible."*

ANSWER: The fifth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew quotes Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as saying, "Do not think I have come to demolish the Sharî'at. I have come to perfect the Sharî'at, not to demolish it. For the truth I am to tell you is that not even a letter or a dot of the Sharî'at shall be annihilated unless heaven and earth perish." On the other hand, it is stated in the Taurah that one of the most important commandments of the Sharî'at of Mûsâ' 'alaihis-salâm' is circumcising the children. In fact, the Taurah quotes Allâhu ta'âlâ as commanding to Ibrâhîm (Abraham) 'alaihis-salâm', "Execute circumcision. For Paradise is not accessible without circumcision." All Prophets coming between Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' and Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' acted upon this commandment. As a matter of fact, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' himself was circumcised. The Gospels do not even contain a word concerning the abrogation of circumcision. When we asked this protesting priest which one of the Gospels abrogated the Sharî'at [by annulling the injunction of circumcision] despite the Biblical verse, "... not even a letter or a dot of the Sharî'at shall be annihilated...," which we have quoted above, his answer was no more than putting forward a few passages from the Epistle to Galatians written by Paul, who had not even reached the time when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had lived. For sixteen years this notorious person, Paul, perpetrated various persecutions and torments to the Believers of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', including the excoriation of one of the blessed Hawârîs. Later he claimed to believe in Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as a result of a dream, which, again, was his own fabrication. Now we ask this censuring priest: For what reason was that notorious Jew's word preferred to the definite and open commandment of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and why was circumcision abandoned? Muslims observe the sunnat of circumcision because our Prophet commanded them to preserve the sunnat of Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' and obey this commandment of Allâhu ta'âlâ in the Taurah. This performance of Muslims consists in obeying the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

divine will of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Christians' abandoning circumcision, on the other hand, means disignoring the commandment of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', which is also enjoined in the Taurah, and obeying Paul, the cruel hypocrite.

[Paul says in the seventh and eighth verses of the second chapter of his Epistle to Galatians, "But contrariwise, when they saw that the gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the gospel of circumcision was unto Peter;" "(For he that wrought effectually in Peter to the apostleship of the circumcision, the same was mighty in me toward the Gentiles:)" (Gal: 2-7, 8) Peter, the closest friend who was always with Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', commands circumcision and observes it himself. Then appears a Jew, who never saw Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in his lifetime and who oppressed bitterly for sixteen years the Nazarenes who believed in Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. This Jew fabricates a lie and says, "I have been given the Bible of uncircumcision. Let those people other than Jews not be circumcised." And this lie is observed as an injunction of the Christian religion. Supposing an ordinary person came forward and said that he had been revealed or inspired that such and such a thing should be done in such and such a manner, and a so-called religion accepted his words as an essential document. A person with discretion would not believe in the heavenliness of that religion.]

Another criticism that Christians stir up against Islam is based on the fact that Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs are in the Arabic language. The priest says, *"Since Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs are in Arabic and no studies have been done to translate it into other languages, Muslims who do not understand Arabic are deprived of knowing the meaning of Qur'ân al-kerîm. All the duâs and dhikrs are in Arabic. Muslims recite prayers without being aware of what they are saying. When people of other nationalities accept Islam and attempt to penetrate the inner realities of Qur'ân al-kerîm, they are encumbered with the burden of learning Arabic. Furthermore, because every Muslim is obligated to visit Mekka and Medina at least once in his lifetime, the land of Hidjaz has gained ascendancy over other lands. The obligation of hajj has become a burden, a trouble for people living in far away countries."*

ANSWER: An observation of the Old and New Testaments would be enough to answer his first objection. The Old and New Testaments were subjected to numerous interpolations each time they were translated into another language. Allâhu ta'âlâ revealed

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

His Qur'ân al-kerîm in the Arabic language in order to protect it against such interpolations. This will suffice as an answer to the priests' criticism.

Their second objection, that is, their criticism about hajj, has already been answered earlier in the text. Repetition would be unnecessary. The Islamic 'Ulamâ explicate in their works the hikmats[1] in the revelations of Qur'ân al-kerîm in the Arabic language and in hajj. Yet, in order to be blessed, we shall give here one of their explanations concerning the realities in the restraint against translating Qur'ân al-kerîm and the obligation of visiting Mekka-i-mukarrama and Medîna-i-munawwara, since it has to do with our subject:

As it is known by people of wisdom and knowledge, people living in various different climates of the earth were originally born from the same father and mother. They are like different generations of a great empire who have increased in number in process of time, parted into numerous tribes, and forgotten about their original relations. The disagreements and controversies among these various tribes emanate from the ideological and credal differences among them, which in turn are the natural proceedings of linguistic and customary differences. Since love of one's country is an inborn quality, everyone naturally loves his own country, as a result of which different people love different countries and therefore have different interests and benefits. When the objective is to remove or offset these differences, which are in the long run harmful to all the tribes and nations in general, there will be no other way than diminishing the sources of difference and assimilating these nations to one another. That is:

1 — For eliminating the harms of linguistic differences, which are the causes of disagreements, it is necessary to establish a common language among them.

2 — For alleviating the harms of customary and systematical differences among them, which are the major sources of disagreements, and for bringing them together in unity, they must be knitted together by means of the same customs and systems.

3 — Love of one's country, which is a spiritual dormancy, must be canalized towards concentricity, that is, people must be made to love one common country. The inner essence and purpose of the principles laid by the Islamic religion is to eliminate the

---

[1] The inner, esoteric reasons, the ultimate divine causes.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

disagreements among people and to tie them together with common aims of happiness and benefits. Qur'ân al-kerîm was revealed in the most beautiful of all the human languages, namely the Arabic language. ['Arab means beautiful. Hence Lisân-ul-'Arabî means the most beautiful language.] By means of the farz and other worships, all nations and tribes have been made equal. And by the obligation of hajj, Mekka-i-mukarrama and Medîna-i-munawwara have been made (Umm-ul-awtân), that is, sacred places, for all the Muslim nations. A Muslim will easily learn the Arabic language if he is drilled in reading Qur'ân al-kerîm and taught Arabic lessons at a very early age. Thus he will exchange ideas with Muslims all over the world. [For there will be a common language between them now.] On the other hand, by means of common systems of behaviour, such as azân (or adhân), namâz, fasting, zakât, hajj, especially the rukns (obligatory actions) in namâz, the namâz performed on Friday, namâz performed in jamâ'at (congregation), following the imâm (person who conducts the namâz in congregation), Islam brings tribes with different customs closer to one another and guides them to a common system of belief and worships. And Mekka-i-mukarrama, the Islamic center where Muslims come together, is their common sacred place. It is a religious duty, a debt to love it, to preserve and protect it. For hundreds of thousands of people from eastern, western, southern and northern parts of the world, who have never seen one another before, nor would it otherwise be possible for them to see one another, come together in Mekka-i-mukarrama for the performance of the farz of hajj, exchange knowledge and ideas, consolidate their religious creed and love, and are welded together. So, the real aim of Islam is to make all peoples and tribes brothers by uniting them in the same beautiful system of belief, worships and ethics. People who obey Islam, [wherever and] in whatever age they live, will attain honour, happiness and success as long as they obey it. Thus, it is doubtless, in a short time six hundred million Muslims on the earth will regain their centuries-old powerful and honourable status and, being full of brotherly affection for one another, they will fill the whole world with peace and happiness.

Amidst all the slanders directed by Christians to the Islamic religion, this priest asserts, *"In Islam, jihâd-i-fî-sebîlillah* (holy war only for Allah's sake) *is farz. On the other hand, there is no commandment for jihâd in Christianity. This case is an evidence for the virtue of Christianity."*

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

ANSWER: The commandment of jihâd is stated clearly in all the books of the Old Testament. We have already quoted the statement of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', "I have not come to demolish the Sharî'at. I have come to perfect the Sharî'at, not to demolish it." This statement bears the meaning that he will also perfect jihâd, which exists in the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Christians refuse this commandment of jihâd enjoined by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. There are very many verses conveying the commandment of jihâd in the Old Testament. It is worth the time spent mentioning them here.

It is stated in the tenth and later verses of the twentieth chapter of Deuteronomy, "When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it." "And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be, that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee." "And if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it:" "And when the LORD thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword:" "But the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which the LORD thy God hath given thee." "Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations." "But of the cities of these people, which the LORD thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing alive that breatheth." (Deut: 20-10 to 16)

The account given to this effect in the thirty-first chapter of Numbers can be summarized as follows: "Commanded by Allâhu ta'âlâ, Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' formed a twelve thousand strong army to fight against the Medians. Defeating the Medians, they killed all the men and enslaved their women and children. They took away all their animals, flocks and property as booties, and burned all their towns and sites." (paraphrased from Num: 31-7 to 10) If you need detailed information on the facts we have summarized here, please consult the book Numbers of the Old Testament. It is stated in the Old Testament that Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' appointed Yûshâ 'alaihis-salâm' (Joshua) as his successor before his death. And he (Yûshâ), obeying the Taurah's commandment, killed many millions of people. Those who are interested will find detailed information from the first chapter through the thirty-first chapter of the book Numbers.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

The eighth and later verses of the twenty-seventh chapter of 1 Samuel state, “And David and his men went up, and invaded the Gesh’u-rites, and the Gez’rites, and the Am’a-lek-ites: ...” “And David smote the land, and left neither man nor woman alive, and took away the sheep, and the oxen, and the asses, and the camels, and the apparel, and returned, and came to A’chish.” (1 Sam: 27-8, 9)

It is written in the eighth chapter of II Samuel that Dâwûd (David) ‘alaihis-salâm’ slaughtered twenty-two thousand Syrian soldiers, and in the tenth chapter that he killed forty thousand horsemen of the Aramaians. (2 Sam: 8-5 and 10-18)

It is written in the eighteenth chapter of I Kings that Ilya (Elijah) ‘alaihis-salâm’ had four hundred and fifty people killed because they had claimed to be Baal’s Prophets. (1 Kin: 18-1 to 40)

It is written in the fourteenth chapter of Genesis that when Ibrâhîm ‘alaihis-salâm’ received the news that the kings who had been attacking Sodom and Gomorrah had enslaved Lût ‘alaihis-salâm’ and pillaged his property, he convened his soldiers in order to save his brother and others, pursued the pillagers up to Dan, conducted a night raid, killed all the pillagers, rescued his brother, Lût ‘alaihis-salâm’, repossessed all the property pillaged, and took them all back, including the women. (Gen: 14-11 to 16)

Paul states in his epistle to the Hebrews that David, Samuel and other Prophets, who had formerly been weak people barely escaping the edge of the sword, mustered power and courage, forced the enemy armies to run away, and conquered lands. (Heb: 11-32, 33)

As it is understood from all these, past Prophets ‘alaihimus-salâm’ were also commanded to make ghazâ and jihâd against disbelievers. Yet Islam’s jihâd-i-fî-sebîlillah, unlike emperors’ wars, is not made for the satisfaction of mundane intentions and sensuous desires or for achieving fame and honour. It is performed to glorify the blessed name of Allâhu ta’âlâ, to make all people attain the right and true way, and to save people from cruelty and persecution. Now we would like to ask Protestants: Were the holy wars made by the Prophets we have mentioned above permissible, approved acts according to Allâhu ta’âlâ, or did they incur Allah’s wrath because they were forbidden? If they say they were permissible and approved, they will have rebutted their own assertion. If they say they were forbidden, this time Paul, who is sacred to them, will be a liar on account of his

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

writings about Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm'. In this case, the Old Testament, which is confirmed to be true and authentic by Christians, will have also been belied. In addition, thousands of innocent people will have been slaughtered as a result of a Believer's wrongdoing. After all, how will Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm' attain salvation in the hereafter? For the fifteenth verse of the third chapter of John's first epistle states, "... and ye know that no murderer hath eternal life abiding in him." (1 John: 3-15)

It is written in the eighth verse of the twenty-first chapter of the Apocalypse (Revelation), "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, and murderers, and whoremongers, and sorcerers, and idolaters, and all liars, shall have their part in the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone: which is the second death." (Rev: 21-8)

[**WARNING:** At it is seen at various places in our book, **(Could Not Answer),** it is written in all the Pentateuchal and Biblical books possessed by Christians that "After death people shall resurrect, be called to account, and remain eternally in the blessings of Paradise or in the fire of Hell." Hundreds of millions of Christians in America and Europe, including all statesmen, scientists, professors, commanders, believe in these Gospels and go to church for worship every week. Some people in Turkey, because they do not read any Islamic literature and therefore know nothing of Islam, call it (modernism) to imitate Europeans and Americans, and (regression) to be a Muslim. However, these people do not work like Europeans and Americans in science, medicine, mathematics or technologies. What they imitate in them is only atrocities such as arranging mixed parties of music, gambling and drinking, spicing their voyeuristic desires in beaches, and annoying their neighbors by turning up the volume of their radio or television to the highest point. Because Islam prohibits such excesses, they call Muslims reactionaries. According to them, any boy or girl who joins them in their eccentricities, illiterate and quite unaware of science and arts as he or she may be, is modern, illuminated. On the other hand, a learned, virtuous, decent, true Muslim who is a university graduate and is therefore well-informed in arts and trade, pays his taxes, obeys the laws, and is kind to others, will be reactionary if he does not join their immoderations. These self-imposed modern and illuminated people are beguiling young people to indecency and sloth, and thus to afflictions in the world and eternal torment in the hereafter. They are causing breakage in family homes. In

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

short, as it is seen, according to these people, only those who imitate Europeans' dissipations and immoralities are illuminated and modern. Since those Europeans and Americans, who believe in Paradise and Hell like Muslims, are not regressive in their view, they must be calling Muslims regressive only because Muslims do not practise their immoralities. Being irreligious, these people do not imitate Europeans' and Americans' pious aspects, and this, in turn, makes them regressive in their own criteria. This book of ours proves that a Muslim is illuminated and always up-to-date, and a non-Muslim is retrogressive.]

As for the nonexistence of the farz of jihâd in the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' invited people to his religion only for three years, which was too short a period to spare time for jihâd-i-fî-sebîlillah. Naturally, it would have been impossible to perform jihâd against the Roman Empire with five to ten men plus a few women. In fact, when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' knew that the Jews were nursing a grudge against him, he became anxious. As is written in the thirty-sixth and later verses of the twenty-second chapter of the Gospel of Luke, during the day previous to the evening when he would be arrested, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said unto his companions, "... But now, he that hath a purse, let him take it, and likewise his scrip: and he that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one." (Luke: 22-36) "And they said, Lord, behold, here are two swords. And he said, unto them, it is enough." (ibid: 22-38) And those swords were no good because as he was being arrested that evening his companions left him and disappeared. All these explanations make it as clear as the sun that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had no intentions to surrender without self-defence, that he would have used the sword to defend himself if it had been possible, and his not making jihâd against his enemies was due to lack of physical means of fighting. Since Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' did not plainly enjoin his followers from jihâd, and inasmuch as he is the consolidator, not the abolisher, of the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', it is obvious that the commandment of jihâd existent in the previous Sharî'at must have been valid in his Sharî'at, too.

Protestants assert in this publication of theirs that, *"Muslims, as a requirement of their religion, which stigmatizes non-Muslims as the enemies of God and religion, look upon them as their enemies. They wish and endeavour to make them Muslims by force or to take them under their domination and thus to levy (*the tax called*) jizya on them."*

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

ANSWER: Yes, any religion or sect contradictory to the belief of tawhîd (unity of Allah) is detestable and repulsive in Islam's view. Owners of such misbelief are said to be the enemies of Allâhu ta'âlâ and His religion. Yet, [as we have stated earlier in the text], it is forbidden to compel them to become Muslims. The priests' statements in this respect are merely intended to malign Muslims. Muslims hate only those non-Muslims who bear hostility against the Islamic religion. There have been hatred, animosity, hostility, conflicts and fights between Muslims and such people. But what are the grounds for the hatred and emnity and all those history-making vehement fights and bloodbaths among the Christian sects themselves? Pages of history books teem with narrations of the cruelties and barbarisms Christians inflicted on the people of the countries they captured. They try to destroy and annihilate people belonging to other religions. Approximately three hundred years before the Hegira, Emperor Constantine converted to Christianity and presently began to perpetrate his barbarisms, cutting off Jews' ears and condemning them to exile in various countries. Later, he deported the Jews out of Alexandria, demolished all their temples, carried out an extensive genocide, and seized their property. The Sephardic Jews also were subjected to innumerous types of torment by Christians. [We have already touched upon the cruelties inflicted on the Jews in Spain.] In the Tolouisse city of France, Christians took an Easter day as an occasion for smacking on the face the Jews they met on the streets. In other cities of France, Jews were pelted with stones on the same Easter day. It is a fact that most of the Jews were killed by the stones ruthlessly hurled, and the people were provoked to do all this savagery by the authorities of the city. So far, there has been seven Jewish deportations from France.

Also, the Hungarian Jews suffered various types of torment inflicted by Christians. Some of them were burned alive. Others were thrown into the sea to drown.

In England, on the other hand, the Jewish people, finding the torments inflicted on them too painful to endure, preferred killing one another lest they should fall into the hands of their torturers.

Members of a Catholic society, which had been established under the name (Oturafe) in Spain, burned alive thousands of people most of whom were Jews and the rest were some rich Christians suspected of apostasy, and the officially invited guests were kings and other high-ranking officials. It is a historically recorded fact that as these wretched people begged, cried and

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

wailed for mercy the spectators, i.e. priests, officials and women, laughed and clapped their hands.

Throughout the period of twelve [now fourteen] hundred years since the rising of Islam there has not been a tiniest event of cruelty inflicted by Muslims on Christians or Jews similar to the cruelties perpetrated by Christians. If there is any, let them divulge it. If they mean the three or four hundred Christians killed during the events that broke out in Lebanon in 1277 [A.D. 1861], these events were provoked by the Jesuits who had come to Lebanon and Damascus from France in order to sow seeds of sedition and mischief. This fact is clearly seen in the legal proceedings that are on record in the Ottoman Archives and which were conducted on the spot in cooperation with a European committee. The Christians were slaughtered by Druses, the Lebanese mountaineers who had come to Lebanon for this purpose. The Ottoman State sentenced to death those felons legally proven to be guilty in this case. In addition. Ahmad Pasha, who had been a successful vizier before but happened to be the governor of Damascus at the time when these hapless events broke out, was found guilty for failing to carry out his military duty and was executed by shooting publicly.

[It is written in the twelfth book of (the Turkish) **Türkiye Târihi** (History of Turkey), "When Rushdu Pasha, an interpreter, was in office as the Sadr-i-a'zam (Grand Vizier), there was aggravated animosity between the Druses and the Catholic Maronites. Eventually, the former being provoked by the English agents and the latter by the French, they attacked each other. Hurshid Pasha, governor of Lebanon, and Ahmad Pasha, governor of Damascus, fell short of restraining the battle waged and directed by the aforesaid two States. Napoleon III was awaiting the exacerbation of the battle, in which case he fancied he would seize an opportunity to invade Lebanon. Fortunately, the Ottoman intervention prevented the problem from becoming worse."

The greatest share in the settlement of these Damascene tumults fell to the lot of Emîr Abd-al-qaadir ibn-i-Muhyiddîn al-Hasanî,[1] a virtuous, great 'âlim, the famed hero of Algeria. This high person, a true Muslim, cooperated with the other Muslims in the defence of Christian districts. He rescued many Christians among whom was the Consul of France from the hands of Druses,

---

[1] Sherîf Abd-al-qaadir passed away in Damascus in 1300 [A.D. 1882].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

gave sanctuary to a number of Christians in his government house, and financially helped the poor and needy ones. French authorities, who were formerly his arch enemies, conferred to him France's greatest medal of honour. Thus, obeying the commandment of Allâhu ta'âlâ, he protected and helped the French and Christian people against whom he had conducted innumerable combats before. Upon this event, Fuad Pasha, the Foreign Minister, was appointed Plenipotentiary with absolute military, administrative, political and financial powers and was assigned the duty of suppressing all sorts of sedition and effecting the required reforms. Fuad Pasha presently moved to Beirut and thence to Damascus, where he punished the instigators and the Druses who joined the events. He paid seventy-five million kurush to the injured party, i.e. the Christians, in compensation for the loss incurred. When Ahmad Pasha, his most beloved friend, was sentenced to death by Dîwân-i-harb (Court Martial), Fuat Pasha said, "I have not killed any living being, not even a chicken all through my life, and now, see what Allâhu ta'âlâ has made me do." Has there ever been a Christian State with a similar example of justice? Instead of justice, they have perpetrated and waged cruelty and supported those who waged cruelty. Details of this event are lush with illustrations of Islam's justice, yet relating them one by one would overflow the capacity of our book. We refer those who are interested to history books.]

While the self-complacent Christians claim that they have avoided having recourse to physical media or force and that they emphasize only the spiritual aspect of the matter such as loving Allâhu ta'âlâ and showing love and compassion to one's neighbours, the inhumane treatments, the savageries and cruelties they laid on one another stay recorded in history books. Upon reading about these savageries and cruelties committed by Christians, one may, let alone hating Christians, regret being human.

A European historian gives an estimated number of the people whom Christians massacred in the name of Christianity, and adds some historical facts pertaining to the time when those massacres were perpetrated. In order to present a memento to our Muslim brothers, we have paraphrased some passages from his book:

In 650 [A.D. 1251] a priest named Novatianus, who took office as the Pope some time later, and another clergy, Cornelius by name, had a row with each other in Rome. Meanwhile another

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

row, namely a struggle for position, was kicked up between two Carthaginian priests, Siprin and Nevât. In the fights that consequently broke out between the supporters of both parties numerous people were killed. Although the death-toll is not precisely known, an estimated two hundred thousand would be anything but an exaggeration.

During the reign of Constantine I, as soon as Christians found an opportunity to avenge themselves on their enemies, they killed Emperor Galerius's young son Kottidin and a seven-year-old son and a daughter of Emperor Maximinus. Abducting the Emperor's wife and the mothers of these two children from the palace, they dragged them along the streets of Antioch. Then they threw them all into a river, where they drowned. Emperor Galerius's wife was executed in Salonica and her corpse was thrown into a river. Many people were killed during these commotions. Their number is estimated to be around two hundred thousand.

Two priests established a sect called Donat in Africa and put up resistance against the Roman Church. During the insurrections launched by these priests an estimated four hundred thousand people were killed their heads being smashed with clubs, since the priests would not approve killing with the sword.

All history books write about the controversies and clashes that burst in Christian countries upon the Nicene Council's decision that Father and Son, two of the persons of trinity, were in full substantial unity. The conflagrations and insurrections caused by this decision burned the whole Roman Empire, various times, and continued for some four hundred years. Hundreds of dynasties destroyed and afflicted during these confusions being excluded, solely the number of killings is about three hundred thousand.

Around sixty thousand people were destroyed during the disturbances of Anganoglest and Angolater.

During the reign of Theodora, the wife of Emperor Teokyil, one thousand Manichaeans were slaughtered because they represented good and evil as two distinct beings. The abetter of this massacre was the priest who heard Theodora's confession. He had told her that her entering Paradise would be possible only after killing all the members of the blasphemous sect. The number of people killed by crucifixion, strangulation and impalement had reached twenty thousand already. Yet the priest had found this number insufficient for Theodora's attaining Paradise.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

The number of people killed in the fights and struggles for bishopric and patriarchate, which have taken place in every century all over the world, is twenty thousand at the least.

During the two-hundred-year crusading expeditions,[1] the number of Christians killed by Christians is estimated to be two million, yet we shall say one million for moderation's sake. During the crusades, again, at least one hundred thousand Christians were slaughtered by the priests called (Muqallid-is-suyûf) who were plundering and pillaging the towns along the Baltic shores.

When the Pope declared war against Lanokduk, around one hundred thousand people were slaughtered, burned, and their ashes were left in the open for a long time.

The number of people killed in the wars made against emperors since the time of Pope Gregory VII is fifty thousand.

The people killed during the skirmishes caused by the matter of Western renegades in the fourteenth century are fifty thousand.

Soon after these events two priests named Johos and Cirum (Jerome) were burned alive, and the consequent combats yielded one hundred and fifty thousand Christians slaughtered.

The events of Merbondol and Gaberir may seem insignificant when compared to this important event. Yet the massacres perpetrated in these events are extremely truculent: Some people were burned alive, suckling babies were thown into burning fire, young girls were raped and then butchered into pieces, old women were blown up with gunpowder inserted into their vaginas. The number of people killed in these savageries reaches eighteen thousand.

If we put aside the number of people, priests and princes beheaded to carry out the laws put by the priestly judges within the period between the Popes Leo X and Clement IX, people who were guillotined without any apparent reasons, people who were burned alive in various countries, great numbers of people whom executioners were tired of beheading in Germany, France and England, the number of people slaughtered in the thirty insurrections issuing from the controversies upon Luther's statements, "There is no such thing as the Eucharist or uniting with God. And Baptism is a lie," those killed in the massacre of St. Bartholomew and in other massacres perpetrated in Ireland

[1] Crusading expeditions commenced in 490 [A.D. 1096], and continued until 670 [A.D. 1271].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and elsewhere, reaches well beyond three million. In addition to the dynasties and eminent families thrown into poverty and destitution, at least two million innocent people were killed.

The number of people killed, crucified and burned by the ecclesiastical societies called inquisition are five million and two hundred thousand.

As for the aborigines killed in the name of Christianity in America; the number given by the author of this history book is five million, yet the bishop of Lascas states that it was twelve million.

As a result of the seeds of mischief sown by the ecclesiastical missionaries sent forth to Japan to promulgate Christianity there, insurrections and civil wars broke out and three million people died.

The death-toll in all these events is almost twenty-five million people.

The historian publisher of this book, after acknowledging that the numbers he has given are well below the actual numbers of the people killed, adds, "To those Europeans who read my book: If you have a record of your genealogy in your home, review it. It is for certain that you will find either victims killed or murderers who killed, in religious fights, among your ancestors. It is stated in the declaration issued by the British Parliament on the twenty-fifth day of June in 1052 [A.D. 1643] that in Ireland alone the number of Protestants slaughtered by Catholics was one hundred and fifty-four thousand." Here we end our paraphrasing from the history book.

As Catholics inflicted these cruelties and persecutions on other people, especially on Protestants towards the end of the Middle Ages, Protestants, of course, did not offer their other cheeks. Nor did they spare any effort in their race of bloodshedding. Thomas, an Anglo-Catholic, states in the forty-first and forty-second pages of his book **Mir'ât-i-sidq** (The Mirror of Faith), which was printed in 1267 [A.D. 1851], "Protestants, as soon as they appeared, pillaged six hundred and forty-five hospices, ninety schools, twenty-three hundred churches, and one hundred and ten hospitals, and killed thousands of the old and poor inmates. In addition, they exhumed corpses and stole grave-clothes." He says in the fifty-second page, "Protestants laid down more than a hundred unjust and unmerited laws against Catholics. As a requirement of these laws, members of the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Catholic sect could not inherit property from Protestants. After the age of eighteen, a non-Protestant would not be given any land property. Catholics were not permitted to open schools. A Catholic priest caught while preaching would be imprisoned. Their taxes were increased. Those who performed Catholic ceremonies were fined. If they were priests, the fine would be seven hundred rupees plus imprisonment. Those who went out of England were killed there and their property was usurped. Those Catholics who did not attend certain Protestant rites were fined. In addition, no Catholic rites were permitted, and their weapons were confiscated. They were not allowed to ride horses. Priests who would not become Protestants, and also those who offered them sanctuary in their homes, were killed. Catholics would not be accepted as witnesses. England's Queen Elizabeth I,[1] in order to spread and promote Protestantism in England and to undertake its spiritual leadership, endorsed all sorts of cruelty and injustice imposed on Catholics. [And she took the lead in these cruelties.] She had two hundred and four eminent people executed. She had ninety-five Catholic bishops killed in dungeons. Some rich Catholics were sentenced to life. Protestants would lash the Catholics they met in the streets. In fact, Estorat, the Queen of Scotland, was kept in a dungeon for a long time and then executed because she was a Catholic. Again, during the reign of Elizabeth I, Catholic scholars and clergy were forced to board ships, whence they were thrown into the sea and drowned. In order to force the Catholics in Ireland to become Protestants, the Queen sent an army against them. Their churches were burned. The notables were killed. Those who ran away into forests were hunted like wild beasts. Even the ones who accepted Protestantism did not escape the massacre. In 1643, the Parliament sent officials to seize the Catholics' property and land. This condition continued until the time of King James II, who showed mercy to the Catholics in 1687. Angered by this, the Protestants presented a petition undersigned by forty-four thousand people to the king. Their request was the maintenance of the laws of cruelty. Yet the Parliament refused this demand of the Protestants. Upon this, one hundred thousand Protestants came together and set fire to the Catholic churches and Catholic districts in London, so that thirty-six fires were seen in one district."

---

[1] Elizabeth I died in 1012 [A.D. 1603].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Thus, despite the admonitions of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', who enjoined, "If they slap you on the right cheek, offer them your left cheek, too. If someone asks you for your coat, give him your cloak, too. Love your enemies, and if they invoke evil on you, pronounce a benediction over them. If your brother hurts you, forgive him up to seventy times. Love your neighbour like loving yourself," all these horrendous and savage events took place among Christians, who claim to believe in the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' who was not commanded to make jihâd.

The jihâd commanded by the Islamic religion is not a cruel or savage deed like the ones mentioned above. Muslims' preparation for jihâd is intended to prevent the cruel Christians from assailing Islamic countries and to save people from the torments of cruel governments. Jihâd is made to bring obstinate tyrants who elude justice and right to reason by means of power and force, to glorify the blessed name of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and to spread Islam's beautiful ethics everywhere.

There are certain modes and obligations that must be observed when making jihâd:

1 — Before beginning the war the disbelievers are invited to accept Islam in a proper language. In other words, it is explained in a plain language that the Islamic religion is the most perfect and the most meritorious religion, that Allâhu ta'âlâ is One, that He does not have a likeness or a partner, and that Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is the true Prophet sent by Him. If they accept this invitation, they will become Believers and also brothers of other Believers.

2 — If the disbelievers do not wish to attain this blessing and happiness and prefer to remain in aberration purported in the seventy-fourth âyat of Shu'arâ sûra, **"We found our fathers doing so,"** they are not compelled to change their religion. They are invited to stay in their motherland on condition that they will pay a very low yearly tax called jizya (1.5 or 2.5 or 3 dirhams of silver), which is a fee for staying in the (now) Islamic country and enjoying all sorts of safety such as property, chastity and lives and, above all, freedom of worship. If they concede to this alternative, they shall practise their religious rites as freely as Muslims do. And their chastity, blood, and property, exactly like those of Muslims, shall be in the protection of the State. A Muslim cannot intrude upon their privacies or even look at their women. He cannot usurp even a penny from them. He cannot abuse them, not even verbally. They shall share equal rights in the courts of justice

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

which carry out the principles of justice prescribed in Qur'ân al-kerîm, and not a slightest amount of injustice shall be done to them. Thus they will get along well with the Believers. In the Islamic law courts a shepherd and a governor are equal.

3 — If the disbelievers refuse the second alternative, too, and attempt to fight against the Believers, then the jihâd shall be performed against them, again by observing the rules of justice and modes prescribed by Islam.

These are the principles of justice and moderation which Islam commands to observe in regard to jihâd. Now we consign it to the conscience of people of wisdom and reason to apply the above-given criteria to the histories of Muslims, and of Christians, then form a judgement.

As will be inferred from the information given above, Islam's rapid spreading is by no means due to such substantial agencies as power and ambition for earthly property. Islam's spreading so rapidly is rooted in its becoming a true and irrevocable religion, in its genuine and all-inclusive justice, [in its commanding knowledge, work, mercy, beautiful morals, and in its being a religion quite congruous with the human species. For those who obey and precisely adapt themselves to Islam soon attain welfare and spiritual repose; as we have stated in the initial pages of our book, this fact is admitted and acknowledged even by priests, who say, "Yes, after accepting Islam, the Arabs, who had been heathenish Bedouins formerly, ameliorated spiritually, made progress in knowledge, arts and civilization, and brought the whole world under their sway in a very short time." Would that they had reason enough to see the fact that all these improvements of Muslims originate from their obedience to Islam, the final and the most perfect religion, and following Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', the last Prophet. This would lead them to happiness.]

Were changing one's faith so facile a job as to be accomplished only by the threat of the sword, all those wars which took millions of lives between Catholics and Protestants would not have taken place at all. Although there was a great deal of credal similarity between them, neither did the Catholics' compulsion and oppression make the Protestants abandon their credo, nor were the Protestants' savage cruelties able to sever the Catholics living on the isle of Ireland from their religious doctrines.

