

Jesus the Prophet: Son of Mary

There is no doubt that God has absolute power in creation. He creates whatever He wants and however He wills. He usually creates a creature from its own kind, and sometimes from a different kind, as He created the she-camel of Salih (peace be upon him) from a rock, and sometimes from the four elements, as He created Adam from water, air, fire, and earth without a father and mother, and as He created Eve from Adam's rib. He created Jesus from a mother without a father. He continued to create the offspring of Adam and his children from a father and a mother. Glory be to Him, how great His majesty is, beyond the definition and the imagination. God has explained in the Holy Qur'an the truth about the birth of Jesus, son of Mary, in a comprehensive statement: From his birth to his death and ascension to Him.



- Professor, Faculty of Arabic & Islamic Studies, State Islamic University Syarif Hidayatullah, Indonesia (1992-2007)
- Senior Researcher & Professor, Faculty of Languages & Linguistics, University Malaya (2007-2016)
- Professor, Islamic University Sultan Sharif Ali, Brunei Darussalam (2016-2022), University of Dharmawangsa, Indonesia (2023-Present)



Globe
EDIT

Prof. Dr. Salahuddin Mohd. Shamsuddin

Mohd. Shamsuddin, Hasballah Tayyib, Lubis

Globe
EDIT



Salahuddin Mohd. Shamsuddin - Zamakhsyari bin Hasballah Thaib
Tonang Hasan Lubis

Jesus the Prophet: Son of Mary

Disagreement of Jewish and Christian Scholars
About His Birth and Crucifixion, and then the
Distortion in His Gospel

**Salahuddin Mohd. Shamsuddin
Zamakhshari bin Hasballah Thaib
Tonang Hasan Lubis**

Jesus the Prophet: Son of Mary

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

**Salahuddin Mohd. Shamsuddin
Zamakhsyari bin Hasballah Thaib
Tonang Hasan Lubis**

Jesus the Prophet: Son of Mary

**Disagreement of Jewish and Christian Scholars
About His Birth and Crucifixion, and then the
Distortion in His Gospel**

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

GlobeEdit

Imprint

Any brand names and product names mentioned in this book are subject to trademark, brand or patent protection and are trademarks or registered trademarks of their respective holders. The use of brand names, product names, common names, trade names, product descriptions etc. even without a particular marking in this work is in no way to be construed to mean that such names may be regarded as unrestricted in respect of trademark and brand protection legislation and could thus be used by anyone.

Cover image: www.ingimage.com

Publisher:

GlobeEdit

is a trademark of

Dodo Books Indian Ocean Ltd. and OmniScriptum S.R.L publishing group

120 High Road, East Finchley, London, N2 9ED, United Kingdom

Str. Armeneasca 28/1, office 1, Chisinau MD-2012, Republic of Moldova,
Europe

Managing Directors: Ieva Konstantinova, Victoria Ursu

info@omniscryptum.com

Printed at: see last page

ISBN: 978-620-9-26306-4

Copyright © Salahuddin Mohd. Shamsuddin, Zamakhsyari Hasballah **Thaib**,
Tonang Hasan Lubis

Copyright © 2025 Dodo Books Indian Ocean Ltd. and OmniScriptum S.R.L
publishing group

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

Jesus the Prophet, Son of Mary
(Disagreement of Jewish and Christian Scholars About His
Birth and Crucifixion, and then the Distortion in His Gospel:
From the Qur'anic Perspective)

Prof. Dr. Salahuddin Mohd. Shamsuddin
University of Dharmawangsa, Medan, North Sumatra, Indonesia

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Zamakhsyari Bin Hasballah Thaib,
Islamic Education, Faculty of Islamic Studies,
University of Dharmawangsa, Indonesia
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3698-3980>
dr.zamakhsyari@dharmawangsa.ac.id

Dr. Tonang Hasan Lubis
Lecturer at University of Dharmawangsa and (UIN), Medan,
North Sumatra, Indonesia

Contents of the Book

Contents	Pages
Introduction.....	4
 Chapter One:	
Theories of Ancient Greek Philosophers on the God and His Divinity.....	10
A. Plato's and Aristotle's Theories on the Existence of God...17	
B. Neo-Platonic Doctrine of Alexandrian Philosophers.....	20
 Chapter Two:	
The Children of Israel.....	23
1. Definition of the Children of Israel.....	24
2. Definition of the Jews and Judaism.....	27
A. The Jews.....	27
B. Judaism.....	28
C. Provisions of Ten Commandments among the Jews.....	30
 Chapter Three:	
Birth of Jesus, Son of Mary.....	35
A. Birth of Jesus, Son of Mary in the Holy Qur'an.....	36
B. Birth of Jesus, Son of Mary, in Christian Holy Books.....	39
 Chapter Four:	
Doctrine of Trinity among the Christians.....	44
1. Doctrine of Monotheism among the Christians.....	47
2. Monotheism in the Christian Doctrine of Trinity	48
3. Christian doctrine of union and incarnation	53
4. Christian Evidence for the Trinity Doctrine	55
5. Falsity of Trinity Doctrine by Sayings of Jesus Christ	67

6. Terms: Father and Son in Old and New Testaments.....	80
7. Christian Doctrine of Crucifixion and Redemption	93
8. Doctrine of Baptism.....	98
9. Doctrine of the Lord's Supper.....	99
10. Doctrine of the Veneration of Cross	100
11. Doctrine of Inheriting Original Sin	101
12. Invalidity of This Illusory Doctrine.....	103

Chapter Five:

The Sacred Books of Christianity Christians.....	108
A. The Old Testament.....	109
B. The New Testament.....	111
1. Gospel of Jesus, Son of Mary.....	111
2. Reality of the Four Gospels among the Christians.....	113
3. Gospel of Matthew.....	115
4. Gospel of Mark.....	118
5. Gospel of Luke.....	120
6. Gospel of John.....	121
7. Gospel of Barnabas and Crucifixion of Christ.....	130