As for the allegation that *"Some people accepted Islam lest they should be forced to pay jizya";* as we have explicated earlier

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

in the text, for many long years Protestants have been striving assiduously to convert people in Muslim countries to their religion and the amount of the salary they offer for accepting Protestantism ranges between a small bag of silvers minimum and five thousand kurushes. With all these endeavours, how many conscientious and religiously well-informed Muslims can they name they have been able to make Protestants so far? Therefore, nothing could be so idiotic, so ignorant and so contumacious as the profession, *"Christians accepted Islam in order to save the five-to-ten kurushes which they were to give yearly as the tax called jizya."*

[One thing the priests forget about or try to overlook at this point is that Islam, while levying the jizya on the non-Muslim citizens, enjoins the (alms called) zakât and 'ushr on the Muslims. And the zakât and 'ushr to be paid by the Muslims, in its turn, is several times the amount to be paid in the name of jizya by the non-Muslims.

Before concluding the subject of jihâd, it will be useful to touch upon an important point: If a state or nation is too modest and unnecessarily polite, it will incur the avarice of its enemies and give the impression of an easy prey for them. Mistaking this modesty and politeness for vulnerability and cowardice, the hostile states will become aggressive. History teems with the examples of our discourse. If it were not for the commandment of making preparations for jihâd in Islam, Muslims' enemies, who are all around them, would attack them in order to annihilate Islam. Today, also, the world's governments allot a major part of their budget for their defence and war industry. This policy is followed even by countries stricken with famine, dearth and poverty. This policy is indispensable for the State's permanence and the country's defence. Christians, who put forward the nonexistence of the commandment of jihâd as a proof for the superiority of their religion, attacked Islamic countries and other weak nations, invaded them, and tyrannized and exploited them for many years. Especially England, France, Germany, Spain and Italy perpetrated these tyrannies and exploitations in the most barbarous way. Then, what is the value of the assertion that Christianity does not command jihâd? We ask the priests this question.]

Another objection which Protestant Christians raise against the Islamic religion is based on the matter of unforgivability of felonies. They make the following allegation in one of their

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

booklets: *"In matters concerning the individual's private relations, the Bible has placed more emphasis on the necessity of love, patience with trouble, and forgiveness than did the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Accordingly, Islam should have afforded a much more sublime merit than that of Christianity in respect of forgiving the guilty individual. In punishing the guilty, it is more relentless than, let alone the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', the laws put by Jews as a result of their misinterpretation of his Sharî'at. It not only represents lex talionis as permissible, but also tolerates vengeance. The third âyat of Sûra-i-Isrâ purports,* **'If a person is killed unjustly, we shall give power and authority of aggression to the inheriting trustee of that murdered person.'** *The hundred and seventy-eighth âyat of Sûra-i-Baqara purports,* **'O Believers! Retaliation** [for those who have been killed deliberately] **has been enjoined as a farz upon you. Retaliation is carried out as a free person for a free person, a slave for a slave, and a woman for a woman.'** *This is a noteworthy point. For Qur'ân al-kerîm, unlike the Taurah, has not made any explanations to forestall the misusage of such an important law. Therefore, people belonging to some Islamic tribes misunderstand these âyats and think that this permission of Qur'ân al-kerîm comprehends not only the murderer but also any one of the murderer's relations, and consequently more often than not an innocent person gets killed in lieu of the murderer. The Taurah, in contrast, protects lex talionis against such wrong interpretations by openly forewarning, 'Sons shall not be killed in lieu of fathers, and fathers shall not be killed instead of their sons. Every (murderer) shall be killed only on account of his own felony,' in the sixteenth verse of the twenty-fourth chapter of Deuteronomy. In addition to the retaliation for murder, Qur'ân al-kerîm commands retaliation for slight woundings. The sixtieth âyat of Hajj sûra purports,* **'If a Believer responds in kind to some harm inflicted on him and then is wronged again, Allâhu ta'âlâ will help him.'** *Through such commandments as these, Qur'ân al-kerîm, contrary to the Bible's advising patience with troubles, love and forgiveness, encourages Muslims to display their grudge against one another. The Ottomans, who had realized that such things would be cruelty and infringement of others' rights, eventually discontinued the execution of the commandment in the thirty-eighth âyat of Mâida sûra, which purports,* **'To visit divine retribution on the male thief and the female thief, cut off their** [right] **hands.' "**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

ANSWER: Through these statements of theirs, the priests raise objections to the contrasts between the Bible and Qur'ân al-kerîm, which they exemplify as follows: "Whereas the Bible contains verses pertaining to forgiveness and love, Qur'ân al-kerîm, let alone comprising such verses, authorizes the victim's inheritor (to revenge); the âyat about retaliation, for instance, not putting certain limitations for this authority, is vulnerable to misusage, and the sixtieth âyat of Hajj sûra is at loggerheads with the Biblical dispensation, which advises to endure hardships, to forgive those who harm you, and to love them."

We have mentioned earlier in the text some of the âyat-i-kerîmas and hadîth-i-sherîfs concerning forgiveness and love. Therefore we consider it would be unnecessary to repeat them here. However, the âyat-i-kerîma about retaliation cannot be confined within the boundaries misrepresented by the priest. Its discourse continues. These priests must have been lost in a reverie of making a truth out of a legerdemain. The hundred and seventy-eighth âyat of Baqara sûra, as a whole, purports: **"O Believers! It has been enjoined as a farz on you to retaliate** [for those killed deliberately]. **Retaliation is to be executed as a free person for a free person, a slave for a slave, and a woman for a woman. One of the brothers,** [inheritors or protectors], **may waive the retaliation in return for a certain amount of blood money** [diyet] **that he will take from the murderer. The amount taken** [diyet] **should not be too much, but it should be calculated in accordance with the current customs and traditions. And the murderer should pay the diyet due to the victim's protector in a proper manner. This forgiveness of retaliation in return for diyet is a facility and mercy conferred on you by your Rabb** (Allahu ta'âlâ). **If a person, after taking this diyet, carries on his hostility and struggle against the murderer's kin, there shall be painful torment for him in the hereafter."**

As is seen, retaliation, together with its prescribed form of relinquishment in return for diyet, is one of the clearly explained commandments in Qur'ân al-kerîm. The Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' did not contain the tenet of waiving retaliation in return for blood money. Forgiving retaliation in return for diyet is a facility and a blessing for Muslims.

The priest suppresses the facility with respect to retaliation in Qur'ân al-kerîm. First of all, this âyat-i-kerîma expresses an open injunction against resumption of hostility and struggle against the murderer or his kins, and a divine intimidation which is intended

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

to discourage the victim's kins from doing so. Resorting to stratagem, the priest quotes only the part befitting his purpose of the âyat-i-kerîma concerning the victim's inheritors and kin, witholding the initial and final parts. Because most Christians are unaware of the Gospels, they have resorted to this same stratagem with the presumption that Muslims, too, are ignorant in their own religion. The thirty-third âyat of Isrâ sûra purports, **"Do not kill anyone,** [be it a Believer or a zimmî]**, without any rightful reason to do so, Allâhu ta'âlâ has made this harâm for you. If a person is killed unjustly, we shall give power and authority to the killed person's inheritor who is his protector** [for the execution of the commandment of the Sharî'at. If the inheritor wishes, the murderer shall be killed as a requirement of retaliation; or he may forgive the murderer in return for diyet. He has a choice between these two alternatives.] **But his protector or inheritor, who has been seconded with this permission of Allâhu ta'âlâ, must not exceed the limits of retaliation."** This âyat-i-kerîma, warning the victim's protector or inheritor against excess, advises to choose forgiveness. The power given to the inheritor or protector is the choice between suing the murderer for retaliation and notifying the judge that he waives retaliation in return for diyet. The non-Islamic blood feuds and successive killings that were widespread among tribes who were quite oblivious of the rules of Qur'ân al-kerîm, e.g. Albanians, Circassions, some Arabic clans, cannot be ascribed to this âyat-i-kerîma. Such unjust bloodsheds are primeval customs peculiar to uncultivated tribes.

So this is the essence of retaliation and its forgiveness as prescribed in Qur'ân al-kerîm. Because the four Gospels do not have a tenet in the name of retaliation, every murderer, every thief, every felon must be pardoned according to them. If it is possible to lead a civilized social life with so lenient a law, we have no say. Yet, since we have not seen a Christian country where such a principle is in application, we would rather take no heed of these priests' paralogisms.

As for the Pentateuchal verse mentioned; the Taurah is in agreement with Qur'ân al-kerîm not only in its rule about murder, but also in rules pertaining to all types of homicide. The hundred and sixty-fourth âyat of En'âm sûra purports, **"No sinner would take on the responsibility for someone else's sin."** The hundred and seventy-ninth âyat of A'râf sûra purports, **"These people are like beasts; in fact, they are lower than beasts."** The priests' discourses are directed to a class of people who, as is intimated in

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

this âyat-i-kerîma, do not even have the skill to answer them. And yet the acts to be imputed to priests are not only lies and slanders. They have written books against the Islamic religion and in these books attempted to disprove open facts.

When it is known what reasons occasioned the revelation of the sixtieth âyat-i-kerîma of Hajj sûra, which advises to respond to malefaction in kind, it will become evident that its import is not as this protesting priest interprets and that this priest is totally unaware of the knowledge of Tafsîr.

Some time during the four months traditionally forbidden for the Arabs to fight, the Meccan unbelievers came to fight the Believers. Afraid to fight in the forbidden months, the Believers tried to dissuade the unbelievers from the combat; but try as the Believers would, the disbelievers would not give up fighting. So the combat began and, because Allâhu ta'âlâ helped the Believers with His Divine support, it ended in the Believers' victory. Yet the Believers' hearts were remorseful for having violated a forbidden month by fighting in it. Upon this, the aforementioned âyat-i-kerîma was revealed, relieving the Believers of their deep sorrow and penitence. Hence, the sixtieth âyat of Hajj sûra, contrary to the priest's supposition, does not enjoin retaliation for minor woundings, nor does it command to answer malefaction with malefaction. It gives the Believers permission to fight back even in a forbidden month if the unbelievers purposely choose it to exploit the Believers' credal abstention and thus debilitate them. In addition, it comprises a divine help which Allâhu ta'âlâ bestows upon Believers. For, if Qur'ân al-kerîm made virtue and superiority dependent solely on forgiveness and love and did not give such permissions, Muslims would be compelled either to abandon the rules of their holy religion or to lie and slander, as this priest is now doing. For no civilization would be possible and no nation could survive under the dispensation of a cult that comprised nothing but forgiveness and love. The most curious example of this natural fact is the Christian world, where people, quite countercurrently with the Biblical admonitions, "Be patient with troubles, love and forgive," bear grudge against one another. History has clearly shown to us how baleful an effect these Biblical admonitions of patience with troubles, love and forgiveness have had on Christians' general conduct. We have already related some of the cruelties Christians imposed on one another in contradiction with these Biblical commandments at various occasions in the text. Another source of astonishment in

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

this subject is that the priest feels sorry for the innocent person who is killed only because of his kinship to the murderer as a result of some tribes' misinterpretation of the âyat-i-kerîma mentioned above. Yet, while regretting on the one hand that such a misdeed should betide to man, he adheres to a creed on the other hand that as a result of a venial sin committed inadvertently by Âdam 'alaihis-salâm', millions of his descendants that came to the world for six thousand years, including all the Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm' of that period, will be punished on account of the 'original sin' committed by their first father, being tormented in Hell fire, which must be innumerous times as bad as being killed. Not only that; the creed this priest holds bears the meaning also that Allâhu ta'âlâ, who created all the universe from nothing, was unable to forgive this sin committed, had to send His only son to the world by creating him through hadrat Maryam, and had him crucified after various insults against His son's wishes. In other words, while disapproving man's being the agent of a deed which means punishing the murderer's kin instead of the murderer himself, he accepts the creed which represents Allâhu ta'âlâ as the agent of the cruelties we have cited above.

Suspension of the commandment of chastening the male and female thieves by cutting off their hands was not an Ottoman policy. It had been discontinued by the previous Islamic States centuries before the Ottomans. Likewise, punishments for such guilts as drinking wine, false witness, calumniating a chaste woman and fornication were not being executed for a long time, with a few exceptions. For execution of such punishments depended on certain conditions. The punishments were impracticable in the absence of these conditions. The abovementioned acts and the conditions for the execution of their respective punishments very seldom concurred in Islamic countries. The reasons for this are the heavy punishments Qur'ân al-kerîm prescribes for those who commit these guilts. In an Islamic regime even judges do not have the authority to forgive these guilts. These punishments, which are called (hadd), are administered publicly. Such articles have made these punishments so formidable that anyone would hardly dare to commit these sins.

[The hundred and seventy-ninth âyat of Baqara sûra purports, **"O you owners of wisdom. Retaliation contains life for you."** Some people may protest this and say, "Could there ever be life in killing a man?" Being afraid to be killed in return, people will shy

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

away from killing someone else. Fear of death will deter them from killing a human being. And when there is no killing, there will be life for a society, for a nation; this is what is meant by the âyat-i-kerîma.

As it is very well known by students of law today, execution of laws is impossible without a penal code. And this penal code, in its turn, consists of fines, imprisonments, and death penalties. While all the world's lawyers are crying out this fact today, would it be done to be opposed to the punishments prescribed by Allâhu ta'âlâ? Communism, a regime which is repulsive to all sorts of human nature, has spread through exceedingly barbarous punishments, which are still being carried on to maintain it. By the same token, priests, men of knowledge and science have turned away from the unreasonable and illogical principles of Christianity. Some of them, who have had the chance to know Islam, have become Muslims willingly. Yet those who have not had the lucky chance to know Islam have turned atheists and Marxists, which by and by gave way to such degenerated formations as hippies, gangs and anarchists among young people. These youngsters are now being feared far and wide in Europe.

Selling of churches have been one of the news headlines in recent newspapers and periodicals. The purchasers are mostly Muslims, who change the churches they have bought into mosques. The majority of church-goers are elderly people. There is no doubt that the ecclesiastics would establish the Inquisition once again were they given the authority and power to do so. Christianity has far and away lost its impetus in Europe. Missionaries, therefore, are trying to promulgate it in Africa and other underdeveloped countries.

We would like to stress one point once again: the punishment inflicted on the convict is like the amputation of a gangrenous limb in the body. If the limb is not cut off, gangrene will infect the whole body. Likewise, if the guilty person is not punished, the entire society will suffer harm. Harm in which only one person is involved is normally preferable to harm that will permeate through the whole community, especially when deterring the latter is singularly dependent upon waging the former.

Islam's penal discipline of cutting off (the thief's) hand is not applied in every event of theft. There are certain conditions for it. This punishment is inflicted on a person who has stolen in one attempt ten dirhams of silver or equal value of durable property which is valuable according to all religious cults from a place

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

where no one other than the owner has the right to enter without the owner's permission, no matter whether the owner of the stolen property is a Muslim or a non-Muslim, and yet on condition that the country where the theft has taken place is Dâr-ul-Islâm (country under Islamic administration). Ten dirhams of silver equals 33.5 grams, which is approximately equal to one-seventh weight of gold, i.e. 5 grams of gold. A person who has stolen meat, vegetables, fruits or milk is not punished with hand-cutting. If the person is found guilty of theft upon his own confession or by the testimony of two eye-witnesses, and yet if the owner of the stolen property says, "No, this person did not steal my property. I gave it to him as a gift (or lent it to him)," or, "The witnesses are not telling the truth," the punishment, again, lapses. It is sunnat (an action, thought or behaviour liked and commended by our Prophet) for the judge to suggest to the owner of stolen property to make a statement synonymous with the statements exemplified above. These technicalities are explained in detail in Islam's books of fiqh. The priest, who definitely does not know Islam, must be totally unaware of the existence of books of fiqh.]

Another objection which Protestant ecclesiastics lodge against Islam is based on Islam's permission to keep slaves. These priests say, *"The Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' not only had alleviated standards for slavery, but also committed captives under the protection of law. Yet it allowed the buying and selling of captives. The essence of Christianity, on the other hand, is quite contrary to slavery, and therefore it has abrogated the institution of slavery wherever it has been dominant."*

ANSWER: This objection of the priests' covers not only Islam, but also the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', which Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was entrusted with the task of perfecting. This makes it doubtful whether they are Christians. For the existing Gospels do not contain a single letter pertaining to prohibition of slavery. For this reason, the Mosaic rule should necessarily maintain its validity in the Sharî'at of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', too. Yet if these priests, as two Europeans educated with modern ideas, consider slavery as an inhuman institution and want it to be abrogated, then they should have based their argument on the illogicality and wickedness of slavery without mixing religion into the matter. Therefore, since this objection of theirs does not have to do with religion, it would be unnecessary to answer it. On the other hand, because what Christians know in the name of slavery

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

is quite incommensurable to slavery as held by Islam, it will be useful to make some brief explanation:

As we all know, the institution of slavery has existed since the first appearance of mankind on earth. All nations have maltreated their slaves, and no nation has held the slave and the master equal. The Ancient Greek laws of slavery (Sklabos) are still written in books. In the Romans, on the other hand, the tyrannies, cruelties, insults and savageries inflicted on slaves have not been repeated by any other nation. Their books contain detailed laws pertaining to slaves (sclavus, servus). This tradition has also existed in Asia and Africa since very ancient times. Europeans have been the most exorbitant profiteers of slavery. This trade was first begun by the Portuguese in the fourteenth century of the Christian era. Later, when America was discovered, while Christian missionaries on the one hand vacated the American continent by annihilating the red skinned aboriginals; the Portuguese, the English and the French on the other hand abducted negroes from Africa, forced them to get on board their ships, and sold them as slaves in America, thus earning millions of dollars. In fact, ships were constructed for this specific purpose, and the poor people were crammed into their holds. It being next to impossible to breathe freely, more than half the number of slaves died on the way. Yet the remaining number would be enough for their owners to make as much money as they wished. At times, being unable to endure this humiliation, the negroes would attempt rebellion. There were loop-holes specially opened on the deck floor through which to fire and kill the rebellious negroes from above them. Queen Elizabeth of England, who was the promoter of Protestants, legitimized and buttressed trade of slaves. Louis X, King of France, caused this trade to become quite widespread. Yet in America, Pennsylvanian people tried to prohibit this trade. Twelve years after this attempt, this trade of slaves was prohibited in Denmark, and then in England by the injunctions issued in 1807, 1811 and 1823, in France in 1814 and 1818, and in Prussia and Russia in 1841. Both the sellers and the buyers of slaves being Christians, after being purchased by these Christian tradesmen the poor negroes were first christened. Then they were dispatched to fields, farms and mines, where they worked in misery day and night all the year round, summer and winter alike, to earn money for their masters. The American North – South war of 1860 was an issue of matters pertaining to slavery. As a matter of fact, hundreds of thousands

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

of negroes were being sold and bought on the American continent, and innumerable Christians were earning millions of dollars through them. Most Europeans today, when they hear the word 'slavery', regretfully remember the negroes living in humility and destitution in America. [And yet it was Christians, alone, who primed all this misery and perpetrated all sorts of unimaginable tortures on these poor people.]

Europeans' wish for the abrogation of slavery in Islamic countries originates from their wrong supposition that it is like slavery as practised in their own country and America. In actual fact, the only difference between slavery and freedom among Muslims is that slaves are transferred from one owner to another in exchange for a certain price. Slaves' service is no different from that of an employee who works for a certain wage. The only trouble which slaves have to undergo in the Islamic system involves learning, education, and training. In an Islamic State, the captives obtained in a war are never killed. Nor are they left to die of hunger and thirst in the battlefield. After the war, as the victorious ghazâ Muslims are given their shares of the booties, they get their shares of slaves and jâriyas,[1] too. Then, they either use their slaves and jâriyas as servants, or sell them to others. As is seen, Islam's slaves are not comparable to those free people and their children whom Christians abducted by trickery and compulsion from Africa and Asia. According to Islam, it is a grave sin to abduct free people or to use them as slaves. In the Islamic system, slaves have attained high ranks in knowledge and politics. Some of them have even become Grand Viziers. Most of the female Sultans in the gorgeous Ottoman dynasty were originally slaves. There were thousands of Muslims who had chosen slaves as their sons-in-law, or jâriyas as their wives, and thus made them their inheritors. When a Muslim bought a slave or a jâriya, he would have to undertake all sorts of responsibility pertaining to his or her food, drink, clothes and other needs, all his or her civil rights and treat him or her tenderly. He could never beat them, abuse them, or give them work that would be too heavy for them to do. According to Islam, emancipating a slave is the greatest worship. There are some extremely grave sins which will be pardoned only after emancipation of a slave. Another custom which was very widely practised among Muslims

[1] Female slaves are called jâriya. Muslims treat them as if they were their sisters or other relatives.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

was emancipating a slave and marrying him off after seven to eight years of service. Could all these situations and facts be compared to those of the slaves in Europe and America?

[Before terminating our discourse on this subject, we would like to remind the priests of another important fact. The kith and kin of the slaves possessed by Muslims applied for the ransom of their relatives by paying the money prescribed for the exchange. Yet, as a result of the mercy, compassion and humanity which Muslims had shown to them, the slaves refused to go back home with their relatives who had ransomed them. They preferred the slavery with Muslims to the freedom with their parents and relatives. There was certainly a reason for this. The father and uncle of our Prophet's slave, Zeyd bin Hârisa, came to take him and requested our Prophet to give Zeyd to them, saying that they were ready to pay any sum of money demanded in return for him. Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' did not demand any money. He said to Zeyd bin Hârisa 'radiy-Allâhu anh' that he was free and might go along with his father and uncle if he liked. Zeyd bin Hârisa said he would not leave our Prophet and insisted on this despite all the earnest request and beggings of his father and uncle. There are many examples of the same sort. We would like to know how the priests would answer this?]

Another objection Christians raise against the Islamic religion is based on its principles pertaining to polygamy, that is, marrying up to four women, and divorce. Christians say, *"The Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' does not contain any law prohibiting the taaddud-i-zawjât (polygamy). And it gives clear permission for divorce. On the other hand, the Bible of Jesus Christ categorically prohibits both of them. As for Qur'ân al-kerîm; it gives permission to marry more than one women. The third âyat of Nisâ sûra purports.* **'Marry two, three, four of those women who are halâl for you.'** *According to this âyat-i-kerîma, one can marry up to four women. In addition to this, the Islamic religion permits men to buy jâriyas whenever they wish. And this, in its turn, is incompatible with the status allotted to women by Allâhu ta'âlâ or their position as men's copartners and assistants. This principle lowers women to servitude. Marrying a couple of women is detrimental to a happy married life. For it not only prevents husband and wife from knowing each other, but also eradicates safety and happiness in the family."*

Here again, the priests prove true to their habits of fallacy and mutilate the âyat-i-kerîma, quoting only the part that will suit

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

their sly purposes. In its complete contextuality, the third âyat of Nisâ sûra purports, **"If you fear that you may not be able to observe the rights of orphan girls** [in case you marry them], **then marry two, three, four of those women who are other than these** (girls) **and who are halâl for you** (to marry). [That is, do not marry more than four women.] **If you fear that you may not be able to establish justice among these women, choose one of them. Or prefer the jâriyas you have. If you are contented with this one wife or the jâriyas, you will be closer to abiding by justice."** As it will be inferred from the meaning conveyed by this âyat-i-kerîma, among the earlier tribes, [especially the Arabs], there was not a limited number of women that one could marry and therefore one man could marry five, ten, or twenty women. The Islamic religion has reduced this number to four. And this right has been restricted within certain stipulations.

When the hardships in establishing equity among one's wives are taken into consideration, a wise person who is afraid of doing injustice will by no means marry more than one women. In other words, the Islamic religion, while expressing an outward permission of marriage up to four women on the one hand, adds the proviso of justice on the other hand, thus tacitly cautioning against marrying more than one. In fact, when asked how to manage this equity among one's wives, our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' answered. "If you drink a glass of water from the hands of one of them, you should drink another glass of water from the others' hands, too." Inasmuch as it would be extremely difficult for a person to apply this rule, the Islamic religion recommends that one should marry one woman.

The priests' statement that "the Gospels prohibit to marry more than one woman" is contradictory with what is stated in the Gospels. Today's Gospels do not contain any injunction saying, "Do not marry more than one woman." Yet it is stated in the third and later verses of the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, "The Pharisees also came unto him, tempting him, and saying unto him, Is it lawful for a man to put away his wife for every cause?" "And he answered and said unto them, Have ye not read, that he which made them at the beginning made them male and female." "And said, For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife: and they twain shall be one flesh?" "Wherefore they are no more twain, but one flesh. What therefore God hath joined together, let not man put asunder." (Matt: 19-3, 4, 5, 6) This verse cannot be interpreted as

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

a prohibition of marrying more than one women. Yet, because wife and husband are virtually accepted as one body, it must be taken as an admonition against excessiveness in divorce. Accordingly, these priests are challenging not only the Islamic religion but also the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' of which the task of perfection was assigned to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', which, in its turn, comes to mean their renunciation of the religion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

So is the case with divorce. The Gospels enjoin against divorcing one's wife for reasons other than fornication. Nevertheless, since we doubt the authenticity of the existing Gospels, we cannot admit that this prohibition is exactly one of the âyats of the original Bible revealed to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. We have some proofs for this:

1 — This subject is written in a curious verse seen in the Gospel of Matthew. The nineteenth chapter goes on as follows in its seventh and later verses: "They say unto him, Why did Moses then command to give a writing of divorcement, and to put her away?" "He saith unto them, Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." "And I say unto you, Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery: and whoso marrieth her which is put away doth commit adultery." "His disciples say unto him, If the case of the man be so with his wife, it is not good to marry." "But he said unto them, All men cannot receive this saying, save they to whom it is given." "For there are some eunuchs, which were so born from their mother's womb: and there are some eunuchs, which were made eunuchs of men: and there be eunuchs, which have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake. He that is able to receive it, let him receive it." (Matt: 19-7 to 12)

In this passage, the answer to the first question explains the reason for the permission to give a written declaration of divorce, and states that Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' granted permission to give a written declaration of divorce to one's wife because of the obduracy of hearts. This explanation implicitly imputes a misdeed to both Mûsâ and Îsâ 'alaihimus-salâm'. For this answer comes to mean that Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' issued injunctions independently of Allâhu ta'âlâ and granted permission to divorce on account of the hardness of the hearts of Israelites though there was no such permission originally. On the other hand, because hardness of a

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

heart could not account for a divorce, the so-called explanation lapses into the shameful position of imputing such a ludicrous answer to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Another point of perversity is this: As Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' talks to the Pharisees, the disciples allegedly interrupt him and say, "If one cannot divorce one's wife for reasons other than fornication, then marriage is not auspicious." For the Apostles knew very little of the books of earlier Prophets, whereas Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was fully cognizant of them. It is astonishing for the Apostles to make such a remonstrative statement to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. For it means that the rule laid down by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is apparently so illogical, so unnatural and so preposterous that his own disciples, let alone enemies, raise an objection to him. Another oddity is this: When the disciples protest, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', supposedly, likens the state of not marrying to that of emasculated people, divides them into three categories, and details that some of them are born eunuchs, some have been emasculated by people, and others have chosen emasculation in order to attain to the creation of heavens. It is natural for emasculated people not to marry, and it makes no difference whether they accept marriage or reject it. Furthermore, telling about kinds of and reasons for emasculation apropos of nothing is something that would be done in an entire delirium. Such foibles could never be attributed to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', an exalted and highly honoured Prophet. His very high position is unquestionable.

2 — It is obvious that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', who continuously said, "I am here to perfect the Sharî'at, not to demolish it," would not change such an important principle in the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

3 — This subject, which is written in the Gospel of Matthew, is also dealt with in the tenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark. Only, Mark does not contain such things as the disciples' question, their remark that it would be "better not to marry," or the detailed information on kinds of eunuchs. If this narrative given in the Gospel of Matthew were a commonly acceptable general report, Mark, who wrote the former part of this event narrated in Matthew, would have written also the latter part, i.e. the Apostles' question, its answer, and details on emasculation.

4 — There is expressive difference between the statements in both Gospels. For the second and later verses of the tenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark reads as follows: "And the Pharisees came to him, and asked him, is it lawful for a man to put away his wife?

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

tempting him." "And he answered and said unto them, What did Moses command you?" "And they said, Moses suffered to write a bill of divorcement, and to put her away." "And Jesus answered and said unto them, For the hardness of your heart he wrote you this precept." "But from the beginning of the creation God made them male and female." (Mark: 10-2 to 6)

On the other hand, it is written in the eighth verse of the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, "... Moses because of the hardness of your hearts suffered you to put away your wives: but from the beginning it was not so." (Matt: 19-8) These two expressions differ in two ways: First, whereas the expression given in the Gospel of Matthew suggests the meaning that Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' gave permission to divorce, the statements quoted in Mark give the impression that Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' commanded divorce. Second, according to Matthew's way of expression, there was no place for divorce in the original form of the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', but Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' gave them permission to divorce because of their hard hearts. Mark, on the other hand, uses the expression 'from the beginning of the creation' instead of 'from the beginning.' Accordingly, the expression in Mark bears the meaning that Allâhu ta'âlâ created them as male and female in the beginning of the creation. And this, in its turn, is contradictory to the expression used in Matthew.

5 — [According to Biblical information], Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was proud of being a descendant of Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm'. Since Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm' had had various wives, it runs counter to reason to admit that he prohibited to marry more than one women.

With these evidences we prove the fact that the verses cited above are not genuine Biblical âyats revealed to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' by Allâhu ta'âlâ, but they have been inserted into the Gospels later. If the priests have any evidences to prove to the contrary, let them go ahead and divulge their evidences. Another cause of consternation for our part is that this objection against Islam's permission to divorce is raised by Protestants. For it is an historical fact that no controversy or disagreement concerning divorce took place among Christians before the fourth century of the Christian era, and they acted upon the Mosaic law up until that time. In the fourth century a bishop named Saint Augustine forbid divorce once and for all. The Catholic Church still observes this prohibition. [St. Augustine, one of the Latin Catholic Church

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

fathers, died in the Tunisian city of Bone in A.D. 430.] From time to time, ecclesiastical authorities gave special permissions of divorce to some European Christian kings. Yet because these permissions were given for political reasons, they were not taken into account by the Church. The ecclesiastics still maintain their views that divorce is unjustifiable.

Protestants were opposed to the Catholic Church's disapproval of divorce. Luther, who disagreed with the Catholic Church in every subject, followed the same route in this subject, too, and unleashed a free licence of divorce. Then, Protestants' disapproval of divorce would mean to disavow Luther, the founder of their own religion.

In order to confuse and mislead Muslim women, this priest has gone to a great deal of trouble to explain in detail that polygamy and divorce, instead of being useful and beautiful at least in some cases, always cause innumerable harms. Since he leaves off traditional proofs and tries to arouse confusion by misusing mental proofs, we shall countermine his plotted slanders mentally:

As every climate has its particular nature and effects, so peoples and tribes living in a particular climate have some certain national traditions and customs peculiar to themselves. Living with these customs and traditions throughout centuries, they have become so staunchly wont to these customs and traditions that it is impossible for them to abandon them. For most of these customs are the requirements of their natural traits kneaded with the air and water of that climate. Making them abandon these customs, therefore, is like changing the nature of something. By the same token, polygamy and divorce was a long-lived traditional custom among the peoples of hot equatorial countries. Those who had the necessary assets married many women. This practice went on till the time of our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. Qur'ân al-kerîm was revealed and reduced the number of wives (to be had at the same time) to four at the most. With the stipulation of justice, this number has been implicitly reduced to one. Accordingly, it is one of the miracles of our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' to have transmuted the Arabic people, who had been used to marrying very many women, and to have accustomed them to marrying up to four women, [which means to make them abandon their deeply rooted customs]. However, because their characters and natural dispositions are unlike those of Europeans, their marrying more than one women will not cause so much of a problem as the priests expect. For marriage is

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

entered into for three purposes:

1 — To produce offspring:

2 — To avoid committing a transgression against someone else and fornication, to lead a chaste life;

3 — To lead a well-organized family life, to protect one's property and possessions.

When a woman cannot have children, the first reason for marriage will lapse and it will cause loss of generation. If the wife has a chronic illness or is too infirm (to carry out her conjugal duties) and the husband is strong and healthy, the second reason for marriage lapses, too. This gives birth to a very grave mischief, i.e. fornication. Finally, if the wife is extravagant, dissolute, disobedient, treacherous, bad-tempered and insolent, the third reason for marriage will become void. So the man will remain in wretchedness, torture and frustration till the end of his life. Many a rich and honest Christian has a barren, old, extravagant or ill-tempered wife, and cannot divorce her and marry another. Thus he regrets being a Christian a thousand times daily. In Islam, on the other hand, the husband has the right to divorce his wife if he finds that she is not suitable for him. If his wife is suitable for him, they will live together happily till the end of their lives. This is the case with most Muslims. In Islamic countries, therefore, no Muslim has ever regretted being a Muslim.