Chapter Six:

Distortion in the Christian Religion.....	138
1. Paul and his role in distorting Christianity.....	139
A. Paul's Intense Hostility Towards Christians.....	140
B. Paul's Personality.....	145
C. Paul and the Disciples of Christ.....	145
D. Paul's Distortion of Christian Doctrine.....	148

2. Paul and Doctrine of Crucifixion and Redemption.....	150
3. Statements by Christian Writers about Paul.....	154
4. Constantine and His Role in Distorting Christianity.....	156
Conclusion	159
References	175

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

Introduction: (From the Quranic Perspective)

The name of Jesus' mother (peace be upon him and her) was Mary, daughter of Imran. She was a righteous woman, devoted to her worship, to the point that no one could rival her in piety and devotion. The angels gave her the good news of the birth of her son without a father, using the word "Be," as a break from tradition and a divine choice. This son's name would be the Messiah, Jesus, son of Mary. The angels informed her that this son would be distinguished in this world and the Hereafter and would be a messenger to the Children of Israel. He would teach the Book, wisdom, the Torah, and the Gospel, and would possess a status and miracles unmatched by any other prophet or messenger.

There is no doubt that God (Glory be to Him) has absolute power in creation. He creates whatever He wants and however He wills. He usually creates a creature from its own kind, and sometimes from a different kind, as He created the she-camel of Salih (peace be upon him) from a rock, and sometimes from the four elements, as He created Adam from water, air, fire, and earth without a father or mother, and as He created Eve from Adam's rib. He created Jesus from a mother without a father. And He continued to create the offspring of Adam and his children from a father and a mother. Glory be to Him, how great is His majesty, beyond measure and beyond imagination. God has explained in the Holy Qur'an the truth about the birth of Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon them both), in a comprehensive statement: from his birth to his death and ascension to Him.

However, the Jews and Christians among the People of the Book differed regarding his status. Some said he was the son of God. Some said he was the third of three. Some said he was God in the human world. Some said he was God's servant and messenger. This last statement is the true from the Qur'anic perspective.

When the Children of Israel deviated from the right path, transgressed God's laws, insulted the prophets and messengers, and spread corruption on earth through oppression and tyranny, God sent Jesus, Son of Mary, as a messenger and taught him the Torah and Gospel.

God (Glory be to Him) revealed to Jesus, Son of Mary, the Gospel, which was the guidance and light, confirming the laws and rulings contained in the Torah.

Jesus (peace be upon him) took the initiative to call the Children of Israel to worship one God and to abide by the laws of the Torah and the Gospel. He debated with them wisely, distinguishing between truth and falsehood. When their stubbornness and disbelief became apparent, Jesus (peace be upon him) asked his people, "Who are my helpers to God?" Among them, the disciples believed in him.

God also granted Jesus (peace be upon him) some miracles, as He had granted other prophets before him, to confirm the truth of his message. Jesus would make something out of clay in the shape of a bird, then breathe into it, and it would become a bird by God's permission. He would heal the blind and the lepers, bring the dead back to life by God's permission, and inform people of what they ate and what worldly goods they stored in their homes. The Jews exaggerated their hostility toward him, turning people away from him and accusing him of lying, accusing his mother of immorality she had never committed.

When the Jews saw that the weak and poor among the people believed in him, supported him, and aided him, they plotted to kill him. They incited the Roman authorities against him, making the Roman governor believe that Jesus, son of Mary, was

calling people to Roman rule. The Roman governor ordered his arrest and crucifixion. God likened him to a hypocrite among the Roman soldiers, so they arrested him, believing him to be Jesus, son of Mary, and crucified him. However, God (Glory be to Him) saved his life from the plot of murder and crucifixion. He will return before the Hour of Resurrection and will refute the Jews who claimed to have killed and crucified him, just as He will refute the Christians who believed that his ransom would be a means of forgiveness for their sins.

Conversely, God sent Jesus, son of Mary, to guide the Children of Israel to the worship of one God. Anyone who claims that Jesus, son of Mary, is the son of God or the third of three is committing blasphemy and a grave slander. The Jews, Christians, and their Christian followers, the Crusaders, altered and distorted the law of Christ, believing that man is free and able to do whatever he wants. Christ bore witness to the forgiveness of all his sins and transgressions until the Day of Judgment.

Before his death, Jesus, Son of Mary (peace be upon them both), gave glad tidings of the mission of a messenger from God who would come after him, named Ahmad, who is the Prophet Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him).

Motives for Choosing this Topic and Its Importance for Research and Study

- The Middle East is the cradle of the three heavenly religions: Judaism, Christianity, and Islam, and the cradle of the revelation of the three heavenly books: the Torah, the Gospel, and the Quran.
- The Middle East is a strategically important region for international politics due to the long-standing political and

military conflict between the Arabs and the Israelites, especially since 1948, when the Arab State of Palestine was under British Mandate.

- The ongoing war between Israel and Hamas among the Palestinians on the one hand, and Israel and the Arab and Islamic countries of the Middle East - Egypt, Syria, Lebanon, Yemen, and Iran - on the other, has prompted us to examine the subject of Christ and Christianity, which has been and continues to be the link between Judaism and Islam. This is to understand the roots of the religious and political dispute between Palestinian Arab Muslims and others, and the followers of the three monotheistic religions, or the family of Abraham (peace be upon him) in general. This bloody conflict, waged in the name of liberating Al-Aqsa Mosque from the clutches of Israel and the occupied Arab territories from the iron grip of the illegal Jewish settlers, could be the beginning of World War III. We must examine this political and religious issue from its roots to arrive at a solution that is convincing to all concerned parties, to bring the peoples of the region closer together based on religion.

A. Research Questions

1. Is the birth of Jesus, Son of Mary, without a father, a violation of the custom and natural law, and considered his own miracle?
2. Is there disagreement regarding his miracles, his death, and his ascension to God?
3. What is the difference between the doctrine of monotheism and the doctrine of the Trinity?
4. What is the fate of the Gospel of Jesus, Son of Mary, after his death?

B. Research Objectives

1. To know the truth about the birth of Jesus, Son of Mary, without a father, a violation of the custom and natural law.
2. To know his miracles, the truth about his death, and his ascension to God, as this is a matter over which scholars, including Jews, Christians, and others, have differed.
3. To know the doctrine of Trinity, with its three hypostases, according to the Christians, and the difference between the Trinity and doctrine of monotheism, free from all taint of polytheism, according to Muslims.
4. To know the fate of the Gospel of Jesus, Son of Mary, after his death? And what is the truth about the Gospels currently circulating among the Christians and others, and the distortions therein.

C. Previous Studies

1. Hindi, Rahmatullah (undated). Izhar al-Haqq. Casablanca: Library of the Arab Unity, Part. 1-2.
2. From the Qur'an to the Holy Scriptures. (undated). Translation of the book: (Izhar al-Haqq) into Urdu by Sheikh Rahmatullah Hindi.
3. Commentary on the Gospel of Mark. Translated by Aziz Fahim (1977). Cairo.
4. Muhammad Abu Zahra. Sheikh. (1966). Lectures on the Christianity. Dar al-Fikr al-Arabi. First edition.
5. Mikhail Wadea. (1984). Proofs of the Divinity of Christ.
6. H. Morris. Railton. "Studies in Christian Doctrine".

It is worth noting that there are many books on this topic, but we have selected those that are considered trustable by the researchers and scholars, both Muslims and non-Muslims.

D. Research Plan

The research consists of an introduction and five chapters and then a conclusion, as follows:

Chapter One:

Theories of Ancient Greek Philosophers on the Concept of God and His Divinity

Chapter Two:

The Children of Israel

Chapter Three:

The Birth of Jesus, Son of Mary

Chapter Four:

Doctrine of Trinity among the Christians

Chapter Five:

Distortions in the Message of Christ and the Holy Gospels among the Christians

Conclusion:

The conclusion summarizes the research and the new findings of this study.

References:

All the references are related to the essence of this topic.

Chapter One

Theories of Ancient Greek Philosophers on the Concept of God and His Divinity

There is no doubt that the conception of God and His divinity among the ancient Greeks played an important role in the history of human thought and its development. Although it could not achieve the same level of acceptance that the beliefs of other religions enjoyed among the nations and peoples of the world. Therefore, we could not ignore it when discussing God and His divinity when studying Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon them), and the Christian religion.

It is therefore appropriate to begin by briefly highlighting the cultural connections between India and ancient Greece.

The civilization of the Nile and Euphrates arose long before its counterpart in Greece, and the influence of the Nile and Euphrates civilization was paramount in the advancement of Greek civilization. We observe a striking similarity between Indian modes of thought and elements of ancient Greek philosophy. Based on this similarity, it is natural to assume that the presence of these characteristics in elements of Greek philosophy is a result of the influence of Indian thought. Some historians have even suggested that what is known as the Zoroastrian school contains non-Greek elements, as it lacks the characteristics of the Greek temperament and appears to have been adopted from Asia. The central theme of this school is liberation, meaning the separation of the soul from the body. Zeller believed that this concept originated in India, but he stated that the Greeks adopted it from Iran. However, subsequent investigations indicate that liberation was not a significant element of Zoroastrianism. It is therefore not unlikely that this concept, after traversing such vast distances, reached Greece directly from India, where Greek thought influenced by it.

It is well known that the journey eastward to acquire knowledge and learning was highly valued in ancient Greece. It is

also known that some Greek philosophers traveled to the East, including Democritus, who visited Egypt and Iran and resided there for an extended period. It is also recorded that Pythagoras, upon leaving his home in Samos, headed to Egypt. Furthermore, it is known that both Solon and Plato made frequent visits to the East. Therefore, it is not surprising that Pythagoras and others traveled to India during that early period of Greek thought. Indeed, there are elements in Pythagoras's philosophy that can undoubtedly be described as Indian, given the striking similarities between these Indian and Greek elements.

It is said that Aristotle, Alexander the Great's tutor, instructed him to learn something about Indian sciences, as Indian wisdom and knowledge were already known in Greece at that time. The accounts translated into Syriac after Alexander's death, and subsequently into Arabic, also tell of Alexander's encounters with some Indian philosophers and his inquiries into various philosophical topics during their discussions. In these accounts, Alexander clearly acknowledges that the intellectual level in India was higher than that in Greece at the time. It is known that the founder of the philosophy of doubt (Berhu) (died: 250 BC) was among the members of the Greek army that reached India. After Alexander's death, Slugs established ties with King Chandragupt Maurya. As for Ashoka, an ancient inscription still exists, stating that Ashoka sent some of his emissaries to the countries bordering the Mediterranean and to the kings of Greece, although we find no mention of these emissaries in Western writings. The countries mentioned in the Ashoka inscription are those to which Buddhism had certainly spread, according to him. The striking similarity we see between elements of Pythagoras' philosophy and Indian thought is not coincidental, as it indicates cultural ties between India and Greece on the one hand, and a reciprocal exchange of

ideas on the other. The presence of elements of Indian philosophy in Pythagoras' philosophy indicates that Indian philosophy was advanced and played an influential role in the development of early Greek thought. We can say that Greek thought was first influenced by Indian thought before the birth of Christ and then influenced Indian thought after the birth of Christ. The important point is that the scientific and intellectual contributions of both Indian and Greek cultures constitute a heritage for all humanity. Therefore, if we begin writing the history of thought and philosophy from India, this would be a realistic approach, and thus neither diminishing the civilization of Greece nor elevating the status of India. (1)

The doctrine of monotheism originated among the Greeks in Greece five hundred years before the birth of Christ (peace be upon him), appearing in the wisdom of the sage Socrates, which Plato later refined and codified. Just as we saw the emergence of monotheism in India, a concept of belief in a supreme God arose in Greece, which then developed and transformed into the doctrine of monotheism. When we examine ancient Greek ideas on monotheism, we clearly see two fundamental elements: the first concerns life after death, and the second concerns the divinity of a God greater than all things.