Another very subtle point is this: Before marriage Christian couples talk to each other and go out together. Therefore, marriage takes place only after both parties have examined each other's character and behaviors and decided to marry each other. But during this togetherness both parties are extremely cautious, trying to look pleasant and conceal the negative aspects of their characters, thus doing their best to deceive each other. In addition, being young and inexperienced, they are misled by their feelings and sensuous desires and, as a result, knowing each other does them no good. The unpleasant events seen after marriage in most Christian families are evidences of this fact. In every country, especially in European countries, there are very few of those men who are strong and potent and yet spend all their lives with their wives without establishing relations with other women. And this is quite natural. Because their culture does not prohibit seeing and talking to other women, men take their wives out to balls, [theatres, movies and other places of music, dancing and drinking], or to visit friends and acquaintances. It being against their rules of decorum to sit with one's wife at such places, every

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

man delivers his wife to another and takes another's wife. Then they begin dancing, which mostly end up in betrayal. Human nature is apt to get tired of things in process of time. No matter how pretty, how good-tempered a person's wife might be, in the course of time there would be gradual decrease in his affection and fervour for her. At such places it would be inevitable for a husband or a wife to feel attracted to other people of the opposite sex. Because women and men in Christian countries live in mixed societies, seeing and talking to one another all the time, there are very few men and women who have spent their lives without committing fornication at all. Sitting together with women, seeing and talking to one another without reserve or any feeling of shame with the pretext of respecting them and observing their rights, they are, on the contrary, pushing women into these dangers, depreciating and lowering them, and exploiting them as sources of trade. On the other hand, the chaste, honourable and bashful wives of Muslims are always respectable in the eyes of their husbands [as well as in the eyes of other people], and their husbands will never let them fall into such dangers or disesteems. As every person would reserve his favourite and most precious belongings for himself, Muslims feel they should protect their wives, who are more valuable, more respectable and dearer than anything else to them, even from harm of birds flying high in the sky. This feeling originates from the exuberance of affection. Europeans have already lost their feelings of morals and honesty in this respect. It is accepted as a mockery, as a ludicrous imbecility for a man to be jealous of his wife or for a woman to be jealous of her husband. When a person is said to be jealous, he will be accepted as boorish and stupid.

People who have benefited exclusively from this disgracefully inhuman state that Europe is in, are those who have become priests. It is natural, therefore, for priests to wish this state to go on being so. We know a person who had been born from Christian parents and brought up as a Protestant in Germany but, because he had enough sense of chastity not to take his sisters to balls and hand them over to others, left his home, Germany, and Christianity, and came to Istanbul, where he was honoured with Islam. Today he is working as a high-ranking official in the Ottoman State.

As it is known by people who have seen Europe, in many sophisticated families there is an outward unity and agreement between husband and wife. When they have guests in their home

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and when they visit their acquaintances, they are so kind to each other that you would think they were extremely affectionate and faithful to each other. But, later, as the families gradually establish closer intimacy with each other, what the husband and the wife really think of each other will become evident. That is, they are so tired of each other that they do not even want to see each other. In fact, in some families the husband and wife will enter into an agreement not to interfere with each other's affairs. Thus both the husband and the wife will have various lovers with whom to lead a promiscuous sex life. Moreover, since none of the parties can remarry so long as the other party is alive, they look forward to each other's death. Sometimes one of them attempts murder to get rid of the other. Prohibition of divorce has given many harms to the European nations. For this reason, in 1206 [A.D. 1792] a law was passed to sanction divorce in France where it had been forbidden. At last divorce was permissible. In 1816, after repeated efforts of priests, the permission for divorce was cancelled. In the years 1830 and 1848 [A.H. 1264], state officials, lawyers and scholars did their best for the ratification of divorce, but their efforts came to naught because of the intrigues carried on by the ecclesiastics. Europeans, who consider slavery to be incompatible with humanity and have waged praiseworthy struggles and efforts for the abrogation of slavery, have been curiously unsuccessful in their endeavours to extirpate the slavery of not being able to divorce one's wife, though its various harms with regard to property, progeny and chastity are becoming more and more conspicuous day by day. Supposing an elderly man had a young wife who went out immodestly dressed and had relationships with other young men as she chose and this man were suspicious of the sexual indulgences but unable to prevent her; would not this man spend all his life in sorrow and affliction, with the children born from this woman running about in front of his eyes every day and causing him an everlasting feeling of inferiority and lamentation over the choking thought of having to leave his property to someone else's offspring? What on earth could be more torturous for a person? Or supposing a chaste young woman were married off to an impotent old man against her will or to someone she did not like at all; this woman would spend all her youth in excruciation. In addition, a civilized society would be deprived of the offspring which otherwise she would have brought forth; this is something at loggerheads with ultimate divine wisdom and civilization. Now, if this woman, despairing that she ever would

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

get out of this situation as long as her husband lived, were carried away by the thought of devising a plot to do away with her husband as soon as she had the opportunity, of if she, being tempted by the sensuous desires of her young construction and sapped by permanent suffering and sorrow, loses her chastity, would not these priests be responsible?

When men and women get together, sit and and talk freely to one another, dance with one another with women in dresses exposing their necks, bosoms and arms and all sorts of ornaments and jewels, how many men and women can help looking at each other? Because Muslim women do not go out often, talk to other men, keep company with them or become so familiar as to make jokes with them, they are not vulnerable to such dangers. Even if a Muslim's wife is ugly and ill-tempered, he will be contented with her because he does not see another woman. Likewise, however intolerable a Muslim woman's husband may be, she will tolerate him and get along with him because she does not see, sit and talk with another man. Thus they will not attempt anything that will incur harm and disaster. For a person who has senses of jealosy and shame it would be impossible to lead a peaceful life in any religion except Islam. As we have stated earlier, every nation has their own traditional customs, and it would be impossible for them to give them up. Therefore we would not attempt to describe the flavour in chastity and shame to the protesting priest. For this is a conscientious flavour. While a normal person will not even share with someone else a glass that he likes very much and always uses for drinking water, we can never understand how anyone could ever destroy his wife, who is a part of himself and his secret treasure where he has entrusted his offspring, by throwing her before lascivious people who are captives of their own lusts.

[In Christian countries women and girls roam around with naked heads, bosoms, arms and legs, tempting men to indecencies, to fornication. As the wife cooks, launders and does the cleaning in the house, her husband finds a naked woman at work or in the streets, enjoys himself and even commits fornication with her. In the evening he comes home, pensive and exhausted. Plunged into lewd fancies, he does not even look at his wife, whom he at one time liked, chose, loved and married. The wife, on the other hand, disillusioned to be deprived of the affection and recreation she deserves after a whole day's housework, has neurotic fits. Thus the family home is broken. The

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

man, who has been going out with a woman he found in the streets, drops her like dirty underwear and finds another woman. Consequently, thousands of women, men and children are destroyed every year. Some of them become immoral, others end up in anarchy, driving a whole nation into decline. The harm given to youngsters, to people, to the State by women who go about naked and with strong smells of perfumes and wantonly ornaments is worse and more threatening than that of alcohol or narcotics. Allâhu ta'âlâ has commanded women and girls to cover themselves up lest His born slaves should fall into disasters in this world and vehement torments in the hereafter. Unfortunately, some people, because they have been captivated by their nafses and lusts, call the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ fundamentalism and the depraved and eccentric practices of Europeans modernism. Some of these so-called modern and illuminated people procured diplomas for one another and shared some critical positions among themselves. They are hooting like owls and attacking Islam at every occasion. With this easy heroism they are collecting applaud and substantial aid from Christians, Jews and Communists, who are our historical enemies, thus becoming more powerful and deceiving youngsters by using all sorts of tricks. May Allâhu ta'âlâ give these so-called modern and illuminated people common sense! May He grant them the reason enough to see clearly between right and wrong!]

Some people answer this as follows: *"At one time due care and attention were paid to the education and training of women. After completely learning her duties as a wife, a woman can very well attend any sort of assembly. Thus there will be no fear of her losing her chastity. For knowledge is dominant over the nafs."* Supposing the person who makes these statements were a thirty year old, strong and decent man, and his wife an ugly but very decent woman, and they were both at a dinner given by their acquaintances. It happened so that the man, sitting beside an extremely pretty, coquettish and attractive woman, established some intimacy with her, and his wife sitting near a young man and clinking glasses with him, became too familiar with him. In this case, would it be possible for the husband and wife to protect themselves from sly, malicious thoughts? Knowledge and education will curb the natural human aspirations to a certain extent. But the sensuous desires dormant in human nature will erupt as soon as they are given the favorable milieu, pushing aside the education given. Here is a beautiful saying from Sa'dî-i-

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Shîrâzî:[1] "Could it ever be believed that a hungry misbeliever would imagine himself sitting alone at a meal table in Ramadân?"

Yes, if the man is a eunuch, you can trust him. But those who are eunuchs metaphorically, that is, those who claim to have freed themselves from the sensuous desires of their nafs, must be exempted from this. For there have been many priests who have emasculated themselves metaphorically and yet whose actions have belied their statements. [The whole world knows about the indecencies which those priests who have emasculated themselves metaphorically have committed when left alone with women coming to them for confession. In daily newspapers we often see pictures of dancing priests who assume monastic garbs during the day and attend parties at night.] Yes, those who have trained and curbed their nafs completely for Allah's sake are no doubt trustworthy people. If such a physical self-sacrifice were seen on priests who make themselves seem like pious and trustworthy people, then there would be no saying against the spiritual effectiveness of Christianity.

The same priest, in one of his booklets, censures the Islamic belief that "Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was not killed but was elevated up to heaven alive," and says, *"This belief is contrary not only to all history books but also to the generally accepted narrative. For it is written in the four Gospels that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' displayed some miracles as he was killed. How could it ever be justifiable to deny a narrative that has reached us from the Apostles, who were the eye-witnesses of the events?"*

ANSWER: As everybody knows, a narrative that happened in the past can be trusted and believed confidently by the people of a later generation only if the narrators themselves saw the events and were people who could never have agreed on a lie. Now, when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was, according to the Christian credo, arrested by Jews, all the disciples who were with him ran away, with the exception of Peter, who walked after him instead. And Peter, in his turn, told the same lie three times as the rooster crowed three times, saying that he did not know Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. When the person mistaken for Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was crucified, no one was present there, none the least of the Apostles. It is written in the Gospels of Matthew and Mark that a few women watched the event from a distance. Since John does not contain any statements to this effect, the priest must be wrong

---

[1] Sa'dî Shîrâzî was martyred in 691 [A.D. 1292].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

when he says, *"...it is written in the four Gospels,"* and *"...the Apostles, who were the eye-witnesses of the events."* In other words, there is not a generally accepted narrative in this respect. On the other hand, history books, which the priest puts forth as documents, are based on sources that have not been confirmed to be true by generally accepted narratives, and therefore they are not dependable. Here are the Biblical accounts of the matter:

It is stated in the fiftieth and later verses of the twenty-seventh chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, "Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost." "And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent;" "And the graves were opened; and many bodies of saints which slept arose," "And came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many." (Matt: 27-50, 51, 52, 53) Norton, a Western writer, states in his book that this is an open lie, and puts forward evidences to prove his argument. In his book, which otherwise praises and defends the Bible, Norton gives the following account: "This story is a lie. The most evident proof for this fact is that Jews, who were deeply distressed by the destruction of Jerusalem, fabricated some wonderful episodes concerning Mesjîd-i-aqsâ, and this episode was one of them. Afterwards an idiot, considering that this episode would go with the time of the crucifixion of Jesus, wrote it on one of the page margins of the Hebrew version of the Gospel of Matthew only for the sake of blessing, and later on another idiotic scribe, as he made another copy of the Gospel, included it in the Gospel. And the translator of this new copy translated this passage exactly as it was." [Consequently, this new translation became the formal religious book of the church.]

There are various evidences to prove that the story which the priest relates in the name of a miracle is unfounded:

1 — According to the writings in the Gospel of Matthew, on the second day following the crucifixion the Jews came to Pilatus, the Roman governor in Jerusalem, and said, "O sir! That mendacious person said when he was alive that he would resurrect three days after his crucifixion. So, command your men to wait on the grave lest his disciples steal him away and then say that he has resurrected. Otherwise the final heresy will be worse than the first one." [paraphrased from Matthew: 27-62 and on]. According to the twenty-fourth verse of the twenty-seventh chapter of Matthew, Pilatus and his wife were inwardly opposed

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

to the killing of Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’. Succumbing to the Jews’ insistence, Pilatus had to give them the permission. If miracles had been seen, the Jews would possibly not go to Pilatus afterwards and make the statement quoted above. For it is stated in Matthew that the curtain of al-Aqsâ was torn apart, the rocks were split, the graves were opened, and the dead were openly going about in the city of Jerusalem. It is an easily discernible fact that the Jews could not have used such terms as ‘mendacious’ or ‘misleader’ about Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ in the presence of Pilatus after he and his wife, in addition to already being against the killing of Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’, had seen so many miracles, or, at least, he would have reprimanded them had they said so.

2 — When the Holy Ghost descended on the Apostles and the Apostles began to speak various languages, it is written in the second chapter of Acts, the people were bewildered and three thousand people immediately believed in Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’. Dead people’s going out of their graves and going around in Jerusalem, tearing of the curtain in the temple, quaking of the earth and rifting of the rocks would have been more of a source of bewilderment to people than the Apostles’ speaking several languages. If it were true that Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’ had shown himself and displayed miracles, thousands of people would have believed in him then. But the Gospels do not contain even any expression implying at least that one person believed in him during the occurrence of the so-called miracles. [This argument proves that what is written in Matthew is not the truth.]

3 — Mark and Luke only state that the curtain of the statue was torn. They do not refer to such incidents as the earthquake, rifting of the rocks, opening of the graves, or resurrecting of the saints and going around in the city. On the other hand, in the Gospel of John, which is well-known for its far-fetched exaggerations of the miracles of Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’, there is no reference to any of these incidents, neither to the tearing of the curtain of the temple, nor to the earthquake or the sequential rifting of rocks, nor to the saints’ resurrecting and going about in the city. If these events were true, Mark, Luke and John would apparently not remain silent in this respect.

4 — According to Matthew’s account, none of the Apostles was present at the crucifixion of Îsâ ‘alaihis-salâm’. But Mary Magdalene, who had been following him from Galilee, Mary, the mother of Jacob and Joses, and the mother of the sons of Zebedee were present there and watched from a distance. (Matt:

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

27-56)

According to Mark, none of the Apostles were present, but Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of Jacob and Joses, Salome and a number of women who had come to Jerusalem with her were all there. (Mark: 15-40, 41)

According to Luke's account, when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was arrested all people who knew him and also those women coming from Galilee were present there. In addition to this, some of the city folk gathered there to watch the event. All these people, seeing the insults Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was subjected to, walked behind Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', "bewailed and lamented him." (Luke: 23-27)

These writings in Luke are contradictory to those in Matthew and Mark. According to Matthew and Mark, those who were present at the crucifixion of [Judas Iscariot instead of] Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' were only a few women, who watched from a distance. A few people's testimony of having witnessed an event from a distance cannot be accepted as a document strong enough to form a basic religious tenet, not at least in the eyes of reasonable people. Luke's expression, 'Some of the city folk', shows that those people knew him but did not believe in him. For terms 'disciples' and 'Apostles' are used everywhere in the Gospel of Luke. Its using the expression 'Some of the city folk' here, therefore, indicates that none of the disciples were there.

On the other hand, the Gospel of John says nothing concerning the existence of disciples or women crying and lamenting him, but only states that his most beloved disciple, his mother, his sister, and Mary Magdalene were present at the scene (John: 19-25, 26). In addition to the other Gospels' accounts, it states that on the cross Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' saw his disciple and his mother with him and said to his mother, "... Woman, behold thy son." "Then saith he to the disciple, Behold thy mother! And from that hour that disciple took her unto his own home." (John: 19-26, 27)

This incident is not referred to in the other Gospels. There is no doubt that the event of crucifixion did take place. Yet if people believing in Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had been at the scene of the event to give an account of the event, there would not be any discordance among the Gospels as to the occurrence of this event and they would all write about the event exactly as it had happened.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

5 — According to the Gospel of Matthew, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was subjected to various insults in the governor's house, he was stripped of his clothes, a scarlet robe was put on him, a crown plaited with thorns was put on his head, a reed was handed to him, they spat at his face, hit him on the head, and, as he was taken out the door for crucifixion, they found a man named Simon of Cyrene and had him carry the cross. When they came to the place called Golgotha[1] (or Calvary), which means skull, he was given vinegar mixed with aloes. When he said, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me," on the cross, one of the bystanders dipped a sponge into vinegar and stretched it out to him with a reed. (Matt: 27-28 to 48)

Mark's account is as follows: He was whipped with a lash, a crown of thorns was put on his face, purple clothes were put on him, he was spat at on the face, beaten on the head, subjected to insults, and taken out. A man named Simon of Cyrene, father of Alexandre and Rufus, came from the country and was passing by. They had him carry the cross. When they came to the place called Golgotha, they gave him wine mixed with murr-u-sâfî (myrrh, burseraceae), which he refused. When he was on the cross, passers-by shook their heads, railed on him, and said, "Ah thou that destroyest the temple, and buildest it in three days," "Save thyself, and come down from the cross." Two thieves, who were crucified with him, reproached him and swore at him. Later, on the cross, when he said, "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken me," one of the people being there dipped a sponge into vinegar and gave it to him to drink. (Mark: 15-17 to 36)

According to Luke's account, "Pilatus (Pilate) first sent Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to Herod (Antipas). When Herod saw Jesus, he was very much pleased. For he had heard very much about him. For a long time he had been looking forward to seeing him to see a miracle of him. But Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' would not answer his questions. Herod, with his soldiers, insulted him, mocked him. He made him put on a bright-coloured garment and sent him to Pilate, who, in his turn, delivered Jesus to the Jews. As they took him along, they caught Simon of Cyrene, who was on his way back from his field, put the cross on his back and bid him to carry it behind Jesus. Meanwhile, a big crowd, among whom were people and women who were crying and beating themselves in their sorrow for him, was following behind him. Jesus turned to

---

[1] A skull-shaped hill near Jerusalem.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

them and said, 'O thee, who art the maidens of Jerusalem. Do not cry for me. But cry for thineselves and for thine children. For those days are coming soon; the days when people without children shall be said to be fortunate. Then they shall begin to say to the mountains: Come and fall on us; and to the hills: Come and cover us. For when a green tree is subjected to all this treatment, what would befall a dry log.' Then, when he was crucified, he said, 'O Father, forgive them, for they do not know what they are doing.' The soldiers, mocking him, approached and offered vinegar to him. One of the two culprits who were crucified with him swore at him and said, 'If you are the Messiah, then save yourself and us.' But the other culprit replied, chiding his friend. Upon this Jesus said unto him: 'Today you shall enter Paradise with me.' " (Luke: 23-7 to 43)

It is written in the Gospel of John: "Then Pilate therefore took Jesus, and scourged him." "And the soldiers platted a crown of thorns, and put it on his head, and they put on him a purple robe," "And they said, Hail, King of the Jews! And they smote him with their hands." (John: 19-1, 2, 3) "When the chief priests thereof and officers saw him (in these clothes), they cried out, saying, Crucify him, crucify him. Pilate saith unto them, Take ye him, and crucify him: for I find no fault in him." "The Jews answered him, We have a law, and by our law he ought to die, because he made himself the Son of God." "When Pilate therefore heard that saying, he was the more afraid;" "And went again into the judgement hall, and saith unto Jesus, Whence art thou? But Jesus gave him no reply." "Then saith Pilate unto him, Speakest thou not unto me? knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee, and have power to release thee?" "Jesus answered, Thou couldest have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above: therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin." "And from thenceforth Pilate sought to release him: but the Jews cried out, saying, If thou let this man go, thou art not Caesar's friend: whosoever maketh himself a king speaketh against Caesar." (ibid: 19-6 to 12) Then John goes on and relates how Pilate, upon these remonstrations, took Jesus out and delivered him to the Jews, and how Jesus, carrying his cross, "went forth into the place called the place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Gol'go-tha:" (verses 16-17)

[The differences between the accounts of the event given in the four Gospels are seen as clearly as the sun. Concerning this event, which the priest claims has been authenticated by a

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

generally accepted narrative, the four Gospels trusted by Christians are at loggerheads with one another. Who could deny this fact? Accordingly, where is the generally accepted narrative asserted by the priest?]

6 — According to the thirty-seventh verse of the twenty-seventh chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was crucified, a placard with the statement, "THIS IS JESUS, THE KING OF THE JEWS," was hung over him.

According to the twenty-sixth verse of the fifteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark, the phrase "THE KING OF THE JEWS" was written on the placard.

According to the thirty-eighth verse of the twenty-third chapter of the Gospel of Luke, the placard contained the statement, "THIS IS THE KING OF THE JEWS," in Hebrew.

According to the nineteenth verse of the nineteenth chapter of John, Pilate wrote the expression. "And Pilate wrote a title, and put it on the cross. And the writing was, JESUS OF NAZARETH THE KING OF THE JEWS." "This title then read many of the Jews: for the place where Jesus was crucified was nigh to the city: and it was written in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin." "Then said the chief priests of the Jews to Pilate, Write not, The King of the Jews; but that he said, I am the King of the Jews." "Pilate answered, What I have written I have written." (John: 19-19, 20, 21, 22) [These Biblical inconsistencies as to what was written on the placard hung over the crucified person who today's Gospels claim was Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from believing or saying so], show us that the person who was crucified was not Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.]

7 — It is written in the fifteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark that it was three o'clock when Jesus was crucified. When the time became six o'clock, darkness fell all over the world until nine o'clock. (Mark: 15-25, 33)

It is written in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke that it was about six o'clock when he was crucified, and darkness fell all over the world until nine o'clock. (Matt: 28-45; Luke: 23-44) John, on the other hand, does not refer to time or the falling of darkness.

8 — It is written in the Gospel of John that on Saturday they broke the legs of the two people who had been crucified with Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' lest they should remain any longer on the cross, and when they came to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' they saw that he was already dead and therefore did not break his legs. (John: 19-32,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

33) The other three Gospels do not contain this part.

9 — There are great differences among the existing Gospels in such matters as the resurrection of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' after being crucified according to the Christian credo and his displaying miracles. Because we have already explained these matters in the chapter dealing with **(the four books called Gospels),** those who wish to renew their information may reread that chapter. (Chapter 4)

A close study of these inconsistencies will show that such matters as the crucifixion of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', his resurrecting and showing miracles are viewed with scepticism among Christians. Eminent Christian scholars have not been able to put forward any evidence strong enough [to refute the pure Islamic belief that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was not crucified; he was elevated up to heaven without being killed; the person crucified was a Jew who resembled him; or] to eliminate this scepticism among Christians, nor have they been able to answer any of the questions asked by Muslims so far. If Christians say, "The Gospels themselves are of documentary value for us with all the inconsistensies in them," then the whole argument will become null and void. For it would be senseless to discuss an issue with a person who denied open facts and persisted in his misbelief.

It is quite possible for a judicious person who does not believe in a heavenly book to deduce from the existing Gospels numerous evidences to prove the fact that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was not killed or crucified and that the person crucified was someone else. Furthermore, supposing someone came forward and, in response to the priest's statement, "A narrative stated unanimously in all the four Gospels cannot be refuted," said, "Being crucified, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' succumbed to the bitter pain and fainted. Those who saw him in this position thought he was dead and hastily took him off the cross lest he should remain on the cross on Saturday. One of his disciples, Joseph by name, took him to a lonely place and buried him there. After a while, he recovered and stood out of his grave. One of his disciples gave him a robe of linen, which was a gardener's garb. He put on this robe and showed himself in this attirement to Mary Magdalene. Later he met his disciples and spoke with them. After a while, he died again at a lonely place, either from the wounds caused by the crucifixion or from some other disease;" now, how would this be answered? As a matter of fact, as it is inferred from the verse in the Gospel of Matthew, which reads, "The Jews went to Pilate and said: Command them

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

to keep guard for three days by the grave; otherwise, his disciples may steal him away at night and then announce that he has resurrected," such doubts existed at that time, too. As we have explained in the chapter dealing with **(the four books called Gospels),** the Gospel of Matthew was written forty to fifty years after ascension of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to heaven. As Matthew wrote his Gospel, he may have included this widespread rumour into his Gospel, and the other writers of Gospel may have written such rumours in their books without inquiring into the matter. There are various evidences to this effect.

First evidence: The statement, "The Jews and the guarding soldiers went together and sealed the stone, thus safeguarding the grave," which the Gospel of Matthew adds for prudential considerations, augments, let alone eliminating, the doubts.

Second evidence: According to the account given in the twentieth chapter of the Gospel of John, Mary Magdalene saw Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' after his resurrection and thought he was a gardner. (John: 20-14, 15) Again, according to the account given at the end of the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of John, Joseph of Arimathea took the corpse of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', wrapped him in linen clothes, found a garden at the place of crucifixion, and put him into a grave there. (ibid: 19-38, 39, 40, 41) Now, why shouldn't it be possible, for instance, that the person who had been mistaken for Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' may have lain unconscious for a while in the grave, then recovered, and removed the stone on the mouth of the grave, — or one of the disciples may have done it for him —, and taken off his shroud and put on a gardner's attirement?

Third evidence: It is written in the twenty-fourth chapter of the Gospel of Luke that when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' resurrected from his grave and showed himself to his disciples, they were bewildered and frightened, thinking it was a ghost or a spectre. Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' said to them: Why are you bewildered? Why do you suffer anxiety in thine hearts. Look at my hands, my feet. I am, myself. Touch me with thine hands and look at me. For a ghost does not have flesh and bones, which you see I have. After saying this, he showed them his hands and feet. As they were still in bewilderment, he said: Have you got something to eat? They gave him a piece of fried fish [and some honey in the comb]. He took it and ate it in front of them. (Luke: 24-36 to 43)

According to this narrative, the person who was crucified did not die on the cross. He recovered, became hungry, and ate. This

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

narrative contradicts the miracle of resurrection (of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm') after death.

Fourth evidence: It is stated (in the Gospels) that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' spoke to his disciples in Galilee, and that he did not speak to them in Jerusalem. According to this assertion, he must have feared the Jews although he had died on the cross and then resurrected. On the other hand, because Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had died on the cross from the Jews' point of view, the Jews must have been looking on the matter of Jesus as a nuisance they had already gotten rid of. It was possible, therefore, for him to talk to his disciples in Jerusalem, since there was no reason for him to fear the Jews. It is obvious that this narrative is another addition to the Bible.

Fifth evidence: It is written in the Gospels that after his resurrection he showed himself to some people in Jerusalem but he did not show himself to his disciples or, especially, to his mother (there). These words imply that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' did not want to meet them and even tried to keep away from them, which comes to mean that, no longer trusting his disciples, he first limited his audience to a couple of people. And this, in its turn, obviously would have been wrong.

Sixth evidence: It is stated that none of the disciples was present when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was buried or when he resurrected, that he was buried by Joseph of Arimathea, and that later he was seen alive by Mary Magdalene. This narrative may normally bring the following thought to one's mind: 'When Joseph of Arimathea came near the crucified person, he may have seen that the person was not dead. Fearing that he might cause the denial of the Biblical verse foretelling that he (Jesus) would resurrect after dying if he divulged that he was not dead, he may have concealed what he had seen." How would the priests answer to eliminate such a suspense?

Seventh evidence: According to Matthew, Joseph of Arimathea was a rich man and one of the disciples of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. (Matt: 27-57) According to Luke, he was a pious person', "a counsellor; and he was a good man, and a just:" (Luke: 23-50) This person states that he put the crucified person into a grave. His putting him into a grave indicates that he was definitely dead. Since people who say that they have seen him again are possibly not lying, it may be thought that they may have seen a vision.

Eighth evidence: The person who was crucified may have somehow freed himself from the cross and thus remained alive,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and his disciples, upon seeing him, may have thought that he had resurrected after dying.

In order to prove that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' died on the cross and was buried, priests put forward the following verse written in the Gospel of Matthew as an evidence: "... so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth." (Matt: 12-40) Yes, the person who was crucified died and was buried. There is no need to prove this fact. Priests' putting forward this verse is intended to prove that he resurrected after dying. Yet the person who was crucified did not stay in the grave for three days and three nights. It is stated unanimously in the four Gospels that the corpse was taken down from the cross on Friday evening and was buried immediately and it could not be found in the grave before sunrise Sunday morning. It is calculated that the corpse stayed in the grave for two nights plus one day. Since the corpse did not stay three days and three nights in the grave according to this calculation, Matthew's statement is contrary to fact. Another point is this: If Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had really made this statement, the disciples should not have had any doubts concerning his resurrection, and they should have welcomed him as soon as seeing him. On the contrary, it is written in the Gospels that all the Apostles categorically rejected the reports of his resurrection. With all these facts, silence would be the only answer that priests could offer to **(Qur'ân al-kerîm),** which states that "The person crucified was not Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'; Judas Iscariot, who had reported where he was, was mistaken for Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and was therefore crucified, and Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was raised up to heaven."

According to the Islamic belief, all Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm' are innocent. They are immune from lying and playing tricks. They were making preparations to crucify Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', when Allâhu ta'âlâ, the Omnipotent, gave the person who had betrayed him the semblance of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' so that the Jews, believing the person they saw now was Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', crucified the traitor, instead. Allâhu ta'âlâ immediately raised Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to heaven. This belief of Muslims is more logical and more worthy of the Prophetic honour of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

The hundred and fifty-seventh âyat of Nisâ sûra purports, **"But they killed him not, nor crucified him, but so it was made to appear to them, ...** [But someone else was made into his semblance, so they crucified this person]." (4-157) All the 'Ulamâ (very profound scholars, savants) of tafsîr (interpretation of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Qur'ân al-kerîm) have interpreted this âyat-i-kerîma as that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was not killed or hanged.

The fifty-fifth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purports, "[Recall that] **Allâhu ta'âlâ** [said] **to Îsâ** 'alaihis-salâm': **Surely I take thee from the earth** [in the most beautiful manner] **and raise thee to the grade of angels."** (3-55) Priests assert that this âyat-i-kerîma contradicts the hundred and fifty-seventh âyat of Nisâ sûra. They want to put forward the word **(mutawaffîka)** as an evidence to prove that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' died. They do not realize that this word is an adjective and therefore **(mutawaffîka)** does not mean, "I shall kill thee." [The Arabic lexicon **(Al-munjid)**, which was prepared by a Christian clergyman and printed in a Catholic printhouse in Beirut, explains the meaning of the word (tawaffâ) as "To fully get what one deserves," hence the meaning "To give one what is worthy of one's honour." It is metonymically used in the meaning of "to kill".] This comes to mean that this âyat-i-kerîma does not mean, "I shall kill thee and then raise thee." It means, **"I shall do what is worthy of thine honour and raise thee to the grade of angels."** Allâhu ta'âlâ decreed to exalt Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and so He did exalt him. He did not decree to have him killed by the Jews, and He did not have him killed, having someone else crucified. For this reason, some 'Ulamâ of tafsîr 'rahimahullâhi ta'âlâ' have interpreted the word (tawaffî) as "to pick," and explained the âyat-i-kerîma as, **"To protect thee from being killed by the Jews, I shall entirely pick thee up from the earth."** It is so strange that Christian sects, while saying that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is the (Son of God), even (God Himself), accept at the same time that he was killed by crucifixion. The Islamic religion, on the other hand, states that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was a human being and a Prophet, and rejects these slanders directed to him. In addition, it enhances his value by stating that he was raised to heaven and informing that the Jews' assertion that they killed him by hanging is wrong and slanderous. We would like to ask which of these two creeds is worthy of the honour of that exalted Prophet, Muslims' creed, or Christians' creed? This comparison will show us whose love of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is more of a true one, Muslims' love, or Christians' love. There are lessons to be taken from Muslims' [true and pure] belief, which deters from such lies as would be detrimental to the honour of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and which Christians furiously strive to disprove. We, Muslims, are both Mûsâwî and Îsâwî because we recognize both Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' as Prophets sent

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

by Allâhu ta'âlâ.

Because Christian groups believe in the defiled, interpolated Gospels, which teem with all sorts of abominable lies, [and which are so common today], they belittle that blessed Prophet with such imputations as, "Jesus was born in a stable, he was killed by the Jews in a humiliating manner, he entered Hell and thus was accursed," which a most indecent person would hesitate to utter about his enemy. Therefore, they are neither Mûsâwî, nor Îsâwî. Since they accept [and defend] Plato's heretic philosophy of trinity, it would be more correct to call them 'Platonists.'

There are many other mental and traditional answers that could be given to Christians to prove the fact that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was not killed or hanged. They are written in detail in the books **(Mîzân-ul-mawâzîn),** in Persian, **(Iz-hâr-ul-haqq),** in Arabic and Turkish, **(Shems-ul-haqîqa)** and **(Îzâh-ul-merâm),** in Turkish, and in the Arabic book **(Er-redd-ul-jemîl),** written by Imâm-i-Ghazâlî 'rahmetullâhi aleyh'.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 13 —
ALLÂHU TA'ÂLÂ IS ONE

The priests' real purpose, they claim, is to compare the inner essence of Christianity with that of Islam and then accept the one which is more truthful. In the initial pages of our book we have answered them by comparing Qur'ân al-kerîm with their publications which they name the Bible. And now we consider it pertinent to compare Christians' and Muslims' systems of belief with each other. Leaving aside the traditional documents, we begin our detailed elucidation based on logical proofs.