The oldest philosophy among the Greeks is the philosophy of celestial bodies known as Ionian philosophy. In it, we see that it acknowledged the existence of invisible spirits of celestial bodies and then tried to search for the existence of a spirit above all those spirits, because it is the one that is suitable to be the origin of the whole universe.

Then Pythagoras appeared five hundred years before the birth of Christ, adding new intellectual elements to ancient Greek philosophy. Regardless of the veracity of the claim that he visited

India, there is a striking intellectual similarity between his approach and that of Indian thought, such as the doctrine of reincarnation, the recognition of the existence of a celestial element and the individuality of the human soul, the unveiling of truth through perception, and the focus on establishing principles for life. These points bridge the gap between India and Greece. Upon these principles, the philosopher Anaxagoras, who came after Pythagoras, established Greek philosophy as a comprehensive system of universals. Thus, Greek philosophy was founded upon these universals, which Socrates and Plato used to build their own systems. The philosophers who lived in Greece before them did not interfere with the worship of the gods in the ancient Greek temples, because their minds and hearts were not free from its influence, as we see in the history of cultural exchanges between India and ancient Greece. However, the results reached by Greek thought had some flexibility to respond to the requirements of philosophical thought on one hand, and thought did not conflict with the national beliefs of the general public on the other hand, as we see in the history of religion in India the existence of understanding between thought and action between the elite and the common people. Thus, the Greek philosophical conception of the doctrine of pure monotheism for the elite was in practice in line with the worship of multiple idols (statues) by the general public side by side.

Socrates' lofty intellectual spirit was superior to the intellectual poverty of the common people. He could not reconcile himself with idol worship, and his belief in monotheism emerged free from any taint of anthropomorphism or likening God to His creation. Maulana Abu al-Kalam Azad mentions that Socrates was accused of not adhering to the religion of the common people in Greece, because, in his view, paganism was merely an art of

questioning and giving - in short, it resembled a private business practice. However, the spirit of his lofty intellect did not succumb to the narrow and limited thinking of his era. He drank the cup of hemlock with patience and integrity, without hesitation or surrendering to falsehood. (2)

His last words as he lay dying were: "He is departing from this lowly world to a higher realm."

Plato then recorded Socrates' wise philosophical research under the name (Dialogue), and presented it as complete principles that he arranged in the form of universals and comprehensive principles through his logical analyses, since he laid the foundation of his theoretical and philosophical research on those universals (Abstracts), so no issue of his era - whether it was related to the system of government or to the existence of God - was devoid of the clothing of thought and philosophy (IDEA).

If imagination has an independent and separate existence from that of the senses, then the rational soul also has an independent existence, separate from that of sensible things, according to Plato. This means he distinguished between the imagined and the sensible. If the soul has an independent and separate existence from matter, then the essence of God also has an existence separate from that of material senses. However, he differentiated between the human self and the divine self. The former, for him, is mortal, meaning it perishes and loses its material existence, while the latter is immortal, meaning it remains and endures forever and will never perish. The mortal self has desires, and these are manifested in the physical self (ego). But the divine essence is the rational origin, the origin of existence for all that exists, and it is completely free from the properties of material life. This is the universal, rational soul that ignited the light of

perception and inspiration within human existence. Here, it seems that the Greek conception of the universal soul is a kind of philosophical conception of the unity of existence. The terms "Atma" in Indian philosophy and "soul" in Greek philosophy are essentially two names for the same concept. "Bram Atma" emerged after "Atma" in Indian philosophy, and the term "Universal Soul" appeared after "Soul" in Greek philosophy. Socrates described the divine essence (Universal Soul) (AIRAGUS) as absolute goodness and beauty, while Plato attempted to go beyond this by exploring the various dimensions of goodness. However, he could not add anything new to Socrates' theories on the attributes of the absolute divine essence (Universal Soul). In other words, both Socrates and Plato described the Universal Soul as absolute goodness and beauty. Then came Aristotle, who sought to place philosophy within the realm of the senses and the visible, moving away from Socrates' spiritual conception of the soul. He divided the rational principle into the First Intellect and the Active Intellect in his conception of the divine essence, the essence that Socrates and Plato described as absolute goodness and beauty, Aristotle described as intellect, and stopped there. Thus, "goodness and intellect" represents the essence of Greek philosophy in its conception of God and His divinity. Plato's dialogues in the Republic are crucial for understanding Socrates' conception of divine attributes. This conception is limited to describing God by His inherent goodness, and His essence is absolute goodness and absolute beauty. Therefore, His essence must also be characterized by goodness and benefit, just as we cannot conceive of any evil or harm emanating from His essence, which is all goodness. Under no circumstances can we attribute all events, good and bad, to His essence as the First Cause. Thus, it becomes clear that His essence is the sole

cause of beneficial good, not the cause of any evil. We can only conceive of good, and nothing else. Evil must be traced back to an origin other than His essence. (3)