The most prominent Christian tenet is trinity, i.e. belief in three gods. According to Christians, there are, may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so, three gods: Allâhu ta'âlâ, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and the Ruh-ul-quds (the Holy Spirit). However, the Biblical expression, "My Son," is an indication of excessive love. It is written in the existing books called Gospels, "Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is equal to Allâhu ta'âlâ in all the attributes such as knowledge and power. After being killed by crucifixion, he was scorched for eight days in Hell, and then, according to Paul, mounting the accursed tree, [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us against saying so], he ascended to heaven, placed his throne on the right hand side of Father, and assumed the task of creating and making. Now the Son has the control. After resurrection as well, Father having abdicated His active role, the Son will be the Absolute Ruler."

According to the belief held by Muslims, Allâhu ta'âlâ is One. He does not have a partner or a likeness in His Person or in His Attributes.

[Imâm-i-Rabbânî Mujaddid-i-elf-i-thânî Ahmad Fârûqî Serhendî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', an extremely profound savant who is best in his prowess of elucidating the accurate belief concerning Allâhu ta'âlâ as held by those true Muslims stringently adherent to the Sunnat, Sharî'at, of Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam', gives the following account in the sixty-seventh letter of the second book of his work **(Mektûbât)**:

"Be it known that Allâhu ta'âlâ is One in His eternal [that

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

which never ceases to exist] Person. He created everything except Himself. He existed eternally. That is, He is eternal in the past. In other words, He always existed. There cannot be nonexistence previous to His existence. All beings other than He were nonexistent. He created them all afterwards. What is eternal in the past will be eternal, everlasting in the future. What is of recent occurrence and created will be mortal, transitory, and prone to cease to exist. Allâhu ta'âlâ is One. That is, His existence, alone, is indispensable. He, alone, is worthy of being worshipped. Existence of things other than He is not essential. It makes no difference whether they exist or not. Nothing except He is worthy of being worshipped.

"Allâhu ta'âlâ has Attributes of perfection. These Attributes are **Hayât, 'Ilm, Semi', Basar, Qudrat, Kalâm,** and **Tekwîn.** These Attributes, too, are eternal. Their existence is with Allâhu ta'âlâ. Creation of creatures afterwards, and all these momentary changes in them do not detract from the eternal being of His Attributes. The eternal being of His Attributes is not affected by the later creation of these beings to which they are related. Philosophers, relying only on their imperfect mentality, and the Mu'tazila group of Muslims, not being keen enough to see the truth, closed the matter by saying that since creatures are of recent occurrence the Attributes which create and control them are of recent occurrence. Thus they denied the eternal **Sifât-i-kâmila** (Attributes of perfection). They said that "the Attribute of Knowledge cannot penetrate tiny motes. That is, Allâhu ta'âlâ does not know small, trivial things. For, otherwise, changes taking place in things would cause changes in the Attribute of Knowledge, too. What is eternal should not change." They did not know that the Attributes are eternal, but their relation to things is of recent occurrence.

"Allâhu ta'âlâ does not have imperfect attributes. Allâhu ta'âlâ is free and far from the attributes of substances, things and states, and He is independent of their needs. Allâhu ta'âlâ is free from time, free from place, and free from direction. He is not in a place or in a location. He created time, places and directions afterwards. An ignorant person will imagine that He is on the Arsh, up above us. The Arsh, places above and below us are all His creatures. He created them all afterwards. Could something that was created afterwards be a place for one who exists eternally? However, the Arsh is the most honourable of creatures. It is purer and more resplendent than anything else. Therefore, it

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

is like a mirror. Greatness of Allâhu ta'âlâ is seen there. It is for this reason that it is called the **(Arshullah).** Nevertheless, the relation of the Arsh to Allâhu ta'âlâ is no different from that of any other being. They are all His creatures. Only, the Arsh is like a mirror. The other beings do not have this capacity. Could a man seen in a mirror be said to be inside the mirror? The man's relation to the mirror is identical with his relation to other things. His relation to all other things is the same. However, there is difference between the mirror and other things. The mirror can reflect a man's image, and other things cannot.

"Allâhu ta'âlâ is not a substance, or an object, or a state. He does not have boundaries or dimensions. He is not long, short, wide or narrow. We say that He is (Wâsî'), which means (wide) literally. Yet this wideness is beyond our knowledge of width. He is (Muhît), that is, He contains all. Yet this containing is unlike what we understand from the word. He is (Qarîb), that is, close to us, with us, yet not as we understand! We believe in that He is Wâsi', Muhît, Qarîb, and with us. Yet we cannot know what these Attributes mean. We say that anything that comes to mind concerning the Person and Attributes of Allâhu ta'âlâ is wrong. Allâhu ta'âlâ does not unite with anything. And nothing unites with Him, either. Nothing enters Him. And He does not enter anything, either. Allâhu ta'âlâ does not divide into parts or break into pieces; He is not analyzed or synthesized. He does not have a likeness or a partner. He does not have a wife or children. He is unlike the things we know or we can think of. It cannot be known or imagined how He is. There cannot be an image or a copy of Him. We know to the extent that He exists. And also His Attributes exist as He stated. Yet He is far from everything that may come to our mind or imagination concerning Him, His existence or His Attributes. Men cannot comprehend Him. Translation of a Persian distich:

When asked, "Am I not thine Rab?"
"He is," said the wise, and kept mum.

"The Names of Allâhu ta'âlâ are **(tawkîfî),** that is, they are dependent upon and subject to Islam's dictation. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to pronounce His Names prescribed by Islam. Names that are not prescribed by Islam cannot be used. They should not be pronounced no matter how beautiful they may be. (For instance), Jawâd, being a Name prescribed by Islam, can be used (for Allâhu ta'âlâ). On the other hand (Sahî), which is

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

synonymous with (Jawâd) and means 'generous', cannot be pronounced (as a Name for Allâhu ta'âlâ) because Islam has never called him (Sahî). [Therefore, He cannot be called Tanrı, or God. Especially in worships, such as calling the azân (or adhân), it would be a grave sin to use the word Tanrı, or God, instead of the Name, Allah.]

"Qur'ân al-kerîm is the Kelâm, the Word, of Allah. Placing His Word into Arabic letters and speech sounds, He has sent it down to our Prophet, Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'. Through His Word He has informed His born slaves of His commandments and prohibitions.

"We creatures talk by means of our (organs of articulation such as) vocal cords in our throat, tongue, palate, etc. We put our desires into letters and speech sounds. By the same token, Allâhu ta'âlâ, the almighty, has sent His Word in letters and sounds without the intermediation of vocal cords, mouth or tongue to His born slaves. He has revealed His commandments and prohibitions in letters and sounds. Both modes of Word belong to Him. In other words, both the **(Kelâm-i-nafsî)**, i.e. His Word before being transacted through letters and sounds, and **(Kelâm-i-lafzî),** i.e. His Word in the mode of letters and sounds, are His Word. It would be correct to call them both 'Kelâm (Word).' As a matter of fact, our word belongs to us when it is nafsî, before being said, as well as when it is lafzî, after it is said. It would be wrong that the Kelâm-i-nafsî is real and the Kelâm-i-lafzî is metaphorical or like the Kelâm. For something which is metaphorical can be denied. And it is kufr (disbelief) to deny the Kelâm-i-lafzî of Allâhu ta'âlâ and to say that it is not Word of Allah. All the heavenly Books and Pages revealed to former Prophets 'alâ nebiy-yi-nâ wa alaihimus-salawâtu wa-t-teslîmât' are the Word of Allah, too. All the contents of those Books and Pages, and also of Qur'ân al-kerîm, are **Ahkâm-i-ilâhî** (Divine Laws of Allah). He has sent every generation laws suitable for their time.

"In Jannat (Paradise), Believers shall see Allâhu ta'âlâ in a manner beyond the limits of mind, beyond the boundaries of place such as location, direction, form. We believe in the fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ shall be seen in the hereafter. But we do not ponder over how this seeing will be. For seeing Him is not something within mind's comprehensive capacity. There is no other way than believing. Shame on philosophers and those Muslims belonging to the Mu'tazila group and all groups of Muslims except the Ahl-us-sunna! They have blindly deprived themselves of believing in this

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

felicity. Attempting to compare what they have not seen or known with things they have seen, they have divested themselves of the honour of attaining îmân.

"Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is the Creator of men, is the Creator of their deeds, too. All virtues and vices depend on His decree [will]. However, He likes good deeds and dislikes bad deeds. Everything, whether good or bad, is dependent upon His Will and Creation; yet it would be insolent to describe Him as merely the Creator of a certain vice. We should not call Him 'the Creator of vices'. We should say He is the Creator of the good and the wicked." This is the end of our translation from **(Mektûbât).**

Fakhr-ud-dîn Râzî[1] 'rahimahullah' has stated twenty or so of the evidences furnished by the 'Ulamâ of Kelâm to prove the unity (being one) of Allâhu ta'âlâ. We shall cite some of them in the following passage:

1 — The twenty-second âyat of Enbiyâ sûra purports, **"If there were gods besides Allâhu ta'âlâ on the earth and in heaven, order in these places would become deranged and a complete disorder would prevail."**

This âyat-i-kerîma signifies a **(Burhân-i-temânû').** That is: Supposing the universe had two creators; the courses of action chosen by these two creators would be either disparate or identical. If they were disparate, then the universe would get into mischief. That is, heavens and earth would be thrown into disorder and perish, or two contradictory things would coexist. For instance, if one of the two gods wished a certain person named, say, Zeyd to move and the other god wished him not to move, when their godly powers affected Zeyd, two opposite things would happen at the same time. [And this, in its turn, is impossible. For two opposite things cannot coexist. In other words, it is impossible for two opposite events to take place at the same time. That is, Zeyd cannot be both moving and not moving at the same time. He is either moving, or not moving.]

If the courses of action chosen by the two gods were identical, disagreement between them would be either possible, or impossible. Disagreement would be impossible because they chose the same course of action. According to the second case, that is, if disagreement between them were possible, then one of them would necessarily be powerless. And being powerless, in its

---

[1] Fakhr-ud-dîn Râzî passed away in Hirât in 606 [A.D. 1209].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

turn, would mean being a creature, having been created afterwards, which would be incompatible with the honour of being a god. Something created afterwards could not be a god.

2 — Supposing the universe had two creators, [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so], either one of them would be either capable, or incapable, of doing whatever he wished to do. If one of them were sufficiently capable of creating whatever he wished to create, the second god would be null and void, nonessential and superfluous, which would mean imperfection. And he who were imperfect, in turn, could not be a creator. If the second god were sufficient to do whatever he wished to do, this time the first god would become null and void.

3 — Supposing the universe had two creators, [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so], they would either need each other, or not, in their power of effecting [creatures]. Or, one of them would need the other, and the latter in turn would not need the former.

In the first case, i.e. if they both needed each other, they would necessarily be imperfect. In the second case, that is, if they did not need each other, neither would be a god. [For each would be nonessential and superfluous in comparison with the other, which would be incompatible with a godly character.] For a god must be an all-inclusive being whom everything needs every moment. Not needing him, therefore, would be out of the question. In the third case, the one that needed the other would normally be imperfect, which would mean only the latter one were a god, and hence only one god.

Qâdî Baydâwî[1] 'rahmatullâhi aleyh' states: If there were supposedly two creators of the universe, both of the gods would be equally omnipotent in their command over all the dispensable beings. For omnipotence is the prerequisite of creating and annihilating. On the other hand, susceptibility of coming into existence and ceasing to exist, that is, being dispensable, is an attribute commonly shared by all beings. Accordingly, no being would exist in the universe. For either none of the gods would be effective, or one of them would be effective and the other ineffective, in the creation of a being. Either case would require a process termed (terjîh-i-bilâ murej-jih). [Terjîh-i-bilâ murej-jih means to prefer either of two certain things to the other without any reason to do so, which would be a false process.]

---

[1] Abdullah Baydâwî passed away in 685 [A.D. 1286].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

It is out of the question for two gods to be effecting the creation of the dispensable beings [creatures]. For if there were no effect on the creation or non-creation of the dispensable beings, the dispensable beings would be nonexistent. If there were no one to prefer, there would be nothing preferred. In other words, if there were no creator there could not be any creatures.

In the second case, i.e. if one of the two supposed gods effected the creation of the dispensable beings while the other one did not; since the creation of the dispensable beings depended on each of the creators in an equal proportion, creation taking place with the effect of one of the two creators would absolutely be terjîh-i-bilâ murej-jih, which, in turn, would be false. If each of the two gods effected at the same time, this would mean two independent agents' (gods') effecting the same one subject, which would be impossible. That is, it would be impossible for two gods to have two contradictory effects on the same dispensable being at the same time. This means to say that an event where "two independent agents (gods) effected the same thing and their effects gave their results" would be quite contrary to fact. Therefore, it would be impossible for each of the two indispensable beings (gods) to effect the same thing at the same time. Then, the universe could not have two creators. [There is absolutely One Creator of this universe. He decreed to create the universe, and did create it. Nothing would exist if He did not decree and create it. There is definitely a Creator of everything. A pen cannot write by itself. It certainly needs an agent to make it write. And this agent, as everyone knows, is the writer. As it would be impossible for a pen to write without a writer, so would it be impossible for the universe to exist without a Creator.]

4 — Supposing the universe had two creators and one of these creators wanted Zeyd to stand up and the other god wanted him to sit down. Zeyd would either stand up or sit down; either case is possible. But when both gods' wishes took effect at the same time, Zeyd would have to both stand and sit at the same time. And this, in its turn, would mean to make two opposite things one, which is impossible. If only what one of them wished were to happen, then the other would be incapable. It is out of the question for a god to be incapable, for incapability is peculiar to dispensable beings, that is, creatures. On the other hand, it is impossible for a creature to have existed since eternity. As eternal incapability is impossible, so it is impossible for a creature to have existed since eternity. As eternal incapability is

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

impossible, so it is impossible for a god to be incapable or of recent occurrence. For a god's incapability would be possible only if he lost his power which he had had in eternity. And this, in its turn, would mean his losing his being eternal. If it were impossible for the other god to will that Zeyd should sit down, this would mean that one of them outacted the other's will, which, in turn, would mean the other's incapability. And he who is incapable could not be a god.

The word **(fî-himâ)** in the twenty-second âyat of Enbiyâ sura, which we have quoted above, denotes the effects of two gods. And this is a definitely authentic documentary evidence for the fact that there could not be two gods. Sa'd-ud-dîn Teftâzânî[1] 'rahimahullah' stated, "This âyat-i-kerîma is a convincing document, and an evidence that anyone will understand clearly, concerning the fact that there could not be two gods."

As will be understood from what we have said so far, Allâhu ta'âlâ is the Creator, the only One worthy of being worshipped, of all the existence, and He has no partner or likeness. Ancient Greek philosophers stated some ten evidences in order to prove that Allâhu ta'âlâ is one. The 'Ulamâ of Kelâm, by using the method termed **innî** (categorical, or a *posteriori*, or from effects to causes, argument), infer the cause from the effect. The Hukemâ, on the other hand, use the method called **limmî,** that is, see the power of the cause, and deduce that this power is the cause of all beings. [Limmî means 'with limma' (in Arabic), that is, 'with (the interrogative) why'. And **innî** means 'with inna (categorically so)'.]

Beings existing in the universe cannot come into existence or cease to exist from themselves. There is a being who effects, creates them. Since there are worlds, and creatures in these worlds, there is a being who creates these worlds and the creatures in these worlds. Existence of creatures is an evidence for the existence of a Creator [and this Creator is Allâhu ta'âlâ]. Creatures in the universe have attributes. Then, Allâhu ta'âlâ, who creates them, has these attributes.

[Everything other than Allâhu ta'âlâ is called **(Mâ'siwâ)** or **('Âlem),** for which the term **(Tabî'at)** (Nature) has been used recently. All the 'âlems (worlds) were nonexistent. Allâhu ta'âlâ created them all. All the 'âlems are dispensable and of recent occurrence. That is, they may come into existence from

---

[1] Teftâzânî passed away in Semmerkand in 792 [A.D. 1389].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

nonexistence or cease to exist, and they came into existence from nonexistence. The hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ was. Nothing was,"** expresses this fact.

Another proof evincing that the universe is of recent occurrence is the fact that the universe is subject to a continuous process of changing. Everything is changing. What is eternal, on the other hand, will never change. Allâhu ta'âlâ Himself and His Attributes never change. In the universe, on the contrary, physical changes take place in substances, and chemical reactions change essence, construction of matter. We see objects' ceasing to exist and changing into other objects. According to recent findings, atomic changes and nuclear reactions cause substances and elements to cease to exist and turn into energy. These changes in 'âlems and substances and their coming into being from one another could not be happening since eternity. They must have a beginning, a first set of substances and elements that were created from nothing and from which they came into being.

Another evidence to prove that the universe is dispensable, that is, that it may come into being from nothing, is the fact that the universe is of recent occurrence. In fact, we see that all things around us have come into existence from nothing. Things are ceasing to exist. Other things are coming into existence from them. However, according to our latest chemical knowledge, the hundred and five elements never cease to exist in chemical reactions. Only their constructions change. Radioactive events have shown that elements, and even atoms, cease to exist and that matter changes into energy. As a matter of fact, the German physicist named Einstein[1] has formulated this change mathematically.

This continuous process of changes in substances and their coming into being from one another must not be coming from eternity. It could not be said that it has always been this way and it will always be. These changes have a beginning. To say that the changes have a beginning means to say that the existence of substances has a beginning. It means to say that all beings were nonexistent and were created from nothing afterwards. If the first substances had not been created from nothing, if their coming into being from one another went back into eternity, this universe would necessarily be nonexistent today. For beings'

---

[1] Einstein died in 1375 [A.D. 1955].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

coming into existence from one another in eternity would require preexistence of other beings to give birth to them, and these other beings' existence would require yet other beings' existence before them. Existence of later ones would depend on the existence of earlier ones. If earlier ones did not exist, later ones would not exist, either. Eternal means without beginning. A being's coming into existence from nothing in eternity would mean that there were not a first being. And if the first being did not exist there could not be any beings later. As a result, everything would necessarily be always nonexistent. There could not be an endless chain of beings each of which would need another being previous to it for its existence. All of them would necessarily be nonexistent.

The fact that the universe exists now shows that it has not existed since eternity in the past and that there was a first being created from nothing. It is necessary to believe that the universe has been created from nothing and that today's universe has been formed after successive chains of things coming into being from one another since that first being.

Wujûd means 'to exist'. The opposite of the word **(wujûd)** is **(adam).** Adam means 'nonexistence.' Âlems, that is, all beings, were in adam before coming into being. That is, they were nonexistent.

There are two sorts of existence: First, **mumkin** (dispensable); second, **wâjib** (indispensable). If the only type of existence were the mumkin (dispensable) and the Wâjib-ul-wujûd (indispensable being) did not exist, then nothing would exist. For it is a change, an event, to come into existence from nothing. According to our knowledge of physics, an event's taking place in something requires a preexisting power's effecting that thing from without it. Therefore, the existence which is mumkin (dispensable) could not come into existence or maintain its existence by itself. If some power did not effect it, it would always remain nonexistent; it could never exist. Something which could not create itself, could not create others, either. Creator of the mumkin (dispensable) has to be the Wâjib-ul-wujûd (indispensable being). Existence of the universe shows that there is a Creator who created it from nothing. As it is seen, the only Creator of all dispensable beings is Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is the only Wâjib-ul-wujûd, and who is not of recent occurrence or dispensable.

It is necessary to believe that Allâhu ta'âlâ is the Wâjib-ul-

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

wujûd, the real and only being to be worshipped, and the Creator of all beings. We have to believe definitely that Allâhu ta'âlâ, alone, created everything in this world and in the world to come, from nothing, without any raw material, without time factor, and without any likeness previous to it. He, alone, creates from nothing, and always keeps in existence, every substance, atoms, molecules, elements, compounds, organic substances, cells, life, death, all events, all reactions, all kinds of power and energy, motions, laws, souls, angels, all living and inert beings. As He created all beings in âlems from nothing in one moment, so He is creating them from one another every moment. When the time comes for the end of the world, He shall annihilate everything in one moment, too. He, alone, is the Creator, the Owner, the Ruler of everything. We have to believe that there is no one to dominate over Him, to command Him, or to be superior to Him. All kinds of superiority, all attributes of perfection belong to Him. He does not have any deficiency, any imperfect attribute. He does whatever He wills. His makings are not intended to be useful to Himself or to others. He does not make something in return for something else. Nevertheless, each of His makings comprises hikmats, uses, blessings and kindnesses. He is eternal. That is, He always existed. **(Wâjib-ul-wujûd)** means 'Being whose existence does not depend on someone or something else and who eternally exists only by itself.' He is not created by someone else. Were it not so, He would necessarily be dispensable and of recent occurrence and someone else's creature, which, in its turn, would countermand all our reasoning so far. In Persian **(Hudâ)** means '(He) who eternally exists by Himself.'

Allâhu ta'âlâ cannot be thought of as dependent upon passing of time such as day and night. Since there will be no change in any respect in Allâhu ta'âlâ, it cannot be said that He was like this in the past or will be like that in the future. Allâhu ta'âlâ does not enter anything. He does not unite with anything. Allâhu ta'âlâ does not have an opposite, a counterpart, a prototype, a partner, an assistant, or a protector. He does not have a mother, a father, a son, a daughter, or a spouse. He is always present with everyone, always contains and sees everything. To everbody He is closer than their jugular vein. Yet how He is present, how He contains, how He is together and close are beyond our comprehension. His closeness cannot be understood through the knowledge of 'Ulamâ, the intellect of scientists, or the kashf and shuhûd of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Awliyâ[1] 'qaddes-allâhu ta'âlâ esrârahum.' The human mind cannot grasp their inner essence. Allahu ta'âlâ is One in His Person and Attributes. No change occurs in any of them.

We see that the universe is in an amazing order. Every year science makes new discoveries on the system of relationship among the creatures of the universe. He who has created these systems must be **Hay**[2] (living, alive), **'Âlim** (knowing), **Qâdir** (having power enough), **Murîd** (willing), **Semî'** (hearing), **Basîr** (seeing), **Mutakallim** (saying), and **Khâliq** (creating). For such things as dying, not knowing, not having enough power, being compelled to do, deafness, blindness and being unable to say, are all defects, things to be ashamed of. Existence of such deficient attributes in a Person who has created this universe in such an order and who protects it from perishing is impossible.

From atoms to stars, every being has been created with some calculations, laws. Orders, laws and connections discovered so far in physics, chemistry, astronomy and biology are astounding. In fact, Darwin had to say, "When I consider the order, the delicate particulars in the construction of the eye, I am so bewildered that I feel on the verge of insanity." Could attributes of imperfection ever be ascribed to Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is the Creator of all these laws and delicate calculations that are being taught in science classes?

Furthermore, we see these attributes of perfection on creatures as well. He has created them in His creatures, too. How could He have created these attributes in His creatures if He Himself did not have them? If He did not have these attributes, His creatures would be superior to Him.

He who has created these 'âlams has to have all the attributes of perfection and none of the attributes of imperfection. For one who is imperfect could not be a Hudâ, a Creator.

Let alone all these mental proofs, âyat-i-kerîmas of Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs of our Prophet Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' state plainly that Allâhu ta'âlâ has attributes of perfection.

---

[1] Walî means a person loved by Allâhu ta'âlâ (pl. Awliyâ). For being a Walî, it is necessary to obey the Sharî'at strictly and to make progress in a path of Tasawwuf. After reaching a certain grade, very subtle, inexplicable pieces of knowledge begin to pour into a Walî's heart. These pieces of information are called **kashf.** Shuhûd means to see through the heart.

[2] Pronounced: high

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

It is not permissible to doubt this fact. Doubt will cause kufr (disbelief). His eight Attributes of perfection written above are called **(Sifât-i-thubûtiyya).** That is, the Sifât-i-thubûtiyya of Allâhu ta'âlâ are eight. Allâhu ta'âlâ has all Attributes of perfection. There is no defect or confusion or change in His Person, Attributes, or Deeds.]

We have stated (above) that Qur'ân al-kerîm teems with âyat-i-kerîmas expressing the fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ is One in His Person, in His Attributes and Deeds. The first âyat of Ikhlâs sûra purports, "[O Muhammad!] **Say** [unto those who inquire about Allâhu ta'âlâ]: **Allah is One** [in His Person, Attributes and Deeds]." The hundred and sixty-third âyat of Baqara sûra purports: **"Thine Ilâh** (God) **is Allah, who is One. There is no Ilâh other than He. He bestows His blessings on everybody in the world, yet He shall be compassionate and kind only to Believers in the hereafter."** There are many such examples in Qur'ân al-kerîm.

According to 'Ulamâ of Lughat (Semantics), the words **(Ahad)** and **(Wâhid)**[1] are synonymous. Yet a closer observation will show that they differ in usage. When the word **(Ahad)** is used, **'(Wâhid)** in every respect' is meant. Ahadiyyat, that is, being one, signifies one being as opposed to many in number; one being which is not made up of many components and which is free from such dependencies as co-ownership, amount, change, colouredness, being light or dark. One who is **(Ahad)** does not have a prototype or a likeness. Neither mind nor feelings will afford His being broken into parts. Also, Ahad is free from concrete fractions, such as various component substances, indivisible parts, tiny solid substances, and appearance, and from abstract fractions such as kind and category. **(Ahad)** is the sole Person who does not have a likeness or a partner, or anyone besides Him, that is, Allâhu ta'âlâ. [Another difference between Wâhid and Ahad is that Wâhid can be in Ahad. On the other hand, Ahad will never go into Wâhid. In other words, Ahad is Wâhid, yet not every wâhid is Ahad. Wâhid is used in the affirmative and Ahad in the negative. For instance, "Ra-aytu rajulan wâhidan (I saw a man)," versus "Mâ ra-aytu ahadan (I saw no one)."]

Allâhu ta'âlâ has mercy upon His born slaves. The thirtieth âyat of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra purports, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ commands you**

---

[1] Lexically, both words mean 'one'.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

to fear and avoid His torment. Allâhu ta'âlâ is very compassionate over His born slaves." [Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated, **"Meditate over the creatures of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Do not ponder over His Person. For you could not appreciate or comprehend His Greatness."** No work could comprehend its maker. In another hadîth-i-sherîf, our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wa sallam' declared, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ is far from everything that will come to mind."**]

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 14 —
A DISCOURSE ON KNOWLEDGE

Although Christians say that "Allâhu ta'âlâ knows things," on various occasions they impute ignorance to Him. For instance, the Holy Bible, which they claim to have remained intact and which is being read in churches today, reads as follows in the first chapter of Genesis, in the Old Testament: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. ..." "And God said, Let there be light: and there was light." "And God saw the light, that it was good: ..." (Gen: 1-1 to 4) "God created heaven and earth. He saw that they were good and beautiful. ... Then He created that, and saw it was beautiful, good, and then that, and then that... ." (paraphrased from Gen: 1-6 to 31)

[O Christians!] Be reasonable, Supposing a civil engineer wanted to build a house; would he begin the construction before making a project and seeing whether it would be lovely enough? Of course, he would not. [Today also, before the construction of a building begins, an architect designs a plan so that the building will be comely and well-proportioned. In this plan he lays down the measurements of all the contents of the building. And the building is constructed according to this plan. Could a well-shaped building be made by piling up cement, stones, sand and bricks in a haphazard way? Has anyone attempted to make a house without a plan?] Is the knowledge that Allâhu ta'âlâ has even shorter [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so] than that of an engineer, a powerless born slave of His?

It is stated as follows about Allâhu ta'âlâ in the fifth and later verses of the sixth chapter of Genesis, in the Old Testament: "And God saw that the wickedness of man was great in the earth, ..." "And it repented the LORD that he had made man on the earth, and it grieved him at his heart." "And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them." (Gen: 6-5, 6, 7) Moreover, it is written in the seventh and eighth chapters of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Genesis that Allâhu ta'âlâ commanded Nûh 'alaihis-salâm' to make a ship and live on this ship with his followers, that He annihilated all human beings and all the living except those who boarded the ship, that a flood inundated everywhere, it rained for forty days and forty nights and then the flood subsided, and that Allâhu ta'âlâ remembered Nûh 'alaihis-salâm' hundred and fifty days later. (Gen: 7-1 to 24; and 8-1)

It stands to reason that if an imbecile did something of vital importance he would not forget it for forty years. How could it ever be possible for Allâhu ta'âlâ, Creator of all 'âlems, to have forgotten Nûh 'alaihis-salâm' and those who were with him? Ignorance that Christians impute to Allâhu ta'âlâ is beyond limits of measurement.

According to Muslims' belief and the teachings of the 'Ulamâ of Kelâm, all things that have happened and will happen are every moment within the knowledge of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Allâhu ta'âlâ knows everything, no matter whether it is existent or nonexistent, possible to exist or impossible. There is not a tiniest mote outside the knowledge of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Muslims have proved this fact with very many mental proofs.

Deeds of Allâhu ta'âlâ are Muhkam (Thorough, above reproach). They are far from defects or imperfection. There are numerous uses and hikmats in everything He creates. The Person whose Deeds are unchangeable and perfect is certainly the Creator of the universe. When a person sees the orderly systems in heavens and on earth, creation of heavens from nothing, qualities and peculiarities in substances, so many kinds of fruits, vegetables, plants, metals, and innumerable genera of animals, he will realize that the Deeds of Allâhu ta'âlâ are unchangeable and perfect. Upon meditating over the fact that all these things have been created with certain calculations and rules, the human mind will be stupefied. Allâhu ta'âlâ has created many a thing which the human mind falls short of comprehending in this universe.

[From his early childhood, man begins to make enquiries about where the things he sees around him have come from. As the child grows, he gradually realizes what a tremendous work of art this earth is on which he is living, and the more he realizes the greater his bewilderment. By the time he enters upon higher education and begins to learn about the subtleties in all these things and creatures around him, his bewilderment turns into admiration. What a stupendous miracle it is that only owing to the gravitation of the earth men are living on a fire-cored, round

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

(somewhat low on both poles) globe travelling by itself with a great speed in an orbit in space. What a great power it is that makes all these mountains, rocks, seas, living creatures, plants around us, improves them and gives them innumerable peculiarities. While some animals walk on the earth, some of them fly in the sky, and others live in water. The sun, sending its lights unto us, provides the highest heat we could conceive of, which causes development of plants and effects chemical changes in some of them, which results in the formation of such substances as flour, sugar, and many others. On the other hand, our earthly globe is, as we know, only a tiny particle in the universe. The solar system, which consists of planets evolving round the sun and of which our globe is a member, is only one of the very many universal systems whose number is beyond our knowledge. Let us give a small example to explain the power and energy in the universe: The latest gigantic source of energy is the atomic bomb, which men have obtained by splitting (heavy) atomic nuclei. Yet when the energy released by great earthquakes is compared with the energy of an atomic bomb, which men consider to be "the greatest source of energy," it will be seen that the former type of energy is equal to tens of thousands of atomic energy.

Man is mostly unaware of what a tremendous factory, an immaculate laboratory his body is. In fact, respiration alone is a terrific chemical event. The oxygen inhaled from the air is burned in the body and then exhaled in the form of carbon dioxide.

The alimentary (digestive) system, on the other hand, is a colossal factory. Nutritives received through the mouth are decomposed and assimilated in the stomach and bowels, the salutary essence extracted is transfused into the blood by way of the intestines, and waste matter is discharged. This fantastic event is automatically accomplished with super precision, and thus the body functions like a factory.]

Neither paper nor pens would suffice to write the details of these events. This fact is more obvious than the sun to scientists such as astronomers, anatomists, zoologists and botanists. [And the Creator of all these phenomena is ALLÂHU TA'ÂLÂ, who is the owner of very great power, who never changes and who is eternal.]