A. Plato and Aristotle's Theories on the Existence of God and His Divinity

The Greek philosophers, in their discussions, arrived at the existence of God. However, their view of God did not differ from their view of the world, because they saw the Lord of the universe and the world as a single reality, as the Eleatics believed, or as the Supreme Form, as Plato said: "The divine essence is the locus of all Forms." He subjected his God to the Forms, seeing in Him nothing more than a being composed of several Forms. Or, in his theory, God "is not a self-subsistent being, but represents the supreme power of the Forms in matter." "God the Maker, insofar as He is the efficient cause, imprints the forms of the Forms in matter in a way that is difficult to describe. He is the archetype insofar as He is the exemplary cause to be imitated. He is beautiful and good insofar as He is the final cause that loves and seeks." "For Plato, God is a fundamental cause, and if He is not the creator, He is at least the governing and organizing force." "Plato believes that God is not merely good but is goodness itself. He is immobile, because to the extent that existence is Being free from movement means being unchanging, and the more unchanging He is, the more perfect He is. He is eternal and everlasting, for time is merely a changing form of existence, and it cannot be reflected in this great God, thus limiting His existence in any way. As for the remaining praiseworthy attributes and perfect qualities, Plato believes there is no need to prove their existence in God, since they are necessarily inseparable from His existence. For He cannot be truly God unless He is perfect in every respect, and He cannot be

so unless all perfect qualities are ascribed to Him. Plato proved the existence of God Almighty with three proofs:

The first proof: Plato used this to demonstrate the existence of God as an efficient cause, stating, "Everything that comes into being does so necessarily through the action of a cause, for it is impossible for anything - whatever it may be - to come into being without a cause." This means that everything that exists—after not existing - must have an effective cause, and this cause can only be effective if it encompasses all the elements of influence.

The second proof: Plato used this to demonstrate God's existence as a moving cause. In this regard, he believed that the mover is the world itself, but this world itself is an act of God. This is because he identified two types of substances: the first is that which can move itself and move others, such as the soul; the second is that which can transmit its motion to others but cannot move itself, such as the body. The first in the universe is what moves the second, and Plato calls it the "world soul." Since the soul cannot be the efficient cause due to its inherent motion, it must be the effect of another cause, one that is free from motion - the First Cause.

The third proof: He demonstrated its existence as a final cause, and this proof is in proving a desired end for all the actions of nature. All three of these proofs aim to prove the existence of God, His perfect perfection, and His ultimate wisdom.” (4)

But Aristotle contradicts his teacher's opinion, "because for Aristotle, God is the First Cause or the First Mover." "And He is not a body." (5) "This First Mover precedes the world in existence, a precedence of cause, not of time. Just as premises preceded conclusions in the mind, but not in chronological order." This is because Aristotle asserts the eternity of the world. "The world is eternal in its matter, form, motion, and the kinds of beings it

contains." And God is merely the final cause of the world or of existence, and He does not create the world. (6)

Here we find three propositions, as follows:

The first proposition: The First Mover is not a body, because if it were a body, it would have to be either infinite or finite. A body cannot be infinite, nor can the First Mover be a finite body, because it is impossible for it to be a finite force moving an infinite motion from eternity to eternity.

The second proposition: The First Mover moves without being moved or being moved. This is the nature of the Beloved and the Intelligible, that is, the nature of the Final Cause. A natural mover is acted upon naturally, while a volitional mover is acted upon by the end, which is not acted upon by it. Therefore, the First Mover is the Good in itself; it is the principle of motion, and it is the principle to which heaven and nature are related. (7)

The third proposition: God moves as the Intelligible and the Beloved. He is the Intelligible because He is pure action, and His action is intellect; He is intellect subsisting in Himself. And intellect is the intellect of the best, that is, the greatest good. Intellect in it is the very essence of the intelligible, so its life achieves the highest perfection. We only experience it for brief periods, while it experiences it eternally, and in a far greater way than we ever could. Its intelligible essence is nothing other than pure action, unaffected by anything else. If it were to intellect something else, it would be intellecting less than itself, and the value of its action would be diminished. For there are things whose unseen nature is better than their seen nature... Thus, in it, intelligibility and intellect are one. But Plato implies, in Aristotle's doctrine, that God does not know the world nor is He concerned with it. And that God does not know beings in themselves as

objects from which He receives His knowledge, but He knows them in His essence, which is the model of existence. The First Mover understands only Himself, claiming that it is not befitting His majesty to know the lowly particulars of worldly matters. (8)

B. Neo-Platonic School of Alexandrian Philosophers on God and His Divinity

Neo-Platonic school of Alexandrian philosophers emerged in the third century CE. Its founder was Ammonius Siccus, followed by Plato, whose student was Porphyry, considered the greatest commentator on Aristotle in his time. Porphyry introduced Neo-Platonic principles into Plato's idealist philosophy. Maulana Azad stated that his teachings on the essence of God were based on the doctrinal principles known in the Upanishads of India. This means that the original means of knowing God (may He be glorified and exalted) is revelation, not reasoning, and the degree of perfection in knowledge is the degree of attraction and annihilation. He also chose the path of negating attributes from the essence of God, because His absolute existence transcends all the talents and abilities that humans possess to express His attributes. Therefore, we cannot judge His essence as such or such, because there is nothing like Him that has appeared to us. Existence, so we cannot judge that it is "merely an existing thing" or that it is "the essence of all that exists," and it cannot be described as life, because the truth is above all these verbal expressions of the senses and the visible.

Plotinus arrived at the same conclusion as Socrates and Plato in describing truth as "the Good," but he stopped there, refusing any further imaginative additions to "the Good" because any such addition would inevitably contain a deficiency. He even rejected the notion of calling it the First Intellect, as Aristotle had

done in his discovery of abstract intellects, and in his expression of the First Intellect as the Cause of Causes. Plato argued: "Do not call it 'intellect,' for if you do, you are dividing it. But why do we call it 'being' and 'the Good' when it is transcendent and beyond all attributes?" He then answered this question himself, saying: "If we call it 'the Good,' the aim is not to define its essence with this attribute, which has existence within itself, but rather to indicate that it is the 'end' and 'finding force' to which everything returns. This terminology serves a specific purpose. Similarly, if we say it is characterized by 'being,' we intend to place it beyond the realm of non-existence, for it is beyond all things, even above all conceptions of existence."