Especially the Awliyâ-i-kirâm, that is, people who have attained to high grades in the world of souls, see very clearly how perfectly systematic the Deeds of Allâhu ta'âlâ are. And perfect, systematic deeds, in their turn, signify that their owner is highly

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

knowledgeable. For instance, when a person sees a beautiful handwriting, he will infer that the person who wrote it is learned and skilled in calligraphy. As a matter of fact, the hundred and sixty-fourth âyat of Baqara sûra purports, **"Certainly, creation of heavens,** [garnished with stars], **and earth,** [embroidered with mountains, seas, plants]; **nights and days following one another; ships travelling on the sea and carrying to people what they need; rains which Allâhu ta'âlâ pours from heaven and thus resuscitates the plants after the earth has dried up; all sorts of animals which He spreads over the earth; winds which He makes blow from all directions; clouds which float between heaven and earth with the command of Allâhu ta'âlâ; all** (these things) **bear evidences and lessons concerning the power and greatness of Allâhu ta'âlâ for those who have reason, wisdom and discernment."** The fifty-third âyat of Fussilat sûra purports, **"We shall show them** [Meccans] **our âyats** [the sun, moon, stars, trees, winds, rains, formation of a baby's limbs in its mother's womb, which signify our greatness] **both in the âfâq** [in heavens and on earth] **and in their very nafs** [the exquisite qualities and dissimilitudes in their creations]. **At last it shall be evident to them that what He** [Qur'ân al-kerîm and Rasûlullah] **said, is true."**

The expression 'âyats in the âfâq' in this âyat-i-kerîma is used to mean the worldly signs which denote the power of Allâhu ta'âlâ, such as heavens, stars, night and day, rays of the sun, darkness, shades, water, fire, earth, air. And what is meant by the 'âyats [signs] in the enfus' is those which are inside man, such as formation of child's limbs in mother's womb, [accomplishment of tremendous phenomena in an automatical and exceedingly fantastic manner, such as taking the oxygen from the air, burning it in the body, and expelling it in the form of carbon dioxide, taking substances of nutrition and drinks through the mouth, decomposing and digesting them, extracting their essence useful to body in the intestines and transferring it into blood, discharging their useless parts, functioning of the heart, the kidneys' filtering harmful matter from blood, ... etc.]. The hikmat of expressing the âfâqî (objective) and enfusî (subjective) proofs in these âyat-i-kerîmas is to make them know, [have îmân in, and worship] Allâhu ta'âlâ, who is far from being opposite from or identical with His born slaves, who knows everything, who is the owner of hikmat, and who is Almighty. In short, these immaculate and orderly Deeds signify that Allâhu ta'âlâ, their Owner and the Creator of all these phenomena, has perfect knowledge and

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

power. The 'Ulamâ of Kelâm have proved this by various evidences. For instance:

1 — Allâhu ta'âlâ is abstract. That is, He is not substantial [or material. He is not an element. He is not an alloy or a compound. He is not numerable. He cannot be measured. He cannot be calculated. No change occurs in Him. He is not dependent upon space. He is not at or in a place. He is not dependent upon time. He does not have an antecedent, a consequence, front, back, top, bottom, right, left. Therefore, the human thought, the human knowledge, the human mind cannot comprehend anything concerning Him]. And He, who is abstract, knows everything.

2 — Allâhu ta'âlâ, whose Person is sublime, knows His own Person. A creator who has this capacity knows others as well. Man's knowing means his mentally visualizing the essences of really existent objects in a manner free of their material beings. There is nothing unknown to Allâhu ta'âlâ. He knows the true essence of His Person. It is a known fact that he who knows himself will know others, too.

Allâhu ta'âlâ has created everything except Himself with or without a means. Knowing the creatures necessitates knowing the existence of a creator.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 15 —
A DISCOURSE ON POWER

It is known that Christians, while expressing that Allâhu ta'âlâ is the Almighty, impute impotence to Allâhu ta'âlâ. [As we have explained earlier in the text], the Taurah (Old Testament) has been interpolated. It is stated in the (interpolated copies of the) Taurah that Allâhu ta'âlâ, after creating the universe in six days, sat down and spent the seventh day resting. It is written at the beginning of the second chapter of Genesis, "And on the seventh day God ended his work which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made." "And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made." (Gen: 2-2, 3) [It is for this reason that Christians observe (Sunday), the seventh day of the week, as a day of rest and holiday and do no work then.]

Did Allâhu ta'âlâ, like a carpenter [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so], use some tools for His creation so that He was tired? It is stated as follows in the twenty-fourth and later verses of the thirty-second chapter of Genesis, [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying these things]: "And Jacob was left alone; and there wrestled a man with him until the breaking of the day." "And when he saw that he prevailed not against him, he touched the hollow of his thigh; and the hollow of Jacob's thigh was out of joint, as he wrestled with him." "And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me." "And he said unto him, What is thy name? And he said, Jacob." "And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel: for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed." (Gen: 32-24 to 28)

O Christians! Please do see reason. This would mean that Allâhu ta'âlâ grappled with a creature of His until morning and could not free Himself from the hold of Ya'qûb 'alaihis-salâm'! Could a god ever be so powerless? Certainly, Allâhu ta'âlâ is free from such imperfections.

According to the [pure] belief of Muslims, Allâhu ta'âlâ has

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

the power enough to create every dispensable being. He has the Attribute of Omnipotence. Omnipotence is an eternal Attribute and effects, creates whatever He wills [wishes]. All Muslims unanimously agree on this fact. Allâhu ta'âlâ is able to create everything that His Omnipotence wills to create. Every creature has come into being through His Omnipotence.

All the things which the Omnipotence of Allâhu ta'âlâ has willed to create are equal with respect to their creation. For they are dispensable beings, creatures. The Attribute of Omnipotence will not effect the Wâjib-ul-wujûd (Allâhu ta'âlâ) or the mumtani' (-ul-wujûd) [that which can never exist]. It is impossible to effect them [to will their creation]. Being dispensable, that is, its making no difference whether something exists or not, is an attribute commonly shared by all beings that are dispensable. All the dispensable beings [creatures] are liable to coming into being or ceasing to exist, depending on the effect of the Attribute of Power (Omnipotence). Capability of Allâhu ta'âlâ (to do anything He wishes) comes from His Person. This state is equal for all beings whose creation has been willed.

If the Power of Allâhu ta'âlâ were related to some creatures only, there would necessarily be a reason for this. And this, in its turn, would indicate that the greatness of Allâhu ta'âlâ were dependent on something [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so]. [For in this case there would have to be a reason to compel Allâhu ta'âlâ to allot His Power to some creatures], which, in turn, would mean imperfection. And imperfection cannot exist in Allâhu ta'âlâ.

According to Christians, Allâhu ta'âlâ is not Omnipotent [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so]. For it is stated in the Taurah, "(God said:) I shall go to Canaan with the Children of Israel. Let them blow the horn strongly so that I will hear it." According to Muslims' belief, Allâhu ta'âlâ hears and sees everything. Yet Allâhu ta'âlâ is free from media such as eyes and ears, [sound and light]. [He sees and hears without any intermediaries.]

According to Christians' credo, Allâhu ta'âlâ has entered Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. As we have stated earlier, they say "Jesus is a God from God, a Light from Light."

According to Muslims' belief, Allâhu ta'âlâ is far from entering something. For something enters something else through one of the following two ways: first, by entering the space it occupies; second, by entering its attributes. Allâhu ta'âlâ is far

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

from entering any space. Its evidence is that Allâhu ta'âlâ is free from place and far from being a part of something. For such dependencies as place and being a part of something are attributes peculiar to matter and material things. And it has already been proven that Allâhu ta'âlâ is not matter and does not have attributes peculiar to matter. All the 'Ulamâ have stated this fact unanimously. As for the impossibility for Allâhu ta'âlâ to enter something by way of entering its attributes; this sort of entering, like any other sort of entering, would run counter to the fact that Allâhu ta'âlâ is (Wâjib-ul-wujûd). For if something entered something else, it would certainly need the thing it were now in. On the other hand, none of these types of entering, whether it be an object's entering something else's place or its attributes' entering something else's essence or its shape's entering another substance or its attributes' entering its essence, would mean entering according to philosophers; they say that this is no more than having a characteristic. In short, when something enters a place, it will need that place. [And this, in its turn, is contradictory to being a god.]

According to Christians, Allâhu ta'âlâ is matter and an object. In fact, it is stated in the Taurah, in the twenty-seventh verse of the first chapter of Genesis, "So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; ..." (Gen: 1-27) Indeed, Christians make various pictures, cherubs, icons, [idols], put them in their churches, and worship them. They hold the belief that "God liveth in heavens. The earth is His foothold."

Allâhu ta'âlâ is far from this Christian credo and anything similar to this credo. In this respect there is agreement between Muslims and the ancient Greek philosophers.

Evidences of this fact are written in books of Kelâm.

Again, [as we have stated earlier in the text], Christians hold the belief that "Because of a venial mistake made by Âdam 'alaihis-salâm', all people and all Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm' who came to earth until the time of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', [because they were smeared with the depravity of the original sin], will be tormented in Hell, and Allâhu ta'âlâ, being at a loss as to how to forgive this (so-called) grave sin, [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so], had His only Son killed after various kinds of affronts and tortures in the hands of Jews, burned him eight days in Hell, and thus forgave the original sin."

According to Muslims' belief, there is no one above Allâhu ta'âlâ to command Him or to interrogate Him. Allâhu ta'âlâ is

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Ghafûr, that is, He has very much forgiveness, and He is Rahîm (merciful, compassionate). If a person has committed sins and died without repenting his sins and supplicating forgiveness, He will forgive him if He wills it be so; or He will torment him in return for his sins. [If He forgave all His born slaves and put them into Paradise, it would be compatible with His Kindness. And if He threw all His born slaves into Hell, it would be compatible with His Justice.] It is such an awkward thing to believe that Allâhu ta'âlâ found no other way than killing His only Son for the forgiveness of His born slaves. On the other hand, priests are travelling from one village to another, forgiving Christians' sins [in return for a certain sum of money], while popes are selling plots from Paradise inch by inch as [if] they possess[ed] the keys to Paradise and the title deeds of these plots. [We have already quoted, (and explained) the Biblical verses on which priests base these practices of theirs.]

As for the degree of respect [!] which Christians have for Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm'; they impute various sins to each Prophet. They would disapprove even the lowest priest's being qualified with these unpleasant adjectives which they impute to Prophets. Examples of these are the slanders such as Lût's 'alaihis-salâm' committing fornication with his blessed daughters when in ecstacy; (Gen: 19-33, 34, 35) Yahûda's (Judah) committing adultery with his daughter-in-law; (Gen: 38-13 to 18) Dâwûd's (David) 'alaihis-salâm' committing adultery with Uryâ's wife; (II Sam: 11-2, 3, 4) Suleymân's (Solomon) 'alaihis-salâm' worshipping idols.

The following principles of belief held by Christians are no less embarrassing than the slanders they direct to Prophets: While believing in the apostleship and even prophethood of the twelve Hawârîs of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', (they accept that) one of them, Judas (Iscariot) betrayed Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to the Jews in return for a bribe of thirty dirhams; [on the night when Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was arrested by the Jews, (according to Christians)], a rooster crowed three times and Peter the Apostle denied knowing Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' three times, each time the rooster crowed; Paul, who had believers of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' killed with various kinds of torture for sixteen to seventeen years and had one of the Apostles flayed alive, is believed, by Christians, to have become a believer, to be more virtuous than Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', to have substituted baptism for circumcision, and diet for the worship of fasting, which is enjoined clearly in the Bible and in the Taurah,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and to have changed many of the Mosaic and Biblical laws.

In order to ascribe divinity to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', Christians impute a sin to every Prophet. In a debate between Muslims and Christians, a priest who asserted that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was divine was asked by an Islamic savant what his proofs were. He answered that he had four proofs, and cited them as follows:

"My first proof is that he was created without a father," he said. When the Islamic scholar said, "Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' was created not only without a father, but also without a mother. Also, angels were created both without a father and without a mother. [Angels are not male or female.] Then, Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' and angels must be accepted as divine like Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so]," the priest **could not answer** him. Then he went on and asserted his second proof.

"My second proof is that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' resuscitated dead people," he said. Upon this the Islamic scholar interrogated, "As it is written in the Taurah, a couple of Israelite Prophets also resuscitated dead people. In fact, Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' animated the inert rod. These people, too, must be sons of Allâhu ta'âlâ [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so]." The priest **could not answer** this, either. Then he passed on to his third proof.

"My third proof is Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' ascension to heaven," he said. Upon this the Islamic savant said, "You say that Îsâ "alaihis-aslam' was lifted up to heaven after being killed along with many insults. Christians and Muslims unanimously believe that Idris 'alaihis-salâm', too, was lifted up to heaven in an honourable and dignified manner and when he was alive. Accordingly, Idris 'alaihis-salâm' would necessarily be more worthy of being a son to Allâhu ta'âlâ." The priest **could not answer** this, either. Then he passed on to his fourth proof.

"Every Prophet committed a sin, but Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' did not. This is an attribute of divinity," he said. When the Islamic scholar asked, "Which Prophets committed sins?", he said, "(For example), David (Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm') did." Upon this the Islamic scholar said, "O priest! This statement of yours makes you more evil, more repugnant than Jews. For the appositive 'Jesus, the son of David' is written in all the four Gospels. If what you said were true and Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm' were an adulterer, [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying so], then Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' would be acknowledging that he were an illegitimate child [may Allâhu ta'âlâ protect us from saying or thinking so] by saying that he is the son of Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm'. Could there be any doubts

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

as to this deduction? O priest! You are on the one hand promoting Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' to divinity in power, and on the other hand downgrading him to an illegitimate son. There is a great contradiction between these two." The priest, once again, **could not answer.** Extremely humiliated and utterly dumbfounded, he left the place.

Another consternating paradox Christians fall into in their belief system is that, while imputing sins to all the Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm', whom Allâhu ta'âlâ has chosen from among His born slaves and sent forth (as Messengers) to people as a great favour and kindness (to humanity), they believe that the Popes whom they have chosen from among themselves are innocent. What a smug fatuity! The second âyat of Hashr sûra purports, **"O thee people of discernment!** [Observe the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ, meditate (over them), and] **take lessons."**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

[This chapter is the translation of the ninety-second chapter of the first section of the (Turkish) book **(Se'âdet-i-Ebediyye)**[1].]

— 16 —
ÎSÂ 'alaihis-salâm' WAS HUMAN HE IS NOT TO BE WORSHIPPED

A committee of Christians from Nejrân came to our master, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'. Nejrân is a city between Hidjâz and Yemen. They were sixty horsemen, twenty-four of whom were eminent chiefs. Their spokesman was named Abdulmesîh. A man named Abdulhâris bin Alqama was the most learned one among them. He had read about the signs of the latest time's Prophet in the Bible. Yet his aspiration for worldly ranks and ambition for fame would not let him become a Muslim. Being well-known for his knowledge, he was revered by kaisers and obeyed by churches. They arrived in Medina and entered the Mesjîd-i-sherîf after the late afternoon prayer. They wore adorned priestly garments. It being their time for prayer, they stood for prayer in the Mesjîd-i-sherîf, and Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said, **"Let them pray."** They performed their prayer eastwards. Their three leaders began to talk. During the conversation, they referred to Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' now as 'God', then as the 'Son of God', now as 'One of Three Gods.' They called him 'God' "because," they said, "he resuscitated the dead, cured ill people, informed about the unknown, made birds from mud, breathed life into them and made them fly." He was called the 'Son of God' because "he did not have a father." He was, according to them, "One of Three Gods," because "God Himself uses such expressions as 'We have made,' 'We have created.' If He were one, He would say. 'I have made,' 'I have created,' " they said. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' invited them to the (Islamic) religion. He recited a few âyat-i-kerîmas. They would not believe. "We had believed before you did," they said. Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' said, **"You are lying! A**

[1] This book, **(Se'âdet-i-ebediyye)**, a treasure of knowledge, has been partly translated into English, in fascicles titled **(Endless Bliss).**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

person who says that Allah has a son cannot have believed." "If he is not the Son of God, then who is his father," they said.

Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated, **"Do not you know? Allâhu ta'âlâ never dies, and He, alone, keeps everything in existence. But Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was nonexistent, and he shall cease to exist again."**

They said, "Yes, we know."

Rasûlullah, **"Do not you know? Is there any child which is unlike its father?"**

They said, "Every child will resemble its father. [The young of a sheep will be like the sheep.]

Rasûlullah, **"Do not you know? Our Rabb** (Allâhu ta'âlâ) **creates, grows, sustains everything. Yet Îsâ** 'alaihis-salâm' **did not do any of these."**

They said, "No, he did not."

Rasûlullah, **"Our Rabb created Îsâ** 'alaihis-salâm' **as He willed, didn't He?"**

They said, "Yes, He did."

Rasûlullah, **"Our Rabb does not eat or drink. No change occurs in Him. Do you know this, too?"**

They said, "Yes, we do."

Rasûlullah, **"Îsâ** 'alaihis-salâm' **had a mother. He came to the world like any other child. He was fed like other children. He would eat, drink, and dispose of waste matter. You know this, too, don't you?"**

They said, "Yes, we do."

Rasûlullah, **"Then, how could Îsâ** 'alaihis-salâm' **be as you think he is?"**

They could not answer and remained silent for a while. Then they said:

"O Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'! Don't you say that Jesus is 'The Word of Allah, and a Soul from Him'?"

Rasûlullah said, **"Yes,** (I do)."

They said, "Then this will be enough for us," and resumed their stubborn stance.

Upon this, Allâhu ta'âlâ ordered (Rasûlullah) to challenge them to mubâhala (cursing one another). So Rasûlullah 'sallallâhu alaihi wasallam' said, "If you do not believe me, then come on and let us make mubâhala, that is, let us say, 'May Allâhu ta'âlâ damn him who is lying!' " This commandment of

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Allâhu ta'âlâ is cited in the sixty-first âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra. One of them, who was named Sherhabîl and was called 'Sayyid' by his colleagues, convened them and said, "He evinces all sorts of qualifications that would make him a Prophet. If we made mubâhala with him, we would certainly incur a catastrophic scourge that would devastate not only us, but also all our descendants!" So, being afraid to make mubâhala, they said, "O Muhammad 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'! We want to remain friends with you. We will give you whatever you want. Let a trustworthy person among your Sahâba accompany us back home, and we shall give him our taxes."

Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated, **"I shall send an extremely trustworthy person along with you."** As the As-hâb-i-kirâm 'alaihimur-ridwân' awaited in submissive silence, eager to know who would be honoured with the exalted Prophet's trust, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' ordered, **"Stand up, O Abâ Ubaydah!"** Declaring, **"This** (person) **is the** (most) **trustworthy among my Ummat** (Muslims)," he sent him along with them.

A peace treaty was made under the following terms: They were to give two thousand sets of clothing every year. One thousand of them would be given in the (Arabic) month of Rajab, and the remaining one thousand in the month of Safer. Forty dirhams [135 grams] of silver would be added to each set of clothing. Sometime later Abdulmesîh, their chief, and Sherhabîl, their Sayyid, became Muslims and were honoured with taking service with Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam.'

The **(Holy Bible),** which Christians have translated into all languages and spread all over the world, contains the following statements in the fourth, fifth, six and seventh verses of the sixth chapter of (Deuteronomy), (fifth book) of the Old Testament: "Hear, O Israel: The LORD our God is one LORD:" "And thou shalt love the LORD thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and all thy might." "And these words which I command thee this day, shall be in thine heart:" "And thou shalt teach them diligently unto thy children, ..." (Deut: 6-4, 5, 6, 7)

The fifth and sixth verses of the forty-fifth chapter of the Book of Esh'iyâ (Isaiah) reads as follows: [I am the LORD, and there is none else, there is no God beside me: ..." "That they may know from the rising of the sun, and from the west, that there is none beside me. I am the LORD, and there is none else." (Is: 45-5, 6)

And it is stated in its twenty-second verse: "Look unto me,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

and be ye saved, all the ends of the earth: for I am God, and there is none else." (ibid: 45-22)

The ninth verse of its forty-sixth chapter states: "... for I am God, and there is none else; I am God, and there is none like me." (ibid: 46-9) Christians' Holy Bible says, "Allah is One. There is nothing like Him." They deny their own Book. May Allâhu ta'âlâ give them wisdom and reason! May He bless them with realizing the truth, so that they will stop deceiving themselves and misleading others!

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 17 —

ÎSÂ 'alaihis-salâm' IS A PROPHET HE IS NOT TO BE WORSHIPPED

Imâm-i Fakhr-ud-dîn Râzî 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', a great Islamic scholar, and the author of the book **(Tafsîr-i kebîr)** and many other valuable books, gives the following account in his interpretation of the sixty-first âyat-i-kerîma of Âl-i-'Imrân sûra:

I was in the city of Hârezm. I heard that a priest had come to the city and was trying to spread Christianity. I went to him. We began to talk. He asked me, "What is the evidence showing that Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is the Prophet?" I gave the following answer:

Fakhr-ud-dîn Râzî — As there are narratives reporting that Mûsâ, Îsâ and other Prophets 'alaihimus-salâm' displayed wonders and miracles, so it has been reported that Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' displayed miracles. These reports are in forms of narratives. You either accept or refuse reports coming in forms of narratives. If you refuse them and say that a miracle does not prove a person's prophethood, then you should also deny the other Prophets whose miracles have been reported to us through narratives. If you admit the truth of the reports coming through narratives and believe that a person who has displayed miracles is a Prophet, then you should accept also that Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is a Prophet. For Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' displayed miracles, which have been reported to us through authentic narratives called **(Tawâtur).** Since you believe other Prophets' prophethood because of the miracles reported through narratives, you should believe that Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' is the Prophet!

The priest — I believe that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is a god, not a Prophet.

[God means ma'bud (that which, or who, is, or is to be, worshipped). Anything which is worshipped is called a god. The name of Allâhu ta'âlâ is Allah, not God. There is no ilâh (god) besides Allâhu ta'âlâ. It would be a very vile mistake to say 'God'

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

instead of 'Allah'.]

Fakhr-ud-dîn Râzî — We are talking about prophethood now. We have to settle the question of prophethood before passing on to divinity. Moreover, you are wrong to say that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is a god. For a god has to exist always. Material beings, objects, things that occupy spaces cannot be gods. And Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was matter, human. He came into existence from nonexistence and was, according to you, killed. He was a child and grew up. He ate and drank. He spoke as we do. He would go to bed, sleep, wake up, and walk. Like any other human being, he needed a number of things to live. Could a person in need ever be Ghanî (who is in possession of everything)? Could something that came into existence from nothing, exist eternally? Could something that changes be everlasting, eternal?

You say that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' ran away and hid himself but the Jews arrested him and hanged him. You say that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was very sad then and had recourse to various ways to escape. If he had been a god or if a piece of God had entered him, would not he have defended himself against the Jews and even destroyed them? Why did he feel sad and look for a place to hide himself? I would swear on the name of Allah that this paradox appals me. How could a reasonable person make or believe these statements? Reason testifies against these statements.

You have three different assertions:

1 — You say that he is a visible, substantial god. To say that the god of the universe is Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', the substantial god incarnate, would mean to say that the Jews killed the god of the universe, since (you believe that) they killed him (Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'). In that case the universe must have been deprived of its god, which is impossible. Furthermore, is it possible for a weakling whom the Jews arrested and killed unjustly to have been the god of the universe?

Another fact reported through narratives is that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' worshipped Allâhu ta'âlâ very much and was very much fond of praying. If Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' were a god, he would not worship or pray. For a god will never worship himself. [On the contrary, others will worship him.]

This is another evidence showing that the priest is wrong.

2 — You say that God has entered him completely and (therefore) he is the Son of God. This belief is wrong. For God cannot be an object or an attribute. It is impossible for God to

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

enter an object. If God were an object He would enter another object. When something enters an object it will become an object and the components of the two objects will be mixed with each other. And this, in its turn, will mean God's being broken. If God were an attribute, then He would need a space, a place, which would mean God's needing something. And he who needs something cannot be a god. [What was the reason for God's entering Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'? His entering Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' without any reason to do so would mean terjîh-i-bi-lâ murej-jih, which, as we have explained while proving the unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ, is out of the question.]

3 — You say that he is not a god but a part of God has entered him and settled in him. If the part which (is supposed to have) entered him were a component part of God, then God should have completely lost His capacity of being God with the departure of that component part. If that part did not have any function in God's being God, then it should not have been a part from God. Hence, God has not entered him.

Now, what is your other evidence to prove that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was a god?

The priest — He is a god because he resuscitated the dead, opened the eyes of people who were blind from birth, and cured the disease called leprosy resulting in itchy patches on the skin. Only God could make such things.

Fakhr-ur-dîn Râzî — Could it be asserted that when there is no evidence for the existence of something it must be nonexistent? If you say that absence of evidence proves non-existence of the thing whose existence would otherwise be inferred from the evidence, it will mean to say that the Creator of the universe did not exist before creating the universe, that is, in the eternal past. And this inference, in its turn, is quite wrong. For the universe [all creatures] is an evidence for the existence of the Creator.

If you say that absence of evidence does not necessarily mean nonexistence of the thing whose existence were to be inferred from the evidence, you will have accepted the existence of the Creator in eternity, when creatures did not exist yet. On the other hand, if you say that God entered Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in eternity, when he was nonexistent, you will need evidence to prove it. Otherwise, you will have accepted it without evidence. For Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was created afterwards. His nonexistence in eternity shows nonexistence of evidence. Since you believe

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

without evidence that God entered Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', how do you know He did not enter me, you, animals, plants, stones? Why don't you believe without evidence that He entered all these things?

The priest — It is obvious that God entered Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and He did not enter you, me, or other beings. You, I, or other beings did not display such wonders. We infer from this that He entered him, and not us or other beings.

Fakhr-ud-dîn Râzî — You assert that Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' displaying miracles is an evidence for God's having entered him. Why do you say that absence of evidence, that is, not displaying miracles, shows that God should not have entered. You cannot say that God will not enter you, me, or other creatures because we do not have wonders or miracles. For we have already proved that absence of evidence does not necessarily mean that something does not exist. Accordingly, God's entering something does not have to do with the appearing of wonders and miracles. Then, you will have to believe also that God has entered me, you, cats, dogs, mice. Now, could a religious system which leads to believing that God has entered these humble creatures ever be a true religion?

It is more difficult to make a viper or a serpent from a rod than it is to resuscitate a dead person. For a rod and a serpent are in no way similar. You believe that Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' transformed the rod into a viper and yet do not call him 'God' or 'Son of God.' Why do you call Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' 'God' or ascribe divinity to him?

Unable to find an answer to this argumentation of mine, the priest had to remain silent. This chapter has been translated from the (Turkish) book **(Se'âdet-i Ebediyye).**

O priest! We wish that you explain the belief systems of these two religions to philosophers who do not belong to either religion or to other wise and reasonable people, ask them which of these two religions they find logical, factual and beautiful, and be true to your advice, "One should compare the two religions, and then accept the one which is beautiful," which you suggest in your book **(Ghadâ-ul-mulâhazât).**

Allâhu ta'âlâ, alone, will grant guidance and assistance.

In order to mislead Muslims and Christianize them, priests wrote many books. The Islamic 'Ulamâ wrote answers to the lies in these books, and thus protected Muslims from falling into the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

pit of Christianity. One of these answers is the Turkish book **(Îzâh-ul-Merâm),** which was written by Abdullah Abdî bin Destan Mustafâ 'rahmatullâhi alaihimâ' and was published in Istanbul in 1288 [A.D. 1871]. He was from Manastir (Bitolj), and passed away in 1303 [A.D. 1896].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 18 —
CONCERNING THE FOUR GOSPELS

The four Gospels, which form the basis of Christians' religion and which they name the Bible are not the genuine Injîl-i sherîf which Allâhu ta'âlâ sent down with Jebrâîl (Gabriel) 'alaihissalâm'. These four Gospels are history books written by four different people after Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' ascension to heaven. One of them, **(Matthew),** is said to be one of the Apostles. Twelve years after Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' ascension to heaven, upon the repeated earnest requests of his friends, he wrote a book titled **(Mîlâd-i-Îsâ),** in which he related what he had seen and heard. The second one, **(Mark),** wrote twenty-eight years later what he had heard from the Apostles. The third one, **(Luke),** wrote a book of history thirty-two years later in Alexandria in order to narrate what he had heard. The fourth one **(John),** is said to have been one of the Apostles. Forty-five years after Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' ascension to heaven, he wrote a biography of Îsâ 'alaihissalâm'.

The **Injîl** (Evangel), sent down by Allâhu ta'âlâ, was only one Book. It is an absolute fact that that heavenly Book did not contain any contradictory, inconsistent writings. These four books, on the other hand, teem with paradoxical lies. It is written in all of them that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was killed by crucifixion. On the other hand, it is declared clearly in Qur'ân al-kerîm that someone else was killed in lieu of him and that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was elevated to heaven alive as he was. If these four Gospels were really Word of Allâhu ta'âlâ, they would not contain any reports belying one another, for there will not be any paradoxical statements in the Word of Allâhu ta'âlâ. These Gospels contain reports that have nothing to do with the facts heard from Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and some of them are reports of events that happened after his ascension to heaven. This fact is admitted by priests, too. The lies in these books are quoted and answered in the book **(Al-a'lâm fî-beyân-i mâfî-dîn-in-Nasârâ)**, written by Imâm-i-Qurtubî,[1] in the book **(Hidâyat-ul-Hiyârâ fî-ajwibat-il-**

[1] Muhammad Qurtubî passed away in 671 [A.D. 1272].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

yahûd-i-wa-n-Nasârâ), written by Ibn-ul-Qayyim-i Jawziyya,[1] and in the book **(Tahjîl man-harraf al-Injîl),** written by Sâlih Su'ûdî Mâlikî. Also, detailed information is given in the books **(Asâmî-ul-kutub)** and **(Kesf-uz-zunûn),** written by Ahmad Efendi of Taşköprü and Kâtib Çelebi 'rahmatullâhi ta'âlâ alaihim'. Sâlih wrote his book in 942 [A.D. 1535].

The genuine Injîl does not exist anywhere. In fact, most priests deny the existence of a heavenly Book called (Injîl). According to a narrative, after Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' ascension to heaven, the Jews burned, or somehow destroyed, that book. At that time the Injîl was not widely known yet. For Îsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' period of prophethood was about three years. And those who believed him were quite few, most of whom were illiterate peasants. For this reason, another copy of the Injîl-i-sherîf could not be written. Only, Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had committed it to his memory. Or, we might as well conjecture that during the destruction of fifty Gospels in the three hundred and twenty-fifth year of the Christian era priests, thinking it was one of those false Gospels, must have destroyed it, too. In those days there were forty to fifty irreconcilable Gospels. There were religious controversies which mostly ended in furious bloodbaths among the upholders of those Gospels. It is written in the ecclesiastical histories that during the trial of Arius, four of those Gospels were sanctioned and the others were disallowed. An Anglican priest conducted a search of the forbidden Gospels, translated the ones he had found into English, and published them in London in 1236 [A.D. 1280], adding a list of the Gospels he had not been able to find. Ahmad Fârisî Efendi, owner of the newspaper **(Al-jawâib),** translated this publication into Arabic. A list of those books called (Gospels) has been added to our book **(Samsâmiyya).**

Because Christians believe that these four Gospels and the books which they possess in the names of **(Taurah)** and **(Zebûr)** are heavenly books, we call them **Ahl-i-kitâb** (People of the Book). The statements quoted as having been made by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' in these four Gospels are of doubtful origin and can never be authentic documents because they are among those narratives called (haber-i-wâhid), versus those authentic narratives called (mutawâtir). Mark and Luke, for instance, were disciples to Paul and had never seen Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. And Paul, in his turn, as Luke writes in the ninth chapter of **(Acts of the**

---

[1] Ibn Qayyim Muhammad passed away in 751 [A.D. 1350].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Apostles), had not seen Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' but came forward with the claim that "Jesus revealed himself to him from heaven" after Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' had been elevated to heaven. Nor is it something believable that they wrote the stories they had heard from the Apostles. For they did not give the names and biographies of the people from whom they are supposed to have heard these stories, but wrote them in a manner as if they had seen Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and heard them from him. Historians classify such stories as lies and slanders. For instance, it is written in the twenty-sixth chapter of **(Matthew)** and in the fourteenth chapter of **(Mark)** that "On the night when the Jews came to arrest Jesus the eleven Apostles who were with him ran away and **(Peter),** who was their chief, watched the event from a distance, followed the Jews taking Jesus until they reached the chief Rabbi's home and then, being frightened, he fled;" and it is written in the four Gospels that the Jews arrested Jesus and "treated him in such and such a way" and "he said to them so and so," in the direct style of a person who saw these events. It is evident that these stories are the lies and slanders that they must have heard from Jews.

If it should be asserted that "Three days later Jesus resurrected from his grave and related the events he had undergone. The stories written in the Gospels, therefore, are not the Jews' fabrications but Jesus' own reports;" this argument will be rebutted by the narrative that "As the Jews interred the corpse of the person they had killed on the cross, they realized that it was not Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', and lest others should find out they secretly exhumed the corpse and buried it somewhere else and then lied and slandered, 'The Apostles stole the corpse from the grave.' " They acknowledge themselves that the report stating that "he resurrected from his grave," is not true. It is written in the last chapter of **(Mark),** "Jesus was resurrected and first showed himself to Mary Magdalene. And she went to the Apostles and told them. They would not believe." **(John)** writes in the twentieth chapter that even Mary thought that the person she saw was a gardener. If it is asserted that "Jesus knew what he was going to experience and told his Apostles that he would resurrect three days later," its answer will be, "Then, they would not have doubted when Mary told them that she had seen him. As a matter of fact, they would have come to his grave and awaited his resurrection."

[Today, all Christians believe that the four Gospels sanctioned

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

by the Nicene council are the Injíl that had descended from heaven. **Trinity,** written in the Gospel of John, is the basis of their faith. In other words, they say that Jesus is a god or the son of God. They say, "The single, eternal God loves him very much and does and creates whatever he wishes Him to. Therefore, whatever we need, we ask from him. With this intention, we entreat him and our idols, which represent him. 'God' or 'the son (of God)' means 'person loved very much.' To say that he is the son of God means to say that God loves him very much." People who hold this belief are called **Ahl-i-kitâb** (People of the Book). Those Christians who say that "he (Jesus) is eternal and creates everything from nothing" are **mushrik** (polytheists). Since they deny Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', that is, because they are not Muslims, they are all disbelievers.]