The theory of Clement of Alexandria can be summarized succinctly as follows:

He said, "It is impossible to know what is in its essence, but rather it is possible to know that there is nothing like it." Thus, he was left with no option but to negate all of God's attributes, for he had closed all avenues of affirmation and proof. Regarding the negation of attributes in Neoplatonism, we have heard of the Upanishads, which express the principle of "Niti" meaning the denial of all attributes.

The Jewish sages of the Middle Ages adopted this Neoplatonic doctrine. Moses Maimonides (d. 605 CE) denied describing God as "existent," because he believed that when we utter this word, we feel the shadows of the attributes of created beings directly covering our senses, while the essence of God is free from all such attributes. He even refused to say that God is "alone, without partner," because the concepts of "unity" and "non-partnership" are not free from notions of relation. Maimonides' doctrine was nothing but an echo of Neoplatonism. (9)

This is the image of God in the ancient conceptions of the philosophers of ancient Greece, the Alexandrian school, and Indian philosophy. We have dealt with it briefly because it has an essential connection to the subject, and because it is very important for studying the following chapters concerning the image of the one God in Judaism and Christianity, and for studying the connection of influence and being influenced between the ancient religions and the New Testament in explaining the description of the one God among the peoples and subsequent generations.

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

Chapter Two:

The Children of Israel

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

Definition of the Children of Israel

The name Israel was for Jacob, Son of Isaac (peace be upon them). He had 12 sons, so his family was called the family of the Children of Israel. God chose them for prophethood in the Old Testament and sent countless messengers among them. Their original homeland was in the regions of Palestine. However, the Children of Israel were forced to live as enslaved subjects in the hands of the Pharaohs in Egypt, following the continuous attacks of the Giants (Amalekites) and their occupation of those regions of Palestine.

Then Moses (peace be upon him) rescued them from the bondage of the Pharaohs. However, they were unable to regain Palestine from the Giants, and Moses (peace be upon him) died. Then came Joshua and after him Caleb (peace be upon them). Joshua (peace be upon him) liberated a wide area of Palestine from the occupation of the Giants through Jihad (struggle/holy war) during his era. However, the Children of Israel were not destined for stability. They lived like the Arabs who carried their homes on their shoulders in search of water and pasture, and their lives were like tribal life, far from civilization.

Whoever resolved disputes among them based on their tribal laws was viewed favorably. If they found military capabilities in him, they appointed him as a commander of their soldiers and called him a "Judge". Their book, "Judges," is full of stories of these judges. Therefore, that era is called the "Era of the Judges".

The Children of Israel succeeded in defending themselves against external attacks, but they were eventually defeated and subjugated by the Canaanites. The Canaanites imposed their sovereignty over a wide area of Palestine, and their rule lasted until

the era of David (peace be upon him). Finally, God sent Samuel as a messenger to the Children of Israel. They asked him to save them from the suffering of tribal life and to pray to God to appoint a king among them to organize the affairs of their lives so that they could face the Philistines.

One of them was appointed king, named Talut, as mentioned in the Quran, though he is referred to in their scriptures as Saul or Samuel. Talut faced the Philistines, and David (peace be upon him), a young man, happened to join Talut's army. A Philistine soldier named Goliath challenged David (peace be upon him) to single combat, and David killed him. This increased David's popularity among the Israelites, and they eventually appointed him their king after Saul

One of them was appointed as king named (Talut), as mentioned in the Qur'an, although he is mentioned in their books as (Saul) or (Samuel). Talut faced the Philistines, and David (peace be upon him) was a young man who joined Talut's army by chance. A member of the Philistine army named (Goliath) challenged David (peace be upon him) to a duel. David killed him, and his popularity increased among the Children of Israel until they appointed him king after Saul. For the first time, God granted the Children of Israel the combination of kingship and prophethood. Children of Israel fully occupied the territories of Palestine in the era of David.

After him came Solomon (peace be upon him) in 974 BCE, who consolidated the pillars of the Children of Israel's kingdom. He built a house by God's command, known as Jerusalem, and named his state after his grandfather, "Judah". However, his son, Rehoboam, took control of the kingdom's affairs after the death of his father Solomon (peace be upon him) in 937 BCE. But he was

not fit to lead the kingdom's affairs, so he destroyed the kingdom's religious reputation and inflicted severe damage on its political stability.

A former servant of his father Solomon (peace be upon him) revolted against him and founded an independent kingdom named (Israel). The Children of Israel were divided into two states: (Israel) in the north, whose capital was Samaria, and (Judah) in the south, whose capital was Jerusalem. A long series of political and doctrinal disputes ensued between them, which lasted until the raid of Nebuchadnezzar.

Idol worship began to spread among them gradually. God sent the Prophets and Messengers among them. When their deviations exceeded all limits, God imposed upon them Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, who launched several raids on Jerusalem in 586 BCE, until he destroyed it in the last raid. Following this, King Zedekiah was taken captive, as were the Jews who survived the fighting, and he took them to Babylon. These Jews lived a life of enslaved and oppressed people for a long period.

When Cyrus (Khosrau), one of the Kings of Persia, conquered Babylon in 536 BCE, he permitted them to return to Jerusalem and rebuild their Holy House once again. The rebuilding of Jerusalem was completed in 515 BCE, and the Jews settled there again. The Kingdom of Israel had been destroyed by the Assyrians before Judah. Their doctrinal differences had significantly lessened and diminished, but the establishment of a state was not in their destiny. The Israelites lived in subjugation and subservience to kings against their will from 400 BCE onwards. Then, in 332 BCE, Alexander the Great conquered them. During this period, they translated the Torah into Greek, a translation known as the

Septuagint (of the Old Testament), undertaken by 72 Jewish scholars in 72 days.

Then, in 165 BCE, the king of Syria, (Antiochus Epifanes), carried out a mass killing of the Jews and burned every copy of the Torah. During this time, Judah Maccabee, a man of great ambition from among the Israelites, formed a community and managed to reclaim a large part of Palestine, expelling the Assyrian kings. He established the Maccabean Kingdom, which lasted until 70 CE. (10)

2. Definition of Jews and Judaism

A. The Jews

Abu al-Hasan Ali al-Hasani al-Nadwi said in defining the Jews: "There was a nation in Europe, Asia, and Africa, the richest of all nations in terms of religious knowledge, and the closest to understanding its terminology and meanings. These were the Jews. However, they were not a factor in civilization, politics, or religion that influenced others. Rather, for centuries they were destined to be controlled by others, and to be subjected to persecution, tyranny, exile, displacement, suffering, and affliction. Their unique history, and what distinguished them among the nations of the earth - long slavery, terrible oppression, national pride, boasting of lineage, greed, lust for money, and usury - all bequeathed to them a peculiar mentality not found in any other nation. They were distinguished by moral characteristics that became their emblem throughout the ages and generations, including submissiveness in weakness, tyranny and misconduct in victory, deceit and hypocrisy in most circumstances, cruelty, selfishness, unjustly consuming people's wealth, and obstructing the path of God. The Qur'an described them with precision and depth, portraying what They were in a state of moral decline, psychological degradation, and

social corruption in the sixth and seventh centuries, which isolated them from leading nations and guiding the world. (11)

B. Judaism

Judaism is both a religion and a family. A Jew is defined as anyone belonging to the family of Judah, one of the brothers of Joseph (peace be upon him). The God of the Jews is the God of the family of Judah, from the Children of Israel. The scope of this conception of God was very limited, and although it gradually expanded, the main features of the familial exclusivity of the God of the Children of Israel, in their understanding, remained in one form or another, a familial and geographical one, throughout the ages until the rise of Islam. As for anthropomorphism and transcendence, their God was characterized by attributes of oppression, anger, and vengeance. His attributes were like those of humans in their intensity of oppression and vengeance. This primitive, representational style was one of the features of the Torah. As for the relationship between man and his deity, the nature of that relationship was like the relationship of a jealous husband with his wife. A jealous husband can forgive all his wife's sins except for her sharing her love for her husband with someone other than him, which is an unforgivable sin. The God of the family of the Children of Israel is very jealous, and He chose the family of the Children of Israel from among other families to be His beloved wife, as this fact is manifested in their claim (We are the chosen people of God) as stated in the Ten Commandments, which means: "Do not make an image of anything like Him, for there is nothing like Him, and do not bow down to Him (other than Him), for your God is a jealous God, very jealous." - We will mention these Ten Commandments shortly - This Jewish representation of God in the form of a jealous husband began to appear after the Jews left Egypt, and remained

until Islam came, but it represents nothing but the primitive and immature thinking of the Old Testament.

In the New Testament of Judaism, elements of expansion were observed in the narrow Jewish conception of their religion, and the intellectual climate of the time was conducive to accepting this new image of the Jewish religion. In contrast to the Jewish conception of God in the Old Testament, which was characterized by intense oppression, anger, and torment, mercy, compassion, pardon, and forgiveness took its place. The God of the Christian conception was not like the tyrannical, oppressive king, nor was He chaste like a jealous husband who was intense in his jealousy and harsh in his revenge. Rather, He was like an ideal father of compassion and tenderness towards his son. There is no doubt that the relationship between parents and children is higher than all relationships in a person's life. It has no place in it for purposes of passion, as we see in the relationship between spouses, because this relationship is about the emotion of mercy, compassion, upbringing, and providing the necessary means for it, even in the case of many repeated mistakes by the children. The mother never deprives her son of her love and tenderness, just as the compassionate father does not refuse to pardon his mistakes. This Christian representation of the concept of God in relation to man was relatively better than the representation of the brusque husband among the Jews in the absence of a means of expressing the concept of God without using means based on the similarity in the relationships that bind man to man.

Regarding the concepts of anthropomorphism and transcendence, the intellectual level of the Christian conception of God is that which the Jewish conception ultimately reached. However, when the doctrine of monotheism was mixed with the concept of idol worship in Rome and the Alexandrian philosophy

of idolatry, the doctrine of the Trinity, atonement, and the worship of Christ (peace be upon him) became dominant. Then, a specific conception of God emerged in the form of idolatry. They denied idol worship, but they ignored their existing polytheistic practices. Thus, the Christian conception of God as a compassionate and loving father, after its fusion with the Trinity, became a polytheistic conception, far removed from pure monotheism.

C. The Ten Commandments of Judaism

The Torah states that God (Exalted is He) revealed to Moses (peace be upon him) the Ten Commandments, which include:

1. The Oneness of God (Exalted is He).
2. Not associating any other deities with God in worship.
3. Not uttering God's name in vain.
4. Observing the Sabbath.
5. Honoring one's parents.
6. Loving one's neighbor as oneself.
7. The prohibition of murder, adultery, theft, and bearing false witnesses.
8. The prohibition of looking at women with lust.
9. The prohibition of coveting what God has bestowed upon others. (Exodus 20:2-17) and (Deuteronomy 5:6-21).
10. The other commandments relating to the work of the heart and the work of the limbs, as indicated by several texts from the books of the Old Testament. (12)