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 19 —
JUDAISM — THE TAURAH — TALMUD

The Îsâwî (Nazarene) religion is a continuation of the Sharî'at of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. It will therefore be useful to give some information about Jews and their Holy Book. First, we shall present a brief history of Judaism:

Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' is one of those Prophets who are called Ulul-azm. He was neither a Jew, nor a Christian. He was a true Muslim. Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' is the forefather of the Israelites, that is, Jews, and of the Arabs. He is at the same time one of the grandfathers of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm'.

The capital of Chaldea was Babylon. Their kings were called **Nemrûd** (Nimrod). At that time Chaldeans worshipped the moon, the sun and stars. They had made various idols to represent these celestial beings. Nimrods, too, were among these idols. Allâhu ta'âlâ sent forth Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' as a Prophet to them. Yet they would not have îmân. They wanted to burn that blessed Prophet in a fire, but Allâhu ta'âlâ made the fire salvation for him. This fire, which they made after piling up wood for many days, became a verdure for him. Although they saw this miracle, most of them would still not have îmân. Ibrâhîm 'alaihis-salâm' went to Egypt. Then, commanded by Allâhu ta'âlâ, he returned to Palestine. After Ibrâhîm's 'alaihis-salâm' death, his son, Is-haq (Isaac) 'alaihis-salâm', became the Prophet, and after Is-haq 'alaihis-salâm' prophethood was granted to his son, Ya'qûb (Jacob) 'alaihis-salâm'. Another name of Ya'qûb 'alaihis-salâm' was Isrâîl (Israel). Therefore, people descending from the twelve sons of Ya'qûb 'alaihis-salâm' are called **(Benî Isrâîl),** which means 'the sons of Isrâîl', (or Iraelites). Yûsuf (Joseph) 'alaihis-salâm', one of Ya'qûb's 'alaihis-salâm' sons, was envied by his brothers. They threw him into a well and lied to Ya'qûb 'alaihis-salâm', saying that he was dead. Then he was saved by some travellers going by the well. They took him out of the well, took him along to Egypt, and sold him as a slave there. His purchaser was Azîz (Potiphar), Egypt's Minister of the Exchequer. He took Yûsuf 'alaihis-salâm' to his home. His wife, Zelîha, fell in love

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

with him. But when Yûsuf 'alaihis-salâm' refused her, she slandered him. Upon this slander, Yûsuf 'alaihis-salâm' was imprisoned in a dungeon. Later, when he interpreted a dream of Pharaoh, the Egyptian Ruler, he was taken out of the dungeon and was made Egypt's Minister of the Exchequer by the Pharaoh. Yûsuf 'alaihis-salâm' brought his father Ya'qûb 'alaihis-salâm' and his brothers to Egypt from Canaan, that is, from (today's) Palestine. The Pharaoh treated Ya'qûb 'alaihis-salâm' and his children with respect and deep interest. Thus the Israelites settled in Egypt, where they led a comfortable life for a while. Later, however, they were subjected to countless torments and persecutions and were reduced to slavery. Who saved them from these troubles and took them to the **(Ard-i-Maw'ûd),** that is, to the Promised Land [Palestine], was Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' was raised in Pharaoh's palace and by Pharaoh himself. When he reached forty years of age, he left the palace and began to live with his kin, especially with his elder brother Hârûn (Aaron).

One day he saw an Egyptian unbeliever [a gypsy] bullying an Israelite. As he tried to rescue him, the gypsy died. Being frightened, Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' fled to the Median city (Midian) in the vicinity of Tebuk.[1] There, he married the daughter of Shu'ayb (Jethro) 'alaihis-salâm', and served him ten years. Then he left for Egypt. On the way, on Mount Tûr (Sinai), he spoke with Allâhu ta'âlâ. When he arrived in Egypt, he invited the Pharaoh to the religion of Allâhu ta'âlâ. He asked him to grant freedom to the Israelites. The Pharaoh refused it and said, "Moses is a powerful magician. He wants to cheat us out of our country." He asked his viziers what they thought. They advised him to convene the magicians to outvie him. The magicians came and, as the Egyptians watched, they dropped the ropes they were holding in their hands on to the ground. Each of the ropes changed into a snake and began to crawl towards Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Upon this, Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' left his rod to the ground. It became a gigantic serpent and swallowed (all) the snakes. Bewildered, the magicians became Believers. The Pharaoh became angry and said, "So he was your master. I shall have your hands and feet cut off and hang you all on date branches." They said, "We believe Mûsâ. We trust ourselves to his Rabb (Allah). Him, alone, do we beg for forgiveness and mercy." The water

[1] An Arabian town, about half way between Medina and Damascus.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

which the unbelievers had been using became blood. It rained frogs. Cutaneous diseases broke out and spread. Darkness fell and the whole country remained in darkness for three days. Awed by these miracles, the Pharaoh permitted the Israelites to leave Egypt. However, as Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and the Israelites were on their way to Jerusalem, the Pharaoh repented having let them go and, rallying his army, fell to follow them. The Suez Isthmus opened and the Believers walked to the other side. As the Pharaoh, too, was passing to the other side, the sea closed in, drowning him and his army. The Israelites saw people worshipping an ox on their way, and said to Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', "We wish to have a god like this." Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' answered them. "There is no god other than Allâhu ta'âlâ. Allâhu ta'âlâ saved you." Then they wandered into a wilderness called Tîh, where they lost their way and suffered dire deprivation of food and drink. (Menn) and (Selva), that is, manna and meat, rained down from heaven. They ate these. When he tapped the ground with his rod, water came out. And they drank this water. They hurt Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' by saying. "We are tired of manna and meat. We wish other things such as broad-beans and onions." For this reason they remained in the wilderness for forty years. Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', leaving Hârûn 'alaihis-salâm' for his place, went to Mount Tûr (Sinai), where he prayed for forty days. He heard the Word of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Allâhu ta'âlâ sent down the Holy Book **(Taurah)** and the Ten Commandments inscribed on two tablets. A munafîq (hypocrite) named Sâmirî collected gold wares and ornaments from the people, melted them, and made a gold calf. He said, "This is Moses' god. Worship this." So they began to worship it. They would not listen to Hârûn's 'alaihis-salâm' remonstrations. When Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' came back and saw their practices, he was very angry. He cursed Sâmirî. He held his elder brother's beard and reproached him. They repented and begged him for forgiveness. Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' preached them the Taurah and the Ten Commandments. They began to perform their worships as prescibed in the Taurah. Afterwards, they deviated from the right course again and finally parted into seventy-one sects.

Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and his ummat went to the region south of the Dead Sea. He made war against a king named **Ûj bin Ûnq** (King of Bashan). He captured the land east of the Sharî'a River. He climbed the mountain opposite Erîha City. He saw the land of Canaan from the distance. Then, leaving his place to Yûshâ

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

(Joshua) 'alaihis-salâm', he passed away there, according to a narrative, 1605 years before the birth of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', when he was one hundred and twenty (120) years old. Yûshâ 'alaihis-salâm' captured Erîha City, and then Jerusalem, from the Amalekites, who were heathens.

Some time later, Dâwûd (David) 'alaihis-salâm' became the king. He recaptured Jerusalem. Thus the most prosperous period in the Jewish history commenced. Afterwards, Suleymân (Solomon) 'alaihis-salâm', (who succeeded Dâwûd 'alaihis-salâm'), had the renowned temple, that is, the **Mesjîd-i Aqsâ** (Al-Aqsâ) built on the site which had been reserved and prepared by his father. Suleymân 'alaihis-salâm' had the **(Tâbût-i-sekîna),** that is, the Ark of the Covenant, which contained the Taurah and the other keepsakes such as the Ten Commandments and the tablets whereon the Ten Commandments (Decalogue) were written, placed in a room of the temple.

The Jewish nation, who were composed of twelve tribes, parted into two disparate kingdoms after Suleymân's 'alaihis-salâm' death. Ten tribes made up the Israelite Kingdom, (established by Jeroboam), and the remaining two tribes, (namely Judah and Benjamen), formed the Judah Kingdom. Later, indulging in their passions for excess, they swerved from the right way, plunged into depravities, and eventually incurred the Divine Wrath. The Israelite Kingdom was demolished by the Assyrians in 721 B.C., and later the Judah Kingdom was abolished by the Babylonians, in 586 B.C. The Assyrians invaded Babylonia. In 587, the Assyrian King Buht-un-nasar (Nebuchadnezzar) burned and devastated Jerusalem. He killed most of the Jews and exiled the rest to Babylon. During these tumults the heavenly Book, Taurah, was burned. This original Taurah was a huge Book. In other words, it was composed of forty parts. Each part was made up of a thousand sûras (chapters), and each sûra contained a thousand âyats (verses). No one but Uzeyr (Ezra or Esdras) 'alaihis-salâm' had memorized this colossal Book. He taught the Taurah to the Jews again. In the course of time, however, it was mostly forgotten, and largely interpolated. Various people wrote whatever they remembered of its verses, and thus a variety of books appeared in the name of Taurah. A rabbi named Azrâ (Ezra) who lived some four hundred years before the birth of Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm', compiled them and wrote today's Taurah, which is called the Old Testament. When the Iranian king Shîreveyh routed the Assyrians, he permitted the Jews to go back to Jerusalem. After 520 B.C. the

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Jews restored the Mesjîd-i-Aqsâ. For some time they lived under Persian domination, then the Macedonians took them under their sway. In 63 B.C. Jerusalem was captured by the Roman General Pompey.[1] He burned and destroyed the Mesjîd-i-Aqsâ. Thus the Jews went under the Romans' dominance. In 20 B.C. Herod, the Romans' Jewish governor in Palestine, had the temple rebuilt. Later the Jews revolted against the Roman domination. Yet, in A.D. 70, the Roman general Titus[2] thoroughly burned and destroyed Jerusalem. He turned the city into a pile of ruins. Beyt-i-muqaddes was burned, too, and only its Western wall remained standing. This wall is now called **(Wailing Wall).** This wall has maintained the national and religious **esprit de corps** in the Jewish community alive for years. Belief in a promised Messiah is another contribution to the prolonged survival of this feeling. The wall was specially protected and the temple was restored by the Byzantines, and then by the Umayyads, and finally by the Ottomans.

After Titus' massacres and cruelties, the Jews left Palestine in groups. They were expelled from Jerusalem and its territories. The Jewish slaves were sent to Egypt, where they were ruled as slaves by the Romans. It was an epoch when the Jews spread all over the world.

Jewry has adopted two disparate sources of commandments for Judaism: 1- Written Commandments; 2- Oral Commandments.

According to Jews, **Torah** and **Talmud** are the two basic Holy Books. The former contains the written commandments, and the latter includes the oral commandments.

The book Torah is called the **Old Testament** by Christians. Jews have divided Torah into three sections: 1- **Taurah,** or Torah (Law, Pentateuch); 2- **Neviim,** or the Prophets; 3- **Ketûbîm,** or the Scriptures (Hagiographa).

Torah is an acronym formed by the initial letters of the Hebrew counterparts of the three words given above. Neviim (the Prophets) is composed of two subdivisions; the Major Prophets, which consists of six[3] books; the Minor Prophets, made up of fifteen books. Ketûbîm, that is, the Scriptures (Writings), is

---

[1] Gnaeus Pompey (106-48 B.C.)

[2] Titus (A.D. 39-81) was the Roman emperor from A.D. 79 to 81.

[3] This number is four in the Hebrew Bible and in all the modern Bibles, and six in Septuagint, the Greek version, and in Vulgate, the Latin version. These two versions of the Bible include the Apochrypha.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

composed of eleven books according to Jews, and fifteen books in Christians' belief.

Jews believe that the five books which they call Taurah have been sent by Allâhu ta'âlâ down to Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. These five books are **(Genesis), (Exodus), (Leviticus), (Numbers), (Deuteronomy)**. It is written about the old age and death of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm', how old he was and how he was buried when he was dead and how the Jews mourned for him in Deuteronomy [Deut: 34]. How does it happen that these reports, which are about the events that are supposed to have taken place after Mûsâ's 'alaihis-salâm' death, are written in a book which is alleged to have been revealed to Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'? This factual hiatus is one of the clear proofs testifying to the fact that the existing Taurah is not in its pristine purity as it was revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ and taught by Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.

As it is stated in the book (History of the Jews) by H.Hirch Graetzin, a Jewish clergyman, Jews established the **(Assembly of the Seventies)** in order to keep their community strictly obedient to the Pentateuchal commandments, and called the head of this assembly **(Chief Rabbi).** Jewish theologians who teach young Jewish people their religion in schools and preach the Taurah are called **(Scribes).** Some of their explanations and amendments of the Taurah have been inserted into the copies of the Taurah written afterwards. These are the scribes mentioned in the Gospels. Another task of these people is to make Jews obedient to the Taurah.

There is yet another version of the Taurah, and it is rejected by most Jews. It is called **(Tora ha-Shomranim)**. Believers of this Torah have always been opposed to the explanations and additions made by these scribes to the Taurah, even if it were a change of one letter. It is reported that there are some six thousand differences between the Taurah possessed by Jews and the Taurah Shomranim.

Christians use the term **Old Testament** (Ahd-i-Atîk) for the book Torah. Jews reject this term.

There is no doubt that the book they call Taurah today is not the genuine Taurah revealed to Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' by Allâhu ta'âlâ. There is a duration of two thousand years between the time when the earliest of these copies of the Taurah was written and the time when Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' lived. Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' advised the scholars of his ummat to preserve the Taurah in the **Tâbût-i-sekîna (Ark of the Covenant)**. When Suleymân 'alaihis-

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

salâm' built the **(Mesjîd-i-Aqsâ)**, he had the ark put in the temple and had it opened. When the ark was opened, it was seen that it contained only the two tablets on which the **Awâmir-i-Ashere** (Ten Commandments) were written.

A book titled **(Who Wrote The Torah)**, published in 1987 by Elliot Friedman, a professor in the University of California in U.S.A., stirred up the Jewish and Christian worlds. Professor Friedman explains that the five books composing the Taurah were written by five different theologians and that they were in no way comparable to the original copy of the Taurah revealed to Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. In the same book, Professor Friedman states that the **(Old)** and **(New) (Testaments)** of the **(Holy Bible)** are in contradiction with each other, and gives examples. Moreover, Professor Friedman points out that there are inconsistencies in the books, and even in the chapters, making up the Taurah, and adds that a book of that sort could by no means be called a (heavenly Book). There is also a vast stylistic textual difference in the five books making up the Taurah.

According to Prof. Friedman, today's Taurah was written by five rabbis who lived several centuries after Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and later another rabbi named Ezra gathered them together and published them in the name of the original version of the Old Testament. Historian Prof. Friedman's conclusive remarks can be briefly paraphrased as follows:

"There are three versions of the Taurah today: The Hebrew version accepted by Jews and Protestants; the Greek version accepted by the Catholic and Orthodox Churches; the Samaritan Pentateuch accepted by the Samaritans.[1] These versions are known as the oldest and the most dependable versions of the Taurah, yet there are innumerable contradictions, both within the versions and between the versions. They contain suggestions of cruelty to people and extremely ugly and unbecoming imputations to Prophets. The real Taurah could by no means be said to have contained these inconsistencies."

Richard Simon, a French clergyman, says in his book (Historia Critique du Vieux Testament) that (today's) Taurah is not the original Taurah revealed to Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and that it is a compilation of various books written in different times. The clergyman's book was seized and he was excommunicated.

---

[1] People of Samaria, an ancient region west of Jordan.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Dr. Jean Astruc says in his book (Conjectures il parait que Mouse s'est Servi pour composer le livre de la Genese) that each of the five books of the Pentateuch is a different book compiled from various sources. He points out also that the same names in one section are changed and repeated at one or two other places.

It is written in the eleventh and later verses of the first chapter of Genesis that plants were created before mankind. On the other hand, it is written in the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth and ninth verses of the second chapter that man was created and at that time there were no plants on the earth and that plants were created after the creation of man. On account of his disclosure of contradictions such as this and many other grave errors, Jean Astruc was proclaimed a heretic.

Gottfried Eichhorn published a book in 1775. In this book he says that the five books, including Genesis, are different both in dates and in styles of language. However, Eichhorn and his books were excommunicated.

Herden, a German poet and philosopher, writes in his work titled (Von Geiste den hebraischen Poesie) that the poems in the book **(Psalms)** of the Old Testament were written by different Hebrew poets in different times and that they were compiled afterwards. He states also that the **(Song of Solomon)** is only a book of carnal and obscene love songs and that the poems in it could not be attributed to such an exalted Prophet as Suleymân 'alaihis-salâm'. Those who are interested should only take a look at the **(Song of Solomon).**

Owing to the improvements in the studies carried on in the Hebrew language in the nineteenth century, it was proved that the five books included in the Taurah did not belong to Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' and that these Pentateuchal books were compiled in different times. Very many European historians, priests and bishops published works on this subject.

Dr. Graham Scroggie of the Mood Bible Institute confesses in the book (Is the Bible the Word of God?) that neither the (Old Testament) nor the (New Testament) is the Word of Allah.

Dr. Stroggie states, "Genesis is full of genealogies. Who was born from whom, how he was born, etc. It always gives information of this sort. Why should these things interest me? What do these things have to do with worships, with loving Allâhu ta'âlâ? How can one be a good person? What is the day of Judgement? Who will call us to account, and how? What should

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

one do to become a pious person? These things have very little reference. For the most part, various fables are related. Before daytime is defined, it begins to tell about the night." How could a book of this kind ever be the Word of Allah?

Today a person who reads the books called **(Torah)** by Jews and the **(Old Testament)** by Christians will think he is reading a book of sexology teaching ways of indecency, obscenity and immorality, instead of a heavenly book revealed by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Many Western priests and scientists, realizing that these books are not the Word of Allah, have published innumerable books and tried to inform everyone of the fact. The capacity of our book would not let us mention them (all) here.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

— 20 —
TALMUD

It is the Jewish holy book next to the Taurah in importance. They call this book (Oral Commandments). It comprises two parts: Mishnah and Gemara.

Mishnah: Means repetition in Hebrew. It is the first book in which the oral commandments have been formed into canons. According to Judaism, when Allâhu ta'âlâ gave Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' the Taurah **(Written Commandments)** on the mount of Tûr (Sinai), He also dictated His **(Oral Commandments)** to him. And Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm' intimated these pieces of knowledge to **Hârûn** (Aaron), **Yûshâ** (Joshua) and **Eliâzâr** 'alaihimus-salâm'. And they, in their turn, communicated them to Prophets succeeding them. Eliâzâr is the son of Shu'ayb (Jethro) 'alaihis-salâm' **[Mir'ât-i-kâinât]**. It is written in **(Munjid)** that Jews call Uzeyr 'alaihis-salâm' Azrâ (Ezra, or Esdras according to Apocrypha).

These pieces of information were conveyed from one generation of rabbis to another. Various books of Mishnah were written in 538 B.C. and A.D. 70. Jewish customs, canonical institutions, debates between rabbis and their personal views were inserted into these books. Thus the Mishnahs became books telling about the personal opinions of rabbis and the discussions among them.

Akiba, a Jewish rabbi, collected and classified them. His disciple, Rabbi Meir, made additions to them and simplified them. The rabbis succeeding them adopted various methods and rules for the compilation of these narratives. Thus very many narratives and books appeared. Eventually, these confusions reached the Holy Yahûda (Judah ha-Nasi). In order to put an end to these turmoils, Judah wrote the most commonly sanctioned one of these books in the second century of the Christian era. Utilizing the existing versions, especially the version written by Meir, Judah compiled a book in forty years. This book was the final and the most famous **(Mishnah),** which was a compilation of the others.

Early Talmudic sages who lived in the first and second

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

centuries of the Christian era and whose views are written in Mishnah are called **Tanna** (pl. **Tannaim),** which means **(Teacher)**. Judah was one of the last teachers. They are called Judges, too. Rabbis who took part in the compilation of **(Gemara)** are called **(Amoraim)**, which means (Commentators). They are not entitled to dispute against the views of the Teachers (Tannaim); they are only interpreters. Those who made amendments or additions to Talmud were called **(Saboraim),** which means (sages or debaters). Of the commentators and interpreters of Talmud, those rabbis who presided over the Judaic Councils are called **(Geonim),** which means Sanctioners. Those who were not presidents of the Councils were called **(Posekim),** which means Decision Makers or Preferers.

Rabbis succeeding Judah made additions and commentaries to Mishnah. The language of Mishnah is Neo Hebrew, which evinces Greek and Latin characteristics.

The purpose in the writing of Mishnah was to promulgate the Oral Commandments, which were complementary to the Taurah, which was accepted as the source of Written Commandments. Afterwards, pieces of information that Judah did not include in the Mishnah he wrote, but which were contained in the Mishnahs written by the other rabbis, were compiled in the name Additions **(Tosefta).**

Language used in the books called Mishnah is simpler than that of the Taurah, and differ much both in vocabulary and in their syntactical fashions. Commandments are presented in forms of general rules. Engrossing examples are given. From time to time you come upon factual events in them. In the introduction of commandments, Pentateuchal verses are given as sources. Mishnah is composed of six parts: 1- Zerâim (Seeds); 2- Moed (Sacred days, e.g. days of feast and fast); 3- Nashim (Women); 4- Nezikin (Harms); 5- Kedoshim (Sacred things); 6- Tehera (Tahârat, cleanliness). These parts have been distributed into sixty-three booklets, which, in their turn, were divided into statements.

Gemara: Jews had two important religious schools: one in Palestine, and the other in Babylon. In these schools, rabbis called Amoraim (Commentators) tried to explain Mishnah, to rectify contradictions, to search for sources for the rules which were laid, being based on customs and traditions, and to make decisions on factual and theoretical matters. The commentary made by the Babylonian rabbis was called the **(Babylonian Gemara).** This

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

book was written together with Mishnah, and the book thus formed was called the **(Babylonian Talmud).** The commentary made by the rabbis in Jerusalem was called the **(Gemara of Jerusalem).** This Gemara, too, was written together with Mishnah, and the outcome was the book called the **(Talmud of Jerusalem)**, or the **(Palestinian Talmud)**.

According to a narrative, the Palestinian Gemara (or the Gemara of Jerusalem) was completed in the third century of the Christian era.

The Babylonian Gemara was begun in the forth century A.D., and completed in the sixth century.

Later on, Mishnah and a copy of Gemara together were called **(Talmud)**, regardless of whether it is of Jerusalem or Babylonian. The Babylonian Talmud was three times as long as the Talmud of Jerusalem. Jews hold the Babylonian Talmud in a higher esteem than the Talmud of Jerusalem. One or two Mishnaic statements sometimes take ten Talmudic pages to explain. Talmud is more difficult to understand than Mishnah. Every Jew has to allot one-third of his religious education to the Taurah, one-third to Mishnah, and one-third to Talmud.

Rabbis have declared that a person who intends to do something evil will become sinful even if he does not commit it. According to them, a person who intends to do something forbidden by rabbis will become foul. Talmud, which is the source of this belief of theirs, has been called (Ebul-Enjâs=Father of fouls) by Muslims [Hebrew Literature, p. 17]. A person who disbelieves or rejects Talmud is not a Jew according to Jews. Therefore, Jews belonging to the Karaite[1] sect, who accept and adapt themselves only to the Taurah are not considered to be Jews by Jews.

Jewish priests avoid admitting the fact that there are vast differences, contradictions between the Palestinian and Babylonian Talmuds.

The Babylonian Talmud was first printed in 1520-1522 A.D., and the Palestinian Talmud in 1523, in Venice. The Babylonian Talmud was translated into German and English, and the Talmud of Jerusalem (Palestinian Talmud) was translated into French.

Stories and legends occupy thirty per cent of the Babylonian

[1] Members of this sect, most of whom live in Crimea, reject rabbinical tradition and interpret scriptures literally.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Talmud and fifteen per cent of the Talmud of Jerusalem. They call these legends **(Haggadah).** These legends are the essence of Jewish literature. They teach them in their schools. The teaching and learning of the Taurah and Talmud is compulsory in Jewish schools, even in universities.

Christians are inimically opposed to Talmud and censure it bitterly.

Since we have already told about the cruelties and persecutions Christians exercised on Jews at various places of our book, we shall not mention them here. However, we shall briefly touch upon the cruelties displayed by Christians towards Jews on account of Talmud:

In Christian countries like France, Poland and England, copies of Talmud were seized and burned. Jews were prohibited from keeping copies of Talmud even in their homes. The most eminent interpreters of Talmudic rules were the Jewish converts Nicholas Donin and Pablo Christiani. Pablo Christiani lived in France and in Spain, in the thirteenth century of the Christian era. In a debate held in 1263 in the Barcelona city of Spain, the rabbis **(could not answer)** the questions they were asked on the rigid principles and writings in Talmud; they could not defend Talmud.

As it is stated in the book **(Al-Kenz-ul-Mersud fî Qawâid-it-Talmud),** it is written in Talmud that Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' is in the depths of Hell, between pitch and fire, that Hadrat Maryam (Mary) committed fornication with a soldier named Pandira, that churches are full of filth, that priests are like dogs, that Christians must be killed, etc.

In 927 [A.D. 1520], with the Pope's permission, the Babylonian Talmud was printed, which was followed by the printing of the Talmud of Jerusalem three years later. And thirty years after this a series of disasters befell Jewry. On September 9, 1553, all the copies of Talmud found were burned in Rome. This example was followed in the other Italian cities. In 1554, Talmud and the other Hebraic books were subjected to censorship. In 1565 the Pope forbid even the utterance of the word 'Talmud.'

Sometime between 1578 and 1581 Talmud was printed once again, in Basel city. In this last edition, some treatises were deducted, statements censuring Christianity were left out, and quite a number of words were substituted. Afterwards, popes resumed their operations of seizing copies of Talmud.

Hakem II, the ninth of the Andalusian Umayyad Sultans,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

ordered rabbi Joseph Ben Masesa to translate Talmud into Arabic. After being translated and read, this Arabic version was named (Filth placed in a case). Hakem II passed away in 366 [A.D. 976].

The Karaite Jews have rejected Talmud and accepted it as a heresy.

According to Talmud, a woman cannot be admitted to religious schools. For she is flighty mentally and therefore is not liable to religious education. The statement, "He who teaches his daughter the Taurah will have taught her a vice," belongs to rabbi Eliazer [Mishnah; part Nashim (Women); section Sotak: 216]. The Jewish rabbi Mûsâ bin Meymun (Moses Maimonides) stated that what the book really meant in that statement was Talmud, not the Taurah.

Talmud professes that astrology is a branch of knowledge most influential in human life. According to Talmud, "The solar eclipse is an ill omen [Evil-Sign] for peoples." It asserts, on the other hand, that the lunar eclipse is an evil sign for Jews. Talmud teems with sorceries and auguries. It associates everything with demons. Rabbi Rav Hunr says, "Each of us has ten thousand demon companions on his right, and ten thousand demons on his left." Rabbi Rabba says, "The congestion of crowds, during preaches in synagogues, is because of demons. Our clothes wear out because demons rub themselves against them. Breaking of feet is, again, because of demons." It is written in Talmud that demons dance on the horns of oxen, that the devil cannot harm a person reading the Taurah, that the fire of Hell will not burn the sinful ones of Israelites.

Again, it is written in Talmud that the sinful ones of the Israelites will burn for twelve months in Hell, that those who deny life after death and the sinful ones of other races will remain eternally in bitter Hell torment, and that the worms of their bodies will not die and their fire will not go out.

Other rabbis state in Talmud, again, that the soul will not be interrogated after parting from the body, that the body is responsible for the sins, that it is out of the question for the soul to be responsible for the body. Another rabbi objects to this in Talmud, again.

It is written in Talmud that "Some rabbis are capable of creating men and watermelons." It is one of the Talmudic narratives that "A rabbi changed a woman into a female ass.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Then he mounted her and rode to the market place. Then another rabbi changed her back to her former state." Talmud contains very many rabbinic legends and myths involving serpents, frogs, birds and fish. According to Talmud, for one, "There lived a fierce animal in the forest. The Byzantine Kaiser wished to see this animal. The animal made for Rome and, when it reached a distance of four hundred miles from the city, it roared, whereon the walls of Rome fell." Another Talmudic legend narrates that "There lived a one-year-old ox in the forest. It was as big as Mount Sinai. Being too big to get on board (Noah's Ark), Noah (Nûh 'alaihis-salâm') tied it to the ship by its horns. There was another giant too big for the Ark: this time a man by the name of (Avc), who was the owner of a territory called Bashan (Bolan). He mounted the ox. Avc was a king and a descent of Amalekites, born from a terrestrial woman married to an angel. His feet were forty miles long." And many other quite illogical, implausible fabrications. ...

Another Talmudic episode alleges that "Titus entered the Temple, drew his sword, and tore to pieces the curtain of the Temple. Blood came out of the curtain. To punish him, a mosquito was sent down and entered his brain. Then the mosquito in his brain grew as big as a pigeon. When Titus was dead his skull was opened and it was seen that the mosquito had a mouth of copper and feet of iron."

Other examples of Talmudic fabrications are, "People who object to rabbinic teachings will be punished;" "If a Jew testifies for a non-Jew against a Jew, he will be cursed;" "An oath administered by a Jew to a non-Jew is not binding at all."

The Talmudic chapters called 'Hoshem hamishpat', 'Yoreh deah', 'Sultan Arah' contain the following statements, "Shedding non-Jews' blood means offering a sacrifice to God.;" "All sorts of sins committed for the cause of Judaism are permissible on condition that they shall be secret;" "Only Jews are considered to be human. Non-Jews are all beasts;" "God has allotted all worldly riches only for Jews;" "The injunction, 'Do not steal,' is valid only when Jews are involved. Lives and property of other races are free (for Jews);" "Chastity and honour of non-Jews are halâl (permissible) (for Jews). The injunction against fornication is intended only for Jews."; "If a Jew has stolen a non-Jew's property or swindled him of his job, he has done a good job;" "Informing a non-Jew about our commandments is equal to betraying the whole Jewry to the executioner. When non-Jews are

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

informed about our teachings against them, they will send us to exile;" "No work is baser than agriculture."

The Talmudic conception concerning the Messiah expected by Jewry is as follows: "The Messiah shall crush non-Jews under the wheels of his chariots. There shall be a great war and two-thirds of the world's population shall die. Jewry shall achieve the victory, and they shall use the losers' weapons for fuel for seven years.

"Other nations shall obey Jews. The Messiah shall refuse Christians and he shall destroy them all. Jews shall take possession of the treasuries of all nations and they shall be very rich. When Christians are annihilated, other nations shall take warning and become Judaized. Thus Jewry shall become dominant all over the world and there shall be no one left unjudaized in any part of the world."

WARNING — As this book, **(could not answer),** shows, Christians and Jews always assailed Muslims and endeavoured to annihilate Islam by means of publication and state forces. As a preliminary arrangement for the success of their tactical assaults, they first extinguished Islamic knowledge and annihilated Islamic scholars, thus making sure of an ignorant younger generation utterly unaware of Islam. In the course of time some of these Muslim children fell into the traps set by Christian missionaries and insidious communists, believed their falsifications and lies and, after an education provided in total deprivation of opportunities to learn about Islam's virtues and superiorities or at least the renowned and honourable accomplishments of their ancestors, they eventually came into a position which offered them an easy competence to talk and write freely on matters of importance. They began to make, (and are still making), ignorant and foolish statements here and there. For instance, they say, "Our grandfathers adopted laws of deserts, confined themselves into intertia within Islam's dingy fetters which impede mind and reason, led a life of the Early Ages. Being estranged from the world under such inculcations as, 'There is life after death. There is blessing and merry-making in Paradise and burning fire in Hell,' they put their trust in an unknown being whom they called God and lived in a lingering apathy and reluctance like animals. We are not regressive like them. We are university graduates. We are following the European and American civilizations and their scientific and technological improvements. We are leading a life of pleasure and merry-making. We are not killing our time with such things as namâz and fasting. What is a modern and

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

enlightened person's business in mosques, in Mecca? What is the point in turning away from such pleasures as music, dancing, drinking and gambling in mixed groups and wasting one's lifetime in tedious occupations such as namâz, fasting, mawlid, etc.? Who has seen Paradise or Hell? Who has gone there? Is a fancy or illusion worth being preferred to this sweet life which is for us to enjoy?" We hope that these poor people, after reading our book and seeing that those European and American statesmen, politicians, scientists, and millions of western people whom they consider to be enlightened, progressive and modern and earnestly try to imitate are actually people who believe in rising after death, in Paradise and Hell, in Allâhu ta'âlâ and His Prophets and rush in large crowds to churches to pray on Sundays; will come to reason and realize that they have been deceived.

HÜSEYN HİLMİ IŞIK, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih'

Hüseyn Hilmi Işık, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih', publisher of the Hakikat Kitabevi Publications, was born in Eyyub Sultan, Istanbul in 1329 (A.D. 1911).

Of the one hundred and forty-four books he published, sixty are Arabic, twenty-five Persian, fourteen Turkish, and the remaining are books in French, German, English, Russian, and other languages.

Hüseyn Hilmi Işık, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih' (guided by Sayyid 'Abdulhakim Arwâsî, 'Rahmat-Allahi 'alaih', a profound Islamic scholar and perfect in virtues of Tasawwuf and capable to guide disciples in a fully mature manner; possessor of glories and wisdom), was a competent, great Islamic scholar able to guide to happiness, passed away during the night between October 25, 2001 (8 Sha'bân 1422) and October 26, 2001 (9 Sha'bân 1422). He was buried at Eyyub Sultan, where he had been born.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

LAST WORDS of ONE of our MARTYRS

THE MARTYR'S IDENTITY:

NAME : M.Tevfîk
RANK : Senior Captain
POSITION : Company Leader
FATHER'S NAME : Alî Riza
DATE of BIRTH : 1296 (1881)
PLACE of BIRTH : Istanbul

On June 2, 1916, he was wounded by a British bullet and attained martyrdom in the Military Hospital in Çanakkale (Dardanelles).

FROM THE ENCAMPMENT IN THE VICINITY OF OVACIK; MAY 18, 1331 (1915), MONDAY

My Dear Father and Mother, the sources of my life, the lightsome guides of my life:

In the first combat I joined at Arıburnu, a nefarious British bullet pierced through the right cuff of my trousers. Hamd (thanks and praise) be (to Allâhu ta'âlâ), I escaped it. But because I do not expect to survive the next series of battles I am going to fight in, I am writing the following lines as a keepsake for you:

Hamd-u-thenâ (thanks, praise and laud) be to Allâhu ta'âlâ, He made me attain this rank. Again, as a requirement of His Divine Decree, He predestinated that I should choose a military career. And you, my parents, brought me up in such a manner as I should serve our sacred religion, our country, our nation. You were the causes and the lightsome guides of my life. I offer my infinite thanks to Janâb-i-Haqq (Allâhu ta'âlâ) and to you.

This is the time to be worthy of the money my nation has paid me up until now. I am exerting myself to perform my sacred religious and patriotic duty. If I should attain the rank of martyrdom, I shall consider myself to be a born slave most

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

beloved to Allâhu ta'âlâ. Being a soldier, this is always very possible for me, my dear father and mother. I entrust my wife Münevver, the apple of my eye, and my dearest son, Nezîh, firstly to the protection of Allâhu ta'âlâ, and secondly to your care. Please do all you can do for them! Please help my spouse educate my son as a Sâlih (pious, devoted) Muslim, and please do your best to bring him up in due manner. You know we are not wealthy. I could not ask for more than possible. For it would be futile. Enclosed is a letter which I wrote to my spouse; please hand it to her! Yet she will be very sorry. Give it to her in such a manner as will alleviate her sorrow. Naturally, she will weep and deplore; please console her. Allâhu ta'âlâ predestined it be so. Please be extra scrupulous concerning the list of my dues and debts which I have appended to my letter to my spouse! The debts which Münevver has kept in her mind or wrote in her note-book are accurate, too. The letter I wrote to Münevver contains the details. Please ask her.

My dear father and mother! I may have offended you various times, though inadvertently. Please forgive me! Please waive the rights you have had over me. Please pray so that my soul attain happiness. Help my spouse in the clearing up of my dues and debts.

My dearest sister, Lutfiye,

You know I always loved you very much. I would always do my best for you. I may have inadvertently offended you, too. Please forgive me; so this is our destiny preordained by Allâhu ta'âlâ. Please forgive me my having trespassed your rights, if ever, and pray so that my soul attain felicity. And please, you, too, help my spouse Münevver Hanım and my son Nezîh!

Do perform the five daily prayers of namâz, you all, please! Be extra careful not to omit any prayer time. Make me happy by (often) reciting the (sûra) Fâtiha for my soul! I entrust you, too, to the Divine Kindness and Protection of Allâhu ta'âlâ.

O my beloved kins, relatives, friends; farewell to you all! Please, you all, forgive me your rights over me! And I forgive you all my rights over you. Farewell, farewell! I entrust you all to Allâhu ta'âlâ. I entrust you to His care eternally. My dearest father and mother.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

TRANSLATION of 147th LETTER

Muhammad Ma'thûm Fârûqî[1] 'rahmatullâhi aleyh', who was one of the great 'Ulamâ of India and a Murshid-i-kâmil, states as follows in the hundred and forty-seventh letter of the first volume of his book, **(Mektûbât)**:

May Allâhu ta'âlâ bless you and us with the honour of adapting ourselves to Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', who is His beloved one and the highest of Prophets! O my merciful brother! Life in the world is very short. In the hereafter, where life will be eternal and everlasting, we shall be paid for what we have done in the world. The most fortunate person in this world is the person who spends his short lifetime doing things that will do him good in the hereafter and making preparations for his long trek to the world to come. Allâhu ta'âlâ has bestowed on you a rank, a position whereby to meet people's needs and to make them attain justice and peace. Show much gratitude for this blessing! And showing gratitude in this sense means meeting the needs of the born slaves of Allâhu ta'âlâ. Serving the born slaves will cause you to attain high grades in this world and the next. Therefore, try to do good to the born slaves of Allâhu ta'âlâ and to make things easy for them by treating them with a smiling face, soft words and mild behavior! This effort of yours shall make you attain love of Allâhu ta'âlâ and high grades in the hereafter. It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"People are household, born slaves of Allâhu ta'âlâ. He loves those who do good to His born slaves."** There are many hadîth-i-sherîfs telling about the virtues of and the rewards for meeting Muslims' needs, pleasing them, and treating them tenderly, mildly, and with patience. I am writing some of them. Read carefully. If you have difficulty understanding them, ask people who are learned in Islam and truly devoted. It is declared in a hadîth-i-sherîf: "(Every) **Muslim is** (another) **Muslim's brother. He will not be cruel to him. He will not leave him in a difficult position. If a person helps his brother, Allâhu ta'âlâ will help him. If a person saves his brother from a difficult position,**

---

[1] Muhammad Ma'thûm passed away in Sirhind city in 1079 [A.D. 1668].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Allâhu ta'âlâ will save him from a difficult position on the Day of Judgement. If a person pleases his brother, Allâhu ta'âlâ will please him on the day of Judgement;" in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"He who helps his brother-in-Islam will be helped by Allâhu ta'âlâ;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ has created some of His born slaves for the purpose of meeting people's needs. These people are the refuge of the distressed. These people will be safe against the torture of the Day of Judgement;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ has bestowed many blessings on some of His born slaves and made them means for relieving His distressed born slaves. If they do not give these blessings to those who need them, He will take the blessings away from them and give them to others;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"If a person helps his brother in need, he will be given thawâb as if he performed i'tikâf**[1] **for ten years. And if a person performed i'tikâf during only one whole day for the sake of Allâhu ta'âlâ, there would be a distance of three trenches between him and Hell. The distance between two trenches is as large as the distance between east and west;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"If a person relieves his brother-in-Islam from a position of privation, Allâhu ta'âlâ will send down seventy-five thousand angels, who will pray for him from morning till evening. If it is evening time, they will pray for him till** (the following) **morning. For each step he takes, one of his sins will be forgiven and he will be given an extra promotion;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"If a person goes to help his Believer brother in need, he will be given seventy thawâbs for each of his steps and seventy of his sins will be pardoned. When he relieves his brother of distress, he will be purified of his sins** (and will become as innocent) **as he was when he was born. If he dies while helping his brother, he will enter Paradise without any interrogation;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"If a person goes to the court of justice in order to save him from a difficult position, he shall be one of those who will pass the Sirat Bridge without slipping;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"The most virtuous, the most valuable of deeds and worships is to please a Believer, to give him clothes or to give him food if he is hungry or to give him something else he needs;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"After the farz** (compulsory worships, such as namâz, fasting in Ramazân etc.), **the most valuable deed is to please a Muslim;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"When a person pleases his Muslim brother,**

---

[1] Secluding one's self for one or more whole days for fasting or prayer.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Allâhu ta'âlâ will create an angel. (This angel) **will pray until that person dies. When he is dead and is put into the grave, the angel will come to him and ask, 'Do you know me?' When the person says, 'No. Who are you?', the angel says, 'I am the pleasure you afforded to a Muslim. Today I have been sent to please you, to help you answer the angels of interrogation and testify to your answers. I shall intercede for you in the grave and on the Day of Rising. I shall show you your rank in Paradise.' "** When he (our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam') was asked what would cause many people to enter Paradise, he said, **"Taqwâ,** (that is, avoiding the harâms and being good mannered)." And when he was asked what would be the reason for which many people would enter Hell, he said, **"The tongue, and the vulva,** (that is, sex organ)**."** It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Of Believers, the one with perfect îmân is the one who has beautiful manners and who treats his wife mildly;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"A born slave will attain high grades and will be given many more thawâbs** (than he would otherwise attain) **owing to his beautiful manners. Bad manners will drag a person down to the depths of Hell;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"The easiest and lightest worship is to talk little and to have beautiful manners."** When a person stood before Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' and asked what the deed Allâhu ta'âlâ liked best was, he said, **"Having beautiful manners."** When the person asked the same question once again, this time approaching from the Prophet's left hand side, the Prophet said, once again, **"Having beautiful manners."** Then the person walked behind him and repeated the same question from behind the Prophet, Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' turned his blessed face towards him and said, **"Why don't you understand? Beautiful manners means to do one's best not to become angry."** It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf: **"A person who does not quarrel even when he is right shall be given a villa at one side of Paradise. A person who does not lie even as a joke shall be given a villa in the middle of Paradise. A person with beautiful manners shall be given this villa at the highest place of Paradise."** It was declared in a hadîth-i-qudsî:[1] **"Of all religions. I have chosen this religion** (Islam), **This religion is completed with generosity and beautiful manners. Complete this religion daily**

[1] The blessed statements of our beloved Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' are called **(Hadîth).** When these statements of our Prophet's are inspired by Allâhu ta'âlâ they are called **(Hadîth-i-qudsî).**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

with these two!" It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf:

"Beautiful manners will melt sins, as lukewarm water melts ice. Bad manners will decompose worships, as vinegar decomposes honey;" in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ is Refîq. He loves a person who carries on his daily communications in a tender way;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ likes mild behaviour and always helps mild people. On the other hand, He does not help people with harsh manners;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"The person who shall not enter Hell and whom the fire of Hell will not burn, is the person who behaves mildly and who makes things easy for others;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ likes a person who does not haste. Hastiness is caused by Shaytân** (Satan). **Allâhu ta'âlâ likes hilm, that is, soft temper;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"A person with hilm shall attain the grade of a person who fasts during the day and performs namâz at night;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"Allâhu ta'âlâ loves very much a person who behaves mildly when he is angry;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"If a person shows a mild reaction to someone who behaves harshly or forgives someone who has been cruel to him or reacts kindly to someone who has wronged him or visits people** (his friends, relatives, etc.) **who do not visit him,** (call him or write to him), **Allâhu ta'âlâ shall make him attain high grades and bless him with villas in Paradise;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"The** (real) **hero is not the winner of a wrestling or speed contest. He is the person who controls his nafs at times of anger;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"He who greets with a smiling face will be given the thawâb of alms;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: (Such acts as) **smiling to your brother-in-Islam when you meet him, performing emr-i-ma'rûf and nehy-i-anil-munker,**[1] **saving a person from heresy at a time when religious teachings have fallen into oblivion and heresy has become widespread, removing stones, thorns, bones, and other waste stuff from streets and squares, filling the bucket of a person who needs water, are all** (equivalents for) **alms;"** in another hadîth-i-sherîf: **"In Paradise there are villas where one can see outside when one is inside, and inside when one is outside. These villas will be given to those who talk softly, to those who give food to hungry people, and to those who perform namâz when others are asleep."** These hadîth-i-

[1] Teaching, promulgating, spreading the commandments of Allâhu ta'âlâ and admonishing people about His prohibitions.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

sherîfs have been derived from the book **(Terghîb-at-terhîb)**,[1] which is one of the valuable books of Hadîth. May Allâhu ta'âlâ bless us all with the fortune of following these hadîth-i-sherîfs. A person whose manners and actions are compatible with (the advice given in) these hadîth-i-sherîfs should be very thankful to Allâhu ta'âlâ. Conversely, if a person's behaviours are not in agreement with them, he must supplicate to Allâhu ta'âlâ for (the blessing of) concordance with these hadîth-i-sherîfs. If a person with incompatible manners is conscious of this shortcoming of his, this is still a great blessing. If a person is unaware of his fault or who does not feel sorry for it, he is most probably slack in faith and îmân.

[1] Author of the book, Abd-ul-azîm Munzirî Qayrawânî Shâfi'î, passed away in 656 [A.D. 1258].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

TRANSLATION of 83rd LETTER

Hadrat Muhammad Ma'thûm delivers the following discourse in the eighty-third letter of the second volume: If a person has had the following two blessings, he should not be sorry for not having any spiritual ecstasies and raptures. One of these two blessings is "adapting oneself to Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm', who is the owner of the Sharî'at." The second one is "loving one's master, one's murshid." These two blessings will make one attain all sorts of happiness and fayz.[1] If a person lacks one of these two blessings, he will end up in a disaster. His knowledge, his piety, or his spiritual devotion and ability to display miracles, no matter to what extent, will not avert this disastrous termination from him. And what would most fatally damage these two blessings and put them in jeopardy of vanishing is being in close contact with irreligious and heretical people, or with their books, [newspapers], and all sorts of publication. We should keep away from such depraved people like bewaring of a lion. We should read books written by the 'Ulamâ of Ahl-as-sunna [or by those true Muslims who are correct both in îmân and in their ways of worshipping]. For those who wish to read books written by these great people, we recommend that they read the book **(Mektûbât),** by Imâm-i Rabbânî.[2] [The books published by Ikhlâs Waqf are the translations of these true 'Ulamâ. For those who wish to learn Islam correctly, we recommend that they read these books.]

The knowledge of qadâ and qader (fate, destiny) is extremely delicate, subtle, and difficult to understand. It has been forbidden through hadîth-i-sherîfs to talk about it or to discuss it. Muslims' duty is to learn the commandments and prohibitions of Allâhu ta'âlâ and to live up to them. We have been commanded to

---

[1] After a Muslim has adapted himself completely to the Sharî'at of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm, inexplicable pieces of knowledge begin to pour into his heart. This occult, esoteric and subtle kind of knowledge is called **fayz,** pronounced /feiz/.

[2] Imâm-i-Rabbânî Ahmad Fârûqî is one of the greatest 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna and Awliyâ brought up and educated in India. He passed away in Sirhind city in 1034 [A.D. 1624].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

believe in qadâ and qader, not to study them. We have to learn about them as much as the 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna have taught us and believe in them in such a manner as prescribed by the 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna. As these true scholars [and experts of Islamic teachings] state, Allâhu ta'âlâ knew in the eternal past all the future good and evil deeds of mankind. When their time comes He wills their creation, and creates them. His creation is called **Taqdîr** (Divine Dispensation). He, alone, is the Creator, the Inventor. There is no creator besides Him. No man can create anything. Ignorant and idiotic votaries of the sects of **Mu'tazila** and **Qaderiyya** have denied qadâ and qader. They have asserted that man creates his own deeds. Such heretics have been on the increase recently.

Man's will and option assumes a certain role in the creation of everything good or evil. When man wants to do something, Allâhu ta'âlâ creates it if He, too, wishes it. Man's will and option is called **kasb** (acquisition). This means to say that every action, everything man does, is actuated by Allah's creation upon man's acquisition (option). The torment that will be inflicted on the murderer is a punishment of his acquisition (option). Sectarians called **Jabriyya** (necessarians or necessitarians) have denied man's will and acquisition. They have maintained that "Allah creates all of man's deeds, regardless of whether man wishes or not. Everything man does is like the swaying of trees and leaves with the wind. Every action is done under Allah's compulsion. Man cannot do anything." These statements are kufr (disbelief). And a person who holds such a belief will become a kâfir (disbeliever). According to these people, "Those who perform good deeds shall be rewarded in the hereafter. Sinners shall not be tormented. Disbelievers, wrongdoers, sinners shall not be tormented because the (real) maker of their sins is Allâhu ta'âlâ. So these people have had to commit these sins." Such misbelievers have been cursed by all Prophets. Could it ever be said that the (involuntary) trembling of the feet and moving them voluntarily were the same things? The ninety-second and ninety-third âyats of **(Hijr)** sûra purport, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ will interrogate them for all of their deeds."** The twenty-fourth âyat of **(Wâqi'a)** sûra purports, **"They shall pay for what they have done."** The twenty-ninth âyat of **(Kahf)** sûra purports, **"Let him who wishes, have îmân; and let him who wills, deny. We have prepared Hell fire for those who deny."** Some miscreants and heretics, in order to shirk the toil of obeying the commandments and prohibitions of Allâhu ta'âlâ and

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

to escape being tormented for their sins, deny the fact that man has a will and acquisition.

Allâhu ta'âlâ is Kerîm, He has infinite mercy. He has always commanded men useful things and what they will be able to do. He has forbidden harmful things. The two hundred and eighty-sixth âyat of **(Baqara)** sûra purports, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ has commanded men things that they will do easily."** It is so surprising that there should be people who deny man's will. Then why will they be angry with those who vex them? Why will they try to educate their sons and daughters? Why would they be exasperated if they saw their wives in indecent positions? Why wouldn't they tolerate such things by saying that "man does not have will, so these people are compelled to do what they are doing"? They hold this belief in order to do all sorts of wicked acts in the world and then not to be tormented in the hereafter. Yet, the seventh âyat of **(Tûr)** sûra purports, **"Verily, thine Rab** (Allâhu ta'âlâ) **shall inflict torment. There shall be no escape from Him."**

The groups of Qaderiyya (libertarians) and Jabriyya (necessitarians) have deviated from the right way, because the former have denied qadâ and qader and the latter have denied (man's) will. They are holders of bid'at (heresy). The right way is the belief as held by the group called **Ahl-i-sunnat wa'l-jamâat** (Ahl as-sunna or, briefly, the sunnî way), which occupies an intermediate position between these two extremes. Those who follow in this true way are called **(Sunnî)**. Imâm-i-Abû Hanîfa, who was the leader of the group of Ahl as-sunna, asked Imâm-i-Ja'fer Sâdiq, "O you, grandson of Rasûlullah! Has Allâhu ta'âlâ left men's deeds to their wills, or does He compel them to perform their deeds?" He answered, "Allâhu ta'âlâ will not leave His right to His born slaves, and it would not be compatible with His justice to compel them and then torment them." Disbelievers say, "Allâhu ta'âlâ wished us to be disbelievers, polytheists. So His wish came true." The hundred and forty-eighth âyat of **(En'âm)** sûra purports, **"Polytheists say, 'If Allah did not wish us and our fathers to be polytheists... .' We tormented their predecessors because they, too, were unbelievers."** Polytheists do not make these statements as an excuse (for their polytheism). They do not say so in order to escape torment. These people do not know that their polytheism or disbelief is something bad. They say, "Whatever Allâhu ta'âlâ wills, is good, and He approves all the things He has willed. He would not have willed them if He

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

had not approved them. Then, He must approve our polytheism and not torment us." Nevertheless, Allâhu ta'âlâ has announced through His Prophets that He will not approve polytheism. He has declared that disbelief is a guilt, that disbelievers are accursed, and that He shall torment them eternally. Something willed is not necessarily approved. Allâhu ta'âlâ wills and creates disbelief and disobedience. Yet He does not approve them. He declares plainly in Qur'ân al-kerîm that He does not approve them. Perhaps, those statements of polytheists were intended to provoke derision against Prophets.

Question: In the eternal past Allâhu ta'âlâ knew (all the) good and evil things (that would happen). He wills and creates in accordance with this knowledge of His. Consequently, man's will becomes defunct. Does this not come to mean that men are compelled to do what they are doing, good and evil alike?

Answer: Allâhu ta'âlâ knew in the eternal past that man would perform his deeds by using his own will. This knowledge of Allâhu ta'âlâ does not indicate that the born slave does not have a will and option. Likewise, Allâhu ta'âlâ creates many things outside of man in accordance with His preordination in the eternal past. If man were compelled to do what he is doing, then Allâhu ta'âlâ would be compelled to create what He is creating. So, as Allâhu ta'âlâ is autonomous, that is, not compelled (in His creations), so is man autonomous (in his options).

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

TRANSLATION of 16th LETTER

We have heard some strange news recently. Some people have been persistently talking about the ma'rifat[1] of (Wahdat-i-wujûd), regardless of whether they know the subject or not. They say, "Everything is He. The name Allah is a word which shows the universe, that is, all beings collectively. For instance, the name Zayd shows all the parts of a person. However, each part has a different name. None of the parts is named Zayd. Yet the name Zayd stands for all the parts. Likewise, Allâhu ta'âlâ is seen everywhere. It is permissible to call the universe Allah." On the contrary, these statements mean to deny Wahdat-i-wujûd (Unity of Allâhu ta'âlâ). They point out the existence of creatures. According to them, the existence of Allâhu ta'âlâ is within the existence of creatures. There is no being except creatures. It is as obvious as the sun that these statements of theirs are wrong.

In actual fact, the existence of Allâhu ta'âlâ is different from that of creatures. Allâhu ta'âlâ should be known to be disparate from creatures. The two existences are different from and dissimilar to each other. In fact, those superior men of tasawwuf who told about **(Wahdat-i-wujûd)** were not successful in expressing what they meant. For it would have been disbelief if they had explained it in a way similar to the statements we have quoted above. On the other hand, if they had said, "He exists apart from creatures," this time the words Wahdat (Unity) and Tawhîd (Oneness) would have lost their significance. If creatures existed separately, the knowledge of Wahdat and Tawhîd would be wrong. However, if they had said, "The universe does not exist separately. Its existence, [i.e. beings collectively], is only an illusion, a fancy, [like the images seen on the screen of television or cinema]," this time the word Wahdat [Unity] and the statement "Everything is He" would have been senseless. For an entity

---

[1] After a person has completely adapted himself to the Sharî'at of Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' and made a certain progress in the guidance of a Murshid-i-kâmil in the spiritual way called Tasawwuf, pieces of inexplicable, subtle knowledge begin to trickle into his heart. Sometimes this trickling improves into flowing. These pieces of knowledge are called **ma'rifat.**

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

which actually exists by itself could not be said to have united with something which exists only in imagination. If they mean, “He, alone, exists. Nothing exists except Him,” by their statement, “Everything is He,” their statement will be correct. Yet in this case their statement. “Everything is He,” will be a metonymy. It will not convey the literal meanings of the words used in it. For instance, when we see a person’s image on the mirror we say, “I see him,” or “I see him in the mirror,” metonymically. It has become a daily figure of speech to refer to the image of something as if it were that thing itself, although it is known that that thing, which actually exists, is quite different from its image. [Likewise, the voice of a person calling the adhân (ezân) or reading Qur’ân al-kerîm which we hear on television, on the radio, or from a loud-speaker, would not be the voice of the person actually producing this voice. It would be some other sound similar to the voice of that person. It would be symbolically true to say that the voice belongs to so and so. Yet it would be wrong literally. Therefore, it would not be permissible (in worships) to follow an imâm[1] whose voice you hear only from a loud-speaker.] To assert that these things (the actual thing and its image) are the same, would be like saying that a lion and an ass are identical. These two animals are completely different. They could not be the same only because (some) people said so. According to some superiors of Tasawwuf, to say that ‘Everything is He” does not mean to say that “Allâhu ta’âlâ has shown Himself in the guise of creatures. He exists separately.” It means to say that “Allâhu ta’âlâ exists. Creatures are the images, visions of that Being.” On the other hand, the statements that we have quoted (in the first paragraph) imply that creatures are eternal, which means to deny the fact that they are of recent occurrence. And this denial, in its turn, is kufr (disbelief).

Another report we have heard is about what some people say about rising after death and about the hereafter: “Every substance, every object we see originates from soil. And they change back into soil again. For instance, vegetables and oats originate from soil. Animals eat them, thus changing them into meat. And human beings eat these vegetables and crops, thus changing them into human beings. These human beings, in their

[1] These technicalities pertaining to Islamic worships are explained in detail in the Turkish book **(Se’âdet-i Ebediyye),** which has been partly translated into English in fascicles titled **(Endless Bliss)**. Imâm, in this context, means the person who conducts the prayer of namâz when it is performed in jamâ’at (congregation of Muslims). It has other meanings, such as, ‘religious leader’, ‘religious savant’, etc.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

turn, reproduce other human beings. This is what we call 'Resurrection.' " These statements mean to deny Resurrection, that is, Rising Again After Death. This denial is called **(ilhâd)** or being **(zindiq)** in the Islamic nomenclature, which means to gainsay hadîth-i-sherîfs and Qur'ân al-kerîm.

Again, we have heard that there are people who allege that "The prayers called namâz which we see (being performed by some people around us) are a commandment intended for ignorant people. Men and all beings are worshipping. All creatures are worshipping consciously or unconsciously. Muhammad 'alaihis-salâm' enjoined the namâz in order to restrain an uncivilized tribe from felonies such as brigandage, etc." Be it known very well that those who make these statements are ignorant and half-witted. Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' stated, **"The namâz is the pillar of the religion. Person who performs namâz has constructed his religion. And he who neglects namâz has demolished his religion;"** and, **"Namâz is the Believer's Mi'râj;"**[1] in other words, it is the occasion on which the Believer is closest to Allâhu ta'âlâ; and, **"Namâz is the apple of my eye;"** and, **"The curtains between man and his Rabb** (Allâhu ta'âlâ) **are raised as he performs namâz."** All sorts of virtues and blessings are contained in the commandments and prohibitions of the Sharî'at. The thirty-second âyat of Yûnus sûra purports, **"Everything beyond this periphery is aberration."** Qur'ân al-kerîm and hadîth-i-sherîfs command us to adapt ourselves to the Sharî'at. This is the way called **(Sirât al-musteqîm)**. People who stray from this way are followers of the devils. Abdullah bin Mes'ûd 'radiy-Allâhu anh' reports: Rasûlullah 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' drew a straight line on the sands, and said, **"This is the way that will lead man to the love of Allâhu ta'âlâ."** Then he drew lines diverging from this line like on a fishbone, and said, **"These are the ways to affliction led by the devils."** The information given by all Prophets and written in the books of the 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna should not be mistaken for imaginary stories. A statement alleging that the Sharî'at is intended for reactionary, idiotic people would be irreligious, heretical, and therefore idiotic.

Please do not be shocked by the statement, "Creatures are not Allâhu ta'âlâ Himself. Nor are they disparate from Him." Do not ask, "Then what are they?" To say that "Creatures are the images

---

[1] Our Prophet's Ascent to heaven. On Mi'râj our Prophet saw Allâhu ta'âlâ, talked to Him, and heard Him in a manner that could not be comprehended or explained by human standards. The night of Mi'râj is celebrated yearly by all Muslims.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

of the Names of Allâhu ta'âlâ; they are not He or beings other than He," means to say that "They are not beings distinct from and dissimilar to Him." For the Names and Attributes of Allâhu ta'âlâ exist with Him. They are not disparate from Him. They do not exist by themselves. In a way, the statement made above is like saying that a person's image in the mirror is neither he, nor another being disparate from him.

It is stated in a hadîth-i-sherîf, **"Allâhu ta'âlâ created Âdam in His own guise."** It means, "As Allâhu ta'âlâ does not have a likeness, so He created Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' in a guise quite unlike those of other creatures." We have to believe directly in the facts stated clearly in hadîth-i-sherîfs such as this and many others. Many words had different meanings in those days than they have now. We should not endanger our îmân by taking them in their present meanings. Allâhu ta'âlâ created in Âdam 'alaihis-salâm' superiorities similar to His own perfections. The hadîth-i-sherîf quoted above points out that these superiorities are not the same, but similar to His superiorities. So is the case with His attributes Knowledge and Power. They are similar (to man's attributes) only in name. Essentially, they are quite different.

Qur'ân al-kerîm is a mu'jiza (miracle). To say that "This mu'jiza is only with respect to literary standards of textuality such as rhetoric and conciseness; the commandments, prohibitions and reports it contains are not mu'jiza," would mean to deny Qur'ân al-kerîm and to mock âyat-i-kerîmas.

It is purported in Qur'ân al-kerîm, in the fifty-fourth âyat of **(Fussilat)** sûra, **"Be it known that He contains everything."** Contain means 'embody', 'include'. According to the 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna, the knowledge of Allâhu ta'âlâ contains everything, that is, He knows eveything. If we should say that Allâhu ta'âlâ Himself contains everything, then (we will have to bear in mind that) this containing is unlike an object's containing another object. We believe that Allâhu ta'âlâ contains everything and that He is together with everything. Yet we do not try to know how these things happen. These things are not comparable to things that are within the scope of man's mind and imagination.

As we pronounce the word **(Lâ ilâha il-l'allah),** we should bear in mind that (by doing so) we are rejecting polytheists' calling their idols 'gods'. Polytheists call their idols 'gods' because they consider the idols to be worthy of being worshipped and worship them. They do not call them so to mean that (they consider) they are creators or indispensable beings. In other words, most disbelievers are polytheists in worships. For becoming a Muslim,

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

one must add the expression **(Muhammadun Rasûlullah)** (to one's pronunciation of the expression "lâ ilâha il-l'allah"). One will not have had îmân unless one utters this expression. Perfection of îmân depends on the renunciation of the desires of the nafs, too. When the words **(Lâ ilâha)** are pronouced, these desires are renounced, too. The twenty-third âyat of **(Jâsiya)** sûra purports, **"Have you seen the person who has made a god of his sensuous desires?"** The 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna state that one's desires and aspirations will become one's ma'bûd (that which one worships). These desires are rejected by saying, **(Lâ ilâha).** When a person utters this word very frequently, he will rid himself from the desires of his nafs and the misgivings infused by the Satan and acknowledge that he is a born slave only to Allâhu ta'âlâ. Repeating the name of Allâhu ta'âlâ frequently will take one closer to Allâhu ta'âlâ. In other words, it will augment the reciprocal love (between Allâhu ta'âlâ and the born slave). Thus one will become fânî, (that is, one's self, which is the most diehard obstacle between one and Allâhu ta'âlâ, will perish). One's heart will no longer have any love except for Allâhu ta'âlâ. And frequent repetition of the Kalima-i-Tawhîd, (that is, saying, "lâ ilâha il-l'allah"), will completely nullify one's attachment to creatures. Thus all the curtains between Allâhu ta'âlâ and the born slave will disappear. Shâh-i-Nakshiband Muhammad Bahâuddîn Bukhârî[1] stated, "None of the things you see and hear is He. All of these things should be renounced, when saying, 'Lâ'." Abû Is-haq Qazrûnî[2] saw our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam' in his dream and asked him what Tawhîd was. The answer was: "When you say **Allah,** none of the things that come to your heart, to your mind, to your imagination, is Allah."

People who name themselves Shaikhs or Murshids (religious guides) and spoil Muslims' îmân by making statements contradictory to the Sharî'at, are not religious people. They are thieves of religion. They are disbelievers. We should shun from them. Talking to them or reading their books will spoil one's îmân and drive one into the eternal affliction. We should avoid these people and reading their books with the same dread as we would feel in avoiding a lion. Should a person ever be misled by these people, let him make tawba immediately (upon realizing that he has been misled). The gates of tawba are (always) open. One's tawba will be acceptable until one takes one's final breath.

---

[1] Muhammad Bahâuddîn passed away in Bukhârâ in 791 [A.D. 1389].

[2] Qazrûnî passed away in 426 [A.D. 1034].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

TRANSLATION of 153rd LETTER

It is necessary to look for an Islamic savant, to find and read the books of the 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna. Each day going by is very valuable. There is no return to the world. The greatest blessing is Sohbat (or Suhba), which means to keep company with an 'Âlim of Ahl as-sunna and thus to be blessed with his words [and breath]. Uways-i-Qarnî loved Rasûlullah 'sallallahu alaihis-salâm' very much and performed acts of worship continuously day and night. Yet he could not attain the grade of any of the Ashâb-i-kirâm, who (had attained their high grades because they) had been blessed with the honour of attaining Rasûlullah's company. If a wise and vigilant person loves any one of the passed Murshids very much and turns his heart towards him, certainly some of the fayz and barakat abounding in the Murshid's heart will flow into his heart. He will attain abundant ma'rifat. However, attaining high grades of Wilâyat requires Sohbat. Lucky for those who attain endless felicity (in the hereafter) by receiving fayz from a Murshid-i-kâmil and making much dhikr (uttering the name of Allâhu ta'âlâ) in their sojourn in this life!

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

TRANSLATION of 154th LETTER

Serve your brother(s), your sisters(s), your wife, your mother, and all your brothers in Islam! Hold fast to the Sunna, [that is, to the Sharî'at], of our beloved Prophet Muhammad Mustafâ 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'! [Learn this Sharî'at, not from the untruthful books reflecting the personal views of people who falsely assume to be religious authorities, but from books through which lovers of Allâhu ta'âlâ convey the information coming from the 'Ulamâ of Ahl as-sunna! It would be a great fortune to have been blessed with the ability of distinguishing these books from the sham books, thus being secure against the harm and mischief of those misleading books. Lucky for those who have attained this blessing!]

Disasters that befall people are the will and foreordination of Allâhu ta'âlâ. We should be contented with and submissive to His foreordination. We should recite the Fâtiha (sûra), say prayers, give alms, and present their thawâb to the souls of the dead (parents, relatives, friends, martyrs, religious scholars, teachers, etc.). We should visit the graves of the Awliyâ, and ask, beg for their help. Serving their living children and grandchildren will cause one to receive fayz from them. We should bring up our children under Islamic education! We should train them to cover themselves, (that is, to dress in a manner prescribed by Islam), teach them religious knowledge, e.g. how to perform namâz, etc., beginning when they are quite young! We should be punctual in performing the five daily prayers of namâz and perform them behind a Sunnî imâm! We should learn how to read Qur'ân al-kerîm correctly, without making errors, and we should read it every day!

A distich:

So grieved is my soul for separation from m'dearest ones,
That my bones ache to the core. Oh, I miss them so much!

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

THE PRAYER TO BE SAID AFTER NAMÂZ

Al-hamd-u-li'l-lâhi Rab-b'il 'âlamîn as-salâtu wa's-salâmu alâ resûlinâ Muhammadin wa Âlihî wa Sahbihî ajma'în. Yâ Rabbî (O my Allah)! Accept the namâz that I have performed! Bless me with a good end and destiny! Bless me with the fortune of pronouncing the Kalima-i-tawhîd at my last breath. Forgive my dead relatives (father, mother, grandfather(s), grandmother(s)) and bless them with Thine Compassion. Allâhum-maghfîr warhâm wa anta khayr-ur-râhimîn. Tawaf-fanî musliman wa al-hiqnî bi-'s-sâlihîn. Allâhum-maghfîr-lî wa bi'l-wâlidayya wa-li'l-mu'minîna wa'l-mu'minât yawma yaqumu'l hisâb. Yâ Rabbî! Protect me against the evils of the Shaytân, the evils of enemies, and the evils of my own nafs! Bless our home with goodness, with beneficial and bountious sustenance! Bless the Ahl-i-Islâm (all Muslims) with salvation! Eliminate and ruin the enemies of Muslims! Bless those Muslims making Jihâd against disbelievers with Thine Divine Aid! Allâhumma in-naka afuw-wun kerîmun tuhib-bu'ul 'afwa fa'fu 'annî. Yâ Rabbî! Bless the unhealthy ones among us with good health and the afflicted ones with relief! Allâhumma innî as'aluka's-sihhata wa'l-âfiyata wa'l-amânata wa husn-al-khulqi wa'r-ridâ-a bi'l-qaderi bi-rahmatika yâ erhama'r-râhimîn. Yâ Rabbî! Bless my mother and father and my children and my kith and kin and all my brothers in Islam with beneficial lives, beautiful manners, common sense, good health, with guidance to the right way and salvation! Âmin. Wa'l-hamdu li'l-lâhi Rabbi'l-âlamîn. Allâhumma salli alâ sayyidina Muhammadin wa alâ âli sayyidina Muhammad kemâ sallayta alâ Ibrâhîma wa alâ âli Ibrâhîm innaka hamîdun mejîd. Allâhumma[1]... . Allâhumma Rabbanâ âtinâ fi'd-dunyâ hasanatan wa fi'l-âkhirati hasanatan wa qinâ 'adhâban-nâr bi-rahmatika yâ er-hama'r-râhimîn. Wa'l-hamdu li'l-lâhi Rab-bi'l 'âlamîn. Astaghfirullah, astaghfirullah, astaghfirullah astaghfirullah-al'azîm alkerîm lâ-ilâha illâ huwa'l-hayya'l qayyûma wa atûbu ilayh.

---

[1] The same prayer will be repeated, with the exception that the word 'salli' will be substituted with 'bârik', and the word 'sallayta' with 'bârakta'.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

THE BELIEF of AHL AS-SUNNA

The belief of Ahl as-sunna is what you need first,
Of the seventy-three, choose this way, the rest'll lead to Hell.
Muslims are all sunnî: and their leader is Nu'mân.
Paradise is promised to their followers in îmân.

First make thine belief firm; then hold fast to Sharî'at!
Obey Islam's five commandments; do avoid its harâms!
If you commit a sin, make tawba, forthwith!
Whoever violates Sharî'at will one day regret it.

Don't ever believe the atheist, else you'll end up in misery!
Mind sweet words, or they'll entice you into catastrophe!
Hypocrites are on the increase; angels in guise, snakes in essence.
To entrap you, they'll be your friends, so true in appearance.

Anyone may claim he is right, and others wrong,
Islam is the criterion whereby to judge who is right!
Person who disobeys Islam is an aberrant one;
He who knows history well, will confirm this word.

Why will a person feeling unwell run to see a doctor?
For no one wants to die, life is more sweet than anything else.
Who on earth could claim he wouldn't like to live forever?
Death does not mean nonexistence: believe in life in the grave!

Paradise is everlasting, and so is Hell; Qur'ân states so,
Beware of everlasting affliction, were it only a suspicion,
Yet some people deny this; a bat will shun light, and a crow
Enjoys rubbish heaps. It is the philomel that will solicit the rose.

No doubt, a lascivious profligate could not like Islam,
These two'd never come together; good and bad are opposites!
Muslims are observant of the right, and kind to people;
Infidels, like serpents, enjoy hurting others.

Alas, Yâ Rabbî, alas! Such a difficult time we live in:
Religious knowledge's sunken into oblivion, very few perform namâz.
Masons insidiously gnaw at Islam from all directions;
Communists inflict torment; death, dungeon on Muslims.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Today's eccentricities the Messenger foretold;
Said: "My follower shall be so lonesome one day;
Every home shall be loud with music, adhân heard no more;
No 'âlim anywhere, the ignorant shall come to the fore!

Believers shall be miserable, disbelievers a Solomon each,
Every man a servant of his wife, woman commanding in the home;
Tall buildings shall be built, like a dog's teeth:
Travelling shall be so fast, distance no longer a matter.

The intellect shall find many things, yet mankind sound asleep.
Birgivî[1] wrote in his book, as many hadîths foretold:
Signs of the world's end shall appear, one after another;
The most famous of these signs; many a person shall be drunk.

People quite unaware of Islam shall be called 'Ulamâ.
The cruel shall be honoured, to ward off his harm.
Shamelessness on the increase, cuckolds wandering,
The basest of mankind in Moscow, issuing orders.

Everyone an 'âlim to himself, Muslim shall be called 'rough.'
Few shall tell the truth, liars talking all the time.
A person shall be praised much, though having no îmân in his heart:
Men, like women, shall wear silk clothes shamelessly.

Wealth, adultery shall be arts, boys used for girls:
Women shall be tightly dressed, legs, bosoms in the open.
Fitna shall prevail all over, manslaughter for nothing.
Bid'at shall be widespread, no one to obey the sunnats.

People lacking moral sense, like Dajjâl, shall invent thousands of lies,
Should a person tell the truth, they shall assail from all directions.
Men shall be unaware of Islam, and women shall be eccentric:
Emr-i-ma'rûf shall be forgotten, charlatans advertising sins.

Islam shall be criticised, harâms shall be committed everywhere,
Being a Muslim shall be in words only, melodies enjoyed in the name of Qur'ân.
The Believer shall be called reactionary, the renegade shall be backed:
All these shall certainly happen before the crack of doom.

Dajjâl, the grand prognostication, shall appear in Khorasan;
Then Îsâ shall descend from heaven, to a mosque in Damascus.
A hadîth says, "Of my daughter Fâtima's descendants, a youth
Named Mehdi shall appear, and his father shall be named Abdullah.

---

[1] Muhammad Birgivî passed away in 981 [A.D. 1573].

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

He shall strengthen Islam; îmân shall spread all over the world,
Then this hero and Îsâ 'alaihis-salâm' shall cooperate
And kill Dajjâl, filling the whole world with justice and safety,
Later, Ye'jûj and Me'jûj[1] shall appear from behind the wall.

Millions shall be their number, and they shall bloodbath everywhere.
Later Dâbb-at-ul-ard shall appear from below Safâ in Mekka:
A beast big as a mountain, it shall know good from bad.
The next portent is: the sun shall rise in the west.

Seeing this, disbelievers shall be Believers altogether,
Yet it shall do no good now coming round to the right course.
Another portent shall be a smoke appearing in Aden[2]
Also, several coloured Abyssinians shall demolish Ka'ba.

The earth shall contain no copy of Qur'ân the great blessing.
Muslims shall all die, and the wrongdoers shall survive.
He shall do all sorts of atrocity, the monster called mankind:
Yet a fire from Hidjâz shall catch all unawares.

As they wander, eccentric, unbridled, doom shall suddenly crack,
And many other things shall happen, yet impossible to express."
What a shame; some people have been made idols;
Ilâhî! If Thou dost not help, we shall all ruin utterly.

All we do in this fashion of apostasy is, sinning, wrongdoing.
People have deviated, everyone has to care for his self!
Depravity around me has covered me with oblivion all over;
Life has gone by fast, wake up, o my heart, wake up!

You' ve always worked for this world, and lost your next world;
Pursuing only your physical needs, you' ve ruined your heart.
You' ve never followed mind or reason, the nafs your commander;
You' ve spent a youth in oblivion, always chasing worldly ambitions.

You would never take advice, aberrant as if intoxicated;
So deeply absorbed in worldly pleasures; now it is time to moan.
Deceived by perfidious people, you' ve fancied the world'd go on forever,
Efforts' ve come to naught, your opulence, riches are no good!

He who follows Islamic superiors, I' ve realized, will be happy;
What a shame, I' ve let a whole life fly away, now I feel so doleful,
How I wish I'd obeyed Qur'ân, now I'd be an eternal sultân,
A man may own the whole world, yet can not stay here forever.

---

[1] Gog and Magog.
[2] A coastal town in Yemen.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Where is Darius[1] or Alexander;[2] where are the Romans and the Greek?
Where is Nimrod or Pharaoh; where is Qârun[3] and where is Hâmân?[4]
Where is Dzengiz[5] and where is Hitler?[6] What did they leave to mention?
Edison[7] or Marconi[8] or Pasteur[9] shall not find kindness in the hereafter!

Do not think people useful to the world have reached perfection!
Theriac is sometimes made from a snake, and medicine from poison!
Do not judge by the appearance, îmân is man's perfection!
Person with îmân will not be lazy; "Work," commands the Subhân.[10]

Lazy and regressive people are censured by Nebiyy-i-Zîshân,[11]
He said in a hadîth, "He who works is beloved to Rabb!"
The soul, too, needs care; it is the beast that only feeds the body!
The health of this body is transient like running water!

Yes, the body is useful, for it is the one that carries the soul;
All the limbs deserve care; so a Muslim should act accordingly!
Did Nebiyyullah ever sit idly? Think well and be considerate!
All the Sahâba were experts in peace and lions in wartime.

I knew all these, yet I followed the nafs, now I am trembling,
I did not avoid sins; would this be the way of showing gratitude?
Hilmi, do not give up hope, Rahmân[12] is the name of your Rab!
Ilâhî, help us; enemies are all around us!

---

[1] Darius (the Great), the ninth and the last king of Ancient Persia.
[2] Alexander (the Great), king of Macedonia from 336 to 323 B.C.
[3] Qârun, a relation and an ummat (follower) of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. Later he came in possession of a great fortune, which spoiled him so badly that he turned away from Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'. He and all his riches were sunken into the earth. Also called Croesus.
[4] Pharaoh's vizier. He disuaded Pharaoh from becoming a Believer. He was the chief instigator in the martyrdom of Hadrat Âsiya, Pharaoh's wife, who was a Believeress in the religion of Mûsâ 'alaihis-salâm'.
[5] Dzengiz Khan, the Mongolian emperor, the most cruel one; an enemy of Islam, He massacred millions of Muslims. He put to the sword those Muslims who took refuge in mosques.
[6] Hitler, (Adolf), chancellor of Nazi Germany. He committed suicide in 1945.
[7] Edison, (Thomas Alva), U.S. inventor [d. 1350 (A.D. 1931)].
[8] Marconi, (Guglielmo), Italian electrical engineer [1291-1355 (A.D. 1874-1937)].
[9] Pasteur, (Louis), French chemist and bacteriologist [1237-1312 (A.D. 1822-95)].
[10] Allâhu ta'âlâ.
[11] Our Prophet 'sall-Allâhu alaihi wasallam'.
[12] Compassionate, merciful.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

Books, newspapers, films, radios have all become fiends;
If they told the truth, they would be a testimony each.
Why should sources of knowledge and science be so disappointing?
New physics and modern chemistry always testify to Thine Being!

Every mote says, "Allah is," from atom to the heavens!
Yet no one sees them, the hearts no more have common sense.
Certainly, the world'll be dungeon for those who deny Haqq![1]
What do you think is the source of these crises in Europe, America, and Asia?

For they do not see Haqq; they are all so befuddled;
Materially improved they are, yet quite unaware of humanity!
Could you expect peace and comfort from communism and freemasonry?
Absolutely will not attain happiness, person who turns away from Islam!

Radio of Moscow made aggressions against Islam daily this Ramazân.
Extremely sordid, so unmanly were the calumnies it heaped.
Even though disbelief survives, the cruel shall perish;
"I shall give respite to the cruel, yet this is no negligence," said Yezdân.[2]

Let Muslims not worry, Deyyân[3] shall protect Qur'ân!
It is an historical repetition; Prophets came in times of unbelief;
Whenever the world was in darkness, rose a brilliant sun;
And now the sun of hidâyat[4] shall rise in Anatolia!

Habîbullah[5] made possible attaining this hidâyat!
What does 'Habîb' mean? Think and you'll see how great he was.
Yâ Rabb! He is such a Prophet that his slaves become sultans!
Once a heart's been filled with his love, it'll give light to lights.

Why isn't that sun seen? The whole world has become blind;
Endless blessing, greatest honour is loving him, no doubt;
For his love I would sacrifice my whole property, my life!
One who has not tasted sugar will not know how sweet it tastes.

So sinful I am, and so shamed; yet my heart glitters with love;
For his love I shed so many tears; the soil of Erzincan is the witness!
This love ended wrongdoing; then I began moaning and groaning,
The last breath is not known; yet this is a portent of happiness!

The blessing is loving him, this I have now realized!
May he be closest to Habîb, he who presented this love to us!

1960 A.D. 1380 H. Erzincan

---

[1] The Right Way, also a name of Allâhu ta'âlâ.
[2] Allâhu ta'âlâ.
[3] Allâhu ta'âlâ.
[4] Guidance to the right way.
[5] The beloved one of Allâhu ta'âlâ; our Prophet.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

WHAT IS A TRUE MUSLIM LIKE?

The first advice is to correct the belief in accordance with those which the Ahl-i sunnat savants communicate in their books. For, it is this madhhab only that will be saved from Hell. May Allâhu ta'âlâ give plenty of rewards for the work of those great people! Those scholars of the four madhhabs, who reached the grade of ijtihâd and the great scholars, educated by them are called **Ahl as-sunna** scholars. After correcting the belief (îmân), it is necessary to perform the worship informed in the knowledge of **fiqh,** i.e. to do the commands of the Sharî'at and to abstain from what it prohibits. One should perform the namâz five times each day without reluctance and slackness, and being careful about its conditions and ta'dîl-i arkân. He who has as much money as nisâb should pay zakât. Imâm-i a'zâm Abû Hanîfa says, "Also, it is necessary to pay the zakât of gold and silver which women use as ornaments."

One should not waste his precious life even on unnecessary mubâhs. It is certainly necessary not to waste it on harâm. We should not get involved with taghannî, singing, musical instruments, or songs. We should not be deceived by the pleasure they give our nafses. These are poisons mixed with honey and covered with sugar.

One should not commit **giybat.** Giybat is harâm. [Giybat means to talk about a Muslim's or a Zimmî's secret fault behind his back. It is necessary to tell Muslims about the faults of the Harbîs, about the sins of those who commit these sins in public, about the evils of those who torment Muslims and who deceive Muslims in buying and selling, thus causing Muslims to beware their harms, and to tell about the slanders of those who talk and write about Islam wrongfully; these are not giybat. **Radd-ul-Muhtâr: 5-263**)].

One should not spread gossip (carry words) among Muslims. It has been declared that various kinds of torments would be done to those who commit these two kinds of sins. Also, it is harâm to lie and slander, and must be abstained from. These two evils were

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

harâm in every religion. Their punishments are very heavy. It is very blessed to conceal Muslims' defects, not to spread their secret sins and to forgive them their faults. One should be compassionate towards one's inferiors, those under one's command [such as wives, children, students, soldiers] and the poor. One should not reproach them for their faults. One should not hurt or beat or swear at those poor persons for trivial reasons. One should attack nobody's property, life, honour, or chastity. Debts to everyone and to the government must be paid. Bribery, accepting or giving, is harâm. However, it would not be bribery to give it in order to get rid of the oppression of a cruel one, or to avoid a disgusting situation. But accepting this would be harâm, too. Everybody should see their own defects, and should every hour think of the faults which they have committed towards Allahu ta'âlâ. They should always bear in mind that Allahu ta'âlâ does not hurry in punishing them, nor does He cut off their sustenance. The words of command from our parents, or from the government, compatible with sharî'a, must be obeyed, but the ones, incompatible with sharî'a, should not be resisted against so that we should not cause fitna. [See the 123rd letter in the second volume of the book **Maktûbât-ı Ma'sûmiyya.**]

After correcting the belief and doing the commands of fiqh, one should spend all one's time remembering Allahu ta'âlâ. One should continue remembering, mentioning Allahu ta'âlâ as the great men of religion have communicated. One should feel hostility towards all the things that will prevent the heart from remembering Allahu ta'âlâ. The more you adhere to the Sharî'at, the more delicious it will be to remember Him. As indolence, laziness increase in obeying the Sharî'at, that flavour will gradually decrease, being thoroughly gone at last. What should I write more than what I have written already? It will be enough for the reasonable one. We should not fall into the traps of the enemies of Islam and we should not believe their lies and slanders.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

The Director,
Hakikat Kitabevi,
Darüşşafaka Cad. 57/A (P.K.35), *11th JANUARY, 1995.*
34262 Fatih/İstanbul, Turkey *MOMBASA-KENYA*

Dear Brother in Islam,

As-Salaam-Alaikum,

After greetings from our end, I wish to say thank you very much for the publications that had been sent to me by your good selves during the month of December, 1994. The publications received by me were as follows:

1. Phamphlet-WAQF IKHLAS
2. ADVICE FOR THE MUSLIM
3. ISLAM AND CHRISTIANITY

The said books were a pleasure to go through and have been circulated the same among my fellow muslim brothers within my town. I also have regular visitors from our neighbouring East African countries who have shown keen interest in the publications. I have also circulated your address amongst them.

I shall very much appreciate if you could send me the following titles:

2. Endless Bliss
6. The Religion Reformers in Islam
7. The Sunni Path
8. Belief and Islam
9. The Proof of Prophethood
10. Answer to an Enemy of Islam
11. Advice for the Muslim
12. Islam and Christianity
13. Could not Answer
14. Confessions of a British Spy
15. Documents of the Right Word

Receiving the said publications shall be a great pleasure.
Awaiting to hear from you, I remain a devotee,

Yours Sincerely,

SULEMAN KASSAM (MR).

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

BOOKS PUBLISHED BY HAKİKAT KİTABEVİ

ENGLISH:

1– Endless Bliss I, 304 pp.
2– Endless Bliss II, 400 pp.
3– Endless Bliss III, 336 pp.
4– Endless Bliss IV, 432 pp.
5– Endless Bliss V, 512 pp.
6– Endless Bliss VI, 352 pp.
7– The Sunni Path, 128 pp.
8– Belief and Islam, 128 pp.
9– The Proof of Prophethood, 144 pp.
10– Answer to an Enemy of Islam, 128 pp.
11– Advice for the Muslim, 352 pp.
12– Islam and Christianity, 336 pp.
13– Could Not Answer, 432 pp.
14– Confessions of a British Spy, 128 pp.
15– Documents of the Right Word, 496 pp.
16– Why Did They Become Muslims?, 304 pp.
17– Ethics of Islam, 240 pp.
18– Sahaba 'The Blessed', 560 pp.
19– Islam's Reformers, 320 pp.
20– The Rising and the Hereafter, 112 pp.
21– Miftah-ul-janna, 288 pp.
22– Book of Namâz, 240 pp.
23– O Son, 352 pp.

DEUTSCH:

1– Islam, der Weg der Sunniten, 128 Seiten
2– Glaube und Islam, 128 Seiten
3– Islam und Christentum, 352 Seiten
4– Beweis des Prophetentums, 160 Seiten
5– Geständnisse von einem Britischen Spion, 176 Seiten
6– Islamische Sitte, 288 Seiten

EN FRANÇAIS:

1– L'Islam et la Voie de Sunna, 112 pp.
2– Foi et Islam, 160 pp.
3– Islam et Christianisme, 304 pp.
4– L'évidence de la Prophétie, et les Temps de Prières, 144 pp.
5– Ar-radd al Jamil, Ayyuha'l-Walad (Al-Ghazâli), 96 pp.
6– Al-Munqid min ad'Dalâl, (Al-Ghazâli), 64 pp.

SHQIP:

1- Besimi dhe Islami, 96 fq.
2- Libri Namazit, 208 fq.
3- Rrefimet e Agjentit Anglez, 112 fq.

ESPAÑOL:

1- Creencia e Islam, 112.
2- Libro Del Namâz, 224.

ПО РУССКИ:

1- Всем Нужная Вера, (128) стр.
2- Признания Английского Шпиона, (128) стр.
3- Китаб-ус-Салат (Молитвенник) Книга о намазе, (224) стр.
4- О Сын Мой, (256) стр.
5- Религя Ислам, (320) стр.

BOSHNJAKISHT:

1- Iman i Islam, (128) str.
2- Odgovor Neprijatelju Islama, (144) str.
3- Knjiga o Namazu, (192) str.
4- Nije Mogao Odgovoriti, (432) str.
5- Put Ehl-i Sunneta, (128) str.
6- Ispovijesti Jednog Engleskog Spijuna, (144) str.

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

اسماء الكتب الفارسية التي نشرتها مكتبة الحقيقة

اسماء الكتب	عدد صفحاتها
١ – مكتوبات امام رباني (دفتر اول)	٦٧٢
٢ – مكتوبات امام رباني (دفتر دوم وسوم)	٦٠٨
٣ – منتخبات از مكتوبات امام رباني	٤١٦
٤ – منتخبات ازمكتوبات معصومية ويليه مسلك مجدد الف ثاني (با ترجمه اردو)	٤٣٢
٥ – مبدأ و معاد و يليه تأييد اهل سنت (امام رباني)	١٥٦
٦ – كيمياي سعادت (امام غزالي)	٦٨٨
٧ – رياض الناصحين	٣٨٤
٨ – مكاتيب شريفه (حضرة عبدالله دهلوى) ويليه امجد التالد ويليهما نامهاى خالد بغدادى	٢٨٨
٩ – در المعارف (ملفوظات حضرت عبد اللّه دهلوي)	١٦٠
١٠ – رد وهابي و يليه سيف الابرار المسلول على الفجار	١٤٤
١١ – الاصول الاربعة في ترديد الوهابية	١٢٨
١٢ – زبدة المقامات (بركات احمدية)	٤٢٤
١٣ – مفتاح النجاة لاحمد نامقي جامي ويليه نصايح عبد الله انصاري	١٢٨
١٤ – ميزان الموازين في امر الدين (در رد نصارى)	٣٠٤
١٥ – مقامات مظهرية و يليه هو الغني	٢٠٨
١٦ – مناهج العباد الى المعاد و يليه عمدة الاسلام	٣٢٠
١٧ – تحفه اثنى عشريه (عبد العزيز دهلوي)	٨١٦
١٨ – المعتمد في المعتقد (رساله توربشتي)	٢٨٨
١٩ – حقوق الاسلام ويليه مالابدّ منه ويليهما تذكرة الموتى والقبور	٢٧٢
٢٠ – مسموعات قاضى محمد زاهد از حضرت عبيد الله احرار	١٩٢
٢١ – ترغيب الصلاة	٢٨٨
٢٢ – أنيس الطالبين و عدّة السالكين	٢٠٨
٢٣ – شواهد النبوة	٣٠٤
٢٤ – عمدة المقامات	٤٨٠
٢٥– اعترافات جاسوس انگليسى به لغة فارسى ودشمنى انگليسها به إسلام	١٦٠

الكتب العربية مع الاردوية والفارسية مع الاردوية والاردية

١ – المدارج السنية في الرد على الوهابية ويليه العقائد الصحيحة فى ترديد الوهابية النجدية	١٩٢
٢ – عقائد نظاميه (فارسي مع اردو) مع شرح قصيدة بدء الامالي ويليه احكام سماع از كيمياي سعادت ويليهما ذكر ائمه از تذكرة الاولياء ويليهما مناقب ائمهٔ اربعه	١٦٠
٣ – الخيرات الحسان (اردو) (احمد ابن حجر مكي)	٢٢٤
٤ –ہر کسی کیلئے لازم ایمان مولانا خالد بغدادیؒ	١٤٤
٥ –انگریز جاسوس کے اعترافات	١٦٠

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

اسماء الكتب	عدد صفحاتها

٤٤ – النعمة الكبرى على العالم في مولد سيد ولد آدم ويليه نبذة من الفتاوى الحديثية ويليهما كتاب جواهر البحار ٣٢٠
٤٥ – تسهيل المنافع وبهامشه الطب النبوي ويليه شرح الزرقاني على المواهب اللدنية ويليهما فوائد عثمانية ويليها خزينة المعارف ٦٢٤
٤٦ – الدولة العثمانية من الفتوحات الاسلامية ويليه المسلمون المعاصرون ٢٧٢
٤٧ – كتاب الصلاة ويليه مواقيت الصلاة ويليهما اهمية الحجاب الشرعي ١٦٠
٤٨ – الصرف والنحو العربي وعوامل والكافية لابن الحاجب ١٧٦
٤٩ – الصواعق المحرقة ويليه تطهير الجنان واللسان ٤٨٠
٥٠ – الحقائق الاسلامية في الرد على المزاعم الوهابية ١١٢
٥١ – نور الاسلام تأليف الشيخ عبد الكريم محمد المدرس البغدادي ١٩٢
٥٢ – الصراط المستقيم في رد النصارى ويليه السيف الصقيل ويليهما القول الثبت ويليها خلاصة الكلام للنبهاني ١٢٨
٥٣ – الرد الجميل في رد النصارى ويليه ايها الولد للغزالي ٢٢٤
٥٤ – طريق النجاة ويليه المكتوبات المنتخبة لمحمد معصوم الفاروقي ١٧٦
٥٥ – القول الفصل شرح الفقه الاكبر للامام الاعظم ابي حنيفة ٤٤٨
٥٦ – جالية الاكدار والسيف البتار (لمولانا خالد البغدادي) ٩٦
٥٧ – اعترافات الجاسوس الانكليزي ١٢٨
٥٨ – غاية التحقيق ونهاية التدقيق للشيخ السندى ١١٢
٥٩ – المعلومات النافعة لأحمد جودت باشا ٥٢٨
٦٠ – مصباح الانام وجلاء الظلام فى رد شبه البدعى النجدى ويليه رسالة فيما يتعلق بادلة جواز التوسل بالنبى وزيارته صلى الله عليه وسلم ٢٢٤
٦١ – ابتغاء الوصول لحبّ الله بمدح الرسول ويليه البنيان المرصوص ٢٤٠
٦٢ – الإسلام وسائر الأديان ٣٣٦
٦٣ – مختصر تذكرة القرطبي للشعراني ويليه قرة العيون للسمرقندي ٣٥٢

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

اسماء الكتب	عدد صفحاتها

٢٢ – الحبل المتين ويليه العقود الدرية ويليهما هداية الموفقين ١٣٦
٢٣ – خلاصة الكلام في بيان امراء البلد الحرام ويليه ارشاد الحيارى في تحذير المسلمين من مدارس النصارى ويليهما نبذة من الفتاوى الحديثية ٢٨٨
٢٤ – التوسل بالنبي وبالصالحين ويليه التوسل لمحمد عبد القيوم القادري ٣٣٦
٢٥ – الدرر السنية في الرد على الوهابية ويليه نور اليقين في مبحث التلقين ٢٢٤
٢٦ – سبيل النجاة عن بدعة اهل الزيغ والضلال ويليه كف الرعاع عن المحرمات ويليهما الاعلام بقواطع الاسلام ٢٨٨
٢٧ – الانصاف ويليه عقد الجيد ويليهما مقياس القياس والمسائل المنتخبة ٢٤٠
٢٨ – المستند المعتمد بناء نجاة الابد ١٦٠
٢٩ – الاستاذ المودودي ويليه كشف الشبهة عن الجماعة التبليغية ١٤٤
٣٠ – كتاب الايمان (من رد المحتار) ٦٥٦
٣١ – الفقه على المذاهب الاربعة (الجزء الاول) ٣٥٢
٣٢ – الفقه على المذاهب الاربعة (الجزء الثاني) ٣٣٦
٣٣ – الفقه على المذاهب الاربعة (الجزء الثالث) ٣٨٤
٣٤ – الادلة القواطع على الزام العربية في التوابع ويليه فتاوى علماء الهند على منع الخطبة بغير العربية ويليهما الحظر والاباحة من الدر المختار ١٢٠
٣٥ – البريقة شرح الطريقة (الجزء الاول) ٦٠٨
٣٦ – البريقة شرح الطريقة ويليه منهل الواردين في مسائل الحيض ٣٣٦
٣٧ – البهجة السنية في آداب الطريقة ويليه ارغام المريد ٢٥٦
٣٨ – السعادة الابدية فيما جاء به النقشبندية ويليه الحديقة الندية ويليهما الرد على النصارى والرد على الوهابية ١٧٦
٣٩ – مفتاح الفلاح ويليه خطبة عيد الفطر ويليهما لزوم اتباع مذاهب الائمة ١٩٢
٤٠ – مفاتيح الجنان شرح شرعة الاسلام ٦٨٨
٤١ – الانوار المحمدية من المواهب اللدنية (الجزء الاول) ٤٤٨
٤٢ – حجة الله على العالمين في معجزات سيد المرسلين ويليه مسئلة التوسل ٢٨٨
٤٣ – اثبات النبوة ويليه الدولة المكية بالمادة الغيبية ١٢٨

(c) ketabton.com: The Digital Library

اسماء الكتب العربية التي نشرتها مكتبة الحقيقة

اسماء الكتب **عدد صفحاتها**

١ – جزء عم من القرآن الكريم ٣٢
٢ – حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الاول) ٦٠٤
٣ – حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الثانى) ٤٦٢
٤ – حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الثالث) ٦٢٤
٥ – حاشية شيخ زاده على تفسير القاضى البيضاوى (الجزء الرابع) ٦٢٤
٦ – الايمان والاسلام ويليه السلفيون ١٢٨
٧ – نخبة اللآلي لشرح بدء الامالي ١٩٢
٨ – الحديقة الندية شرح الطريقة المحمدية (الجزء الاول) ٥٩٢
٩ – علماء المسلمين وجهلة الوهابيين ويليه شواهد الحق
ويليهما العقائد النسفية ويليها تحقيق الرابطة ٢٢٤
١٠ – فتاوى الحرمين برجف ندوة المين ويليه الدرة المضيئة ١٢٨
١١ – هدية المهديين ويليه المتنبئ القادياني ويليهما الجماعة التبليغية ١٩٢
١٢ – المنقذ عن الضلال ويليه الجام العوام عن علم الكلام ويليهما تحفة الاريب
ويليها نبذة من تفسير روح البيان ٢٥٦
١٣ – المنتخبات من المكتوبات للامام الرباني ٤٨٠
١٤ – مختصر (التحفة الاثني عشرية) ٣٥٢
١٥ – الناهية عن طعن امير المؤمنين معاوية ويليه الذب عن الصحابة
ويليهما الاساليب البديعة ويليها الحجج القطعية ورسالة رد روافض ٢٨٨
١٦ – خلاصة التحقيق في بيان حكم التقليد والتلفيق ويليه الحديقة الندية ٥١٢
١٧ – المنحة الوهبية في رد الوهابية ويليه اشد الجهاد
ويليهما الرد على محمود الآلوسي ويليها كشف النور ١٩٢
١٨ – البصائر لمنكري التوسل باهل المقابر ويليه غوث العباد ٤١٦
١٩ – فتنة الوهابية والصواعق الالهية وسيف الجبار والرد على سيد قطب ٢٥٦
٢٠ – تطهير الفؤاد ويليه شفاء السقام ٢٥٦
٢١ – الفجر الصادق في الرد على منكري التوسل والكرامات والخوارق
ويليه ضياء الصدور ويليهما الرد على الوهابية ١٢٨

Get more e-books from www.ketabton.com
Ketabton.com: The Digital Library