The Gospel states that Jesus, son of Mary, the Messiah (peace be upon him), commanded the observance of these commandments, which the Torah also commanded. In the Gospel of Matthew, Jesus said: "If you want to enter life, keep the commandments." The man asked, "Which ones?" Jesus replied, "You shall not murder, you shall not commit adultery, you shall

not steal, you shall not bear false witness, you shall honor your father and mother, and you shall love your neighbor as yourself.” (Matthew 19:18-20). Also, in the Gospel of Matthew: “One of them asked him, ‘Teacher, which commandment in the Law is the greatest?’ Jesus answered, ‘You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart, with all your soul, and with all your mind. This is the first and greatest commandment. The second is like: You shall love your neighbor as yourself.’ These two commandments depend on all the Law and the Prophets.” (Matthew 22:35-40). The Gospel of Mark adds the phrase, “You shall not rob.” It also states that when one of the scribes asked him which commandment was the most important, he answered him with the same commandment he had given in the previous texts. It also states: “The scribe said to him, ‘Well said, Teacher. You have spoken truly, for there is one God, and there is no other besides him. Love for him must come from all your heart, and from all your understanding, and from all your soul, and from all your strength. And loving your neighbor as yourself is more important than all burnt offerings and sacrifices.’ When Jesus saw that he answered prudently, he said to him, ‘You are not far from the kingdom of God.’” (13)

These commandments, which God Almighty commanded in the laws of Moses and Jesus (peace be upon them), were also commanded by God Almighty in the law of Muhammad ibn Abdullah (peace and blessings be upon him). Indeed, the Holy Quran contains more comprehensive and complete commandments than those found in the Torah and the Gospel, for it is the last of the divine books revealed to the Seal of the Prophets and Messengers. In Surah An-Nisa, God Almighty commands the sincere worship of Him (Glory be to Him), that nothing be associated with Him, kindness to parents, relatives, orphans, the needy, the neighbor who is near, the neighbor who is far, the

companion at your side, the wayfarer, and those whom your right hands possess. He also commands that God does not love those who are arrogant and boastful, and He forbids stinginess, concealing one's blessings, injustice, and spending money to be seen by others. (14) Furthermore, Surah Al-Isra commands the preservation of these commandments, in addition to forbidding extravagance, killing children for fear of poverty, and killing a soul that God has forbidden. Except with truth, and regarding consuming the orphan's wealth except in the best way, and in it is the command to fulfill the covenant, and to fulfill the measure, and the prohibition of a person pursuing what he has no knowledge of, and of walking on the earth with arrogance, pride and haughtiness over creation. (15) And at the end of these commandments, God said: {That is from what your Lord has revealed to you of wisdom. And do not associate with God another deity, lest you be thrown into Hell, blameworthy and banished.} (16)

The divine laws revealed to Moses, Jesus, and Muhammad (peace be upon them) all agreed on the obligation to uphold the first commandment: the worship of God alone, without any partners, and the exclusive devotion of God to Him alone, without associating any partners with Him in His divinity, names, or attributes. Islam also agrees with the previous divine laws on the obligation to uphold the other commandments, with the exception of the commandment to observe the Sabbath, which is specific to the laws of Moses and Jesus (peace be upon them). God has designated Friday as the day of observance in Islam. Furthermore, God has distinguished Islam with other commandments that surpass those of previous laws, because Islam is the final divine law and its Prophet is the last of the prophets and their messages.

The Christians broke their covenant to uphold the first and greatest commandment - after the ascension of Christ (peace be upon him) - the first commandment, upon which all divine laws agree, which commands the oneness of God in His divinity, names, and attributes, and the exclusive worship of God alone. Three centuries after the ascension of Christ (peace be upon him), the Christians convened a council in Nicaea in 325 CE, attended by their bishops and monks, where they affirmed the divinity of Christ, declaring him a god alongside God (but He above such a claim). They said: "We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, begotten of the Father, the only begotten, that is, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father, by whom all things were made in heaven and on earth. For us men and for our salvation, He came down and was incarnate, and became man, and suffered, and rose again on the third day and ascended into heaven and will come again from there to judge the living" (and the dead). (17)

In brief, the divine revelation sent down to Noah and the prophets (peace be upon them) after him, up to the last and final prophet, Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him), contained a single set of fundamental principles common to all divine messages. These principles include belief in God, His angels, His books, His messengers, the Day of Judgment, the reckoning, and the distinction between good and bad deeds. In other words, the divine messages agree on three fundamental principles:

- a. Belief in one God (and in those who brought the divine scriptures, namely the messengers and angels).
- b. The call to perform righteous deeds.
- c. Resurrection after death (for recompense and reckoning).

As for the laws and rulings that regulate human life and its affairs related to happiness and livelihood, these vary according to the nature of the era and its prevailing mentality, from the primitive stage to the stage of civilization. The first divine law revealed to regulate human life was the Torah, revealed to Moses (peace be upon him), in which God Almighty ordained the preservation of divine law.

Then the law of Moses (peace be upon him) became the law of the prophets after him, up to the last of the prophets of the Children of Israel, Jesus, son of Mary, to whom God (Glory be to Him) revealed the Gospel, confirming the laws of the Torah that had preceded it. He was to be guided to act according to its rulings and to make lawful for the Children of Israel what had been forbidden to them in the Torah by God.

These three fundamental principles of God's religion (Exalted is He) do not change from one religion to another or from one prophet to another.

Aside from the small Maccabean kingdom, the Jewish people had dispersed, and their settlements were established in the regions near the Mediterranean Sea. After the end of their exile to Babylon, many then returned to Palestine, but the majority did not remain in Babylon. Jerusalem was under Roman rule; the Romans called it Judea, and it was governed by a governor appointed by the Romans. In terms of material means, the Jews could not live in an atmosphere of freedom, so their eyes were fixed on something positive happening in the future. Many Jews awaited the arrival of a messenger from God (may He be glorified and exalted) who would deliver them from a life of servitude and establish a king and ruler for them. We will discuss the Christians' deviation from the laws of Moses and Jesus (peace be upon them), and the subsequent alteration of the divine scriptures.

Chapter Three:

The Birth of Jesus, Son of Mary

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

The Roman Caesar Augustus was in power, and the ruler of "Judea" was Herod. It was under such circumstances that Jesus (peace be upon him) was born.

There is no reliable source upon which we can depend for a full account of the life of Jesus Son of Mary other than the Four Gospels, which are the sole means of knowing his blessed life. However, they are not fit for complete reliance. Therefore, we shall first mention what has been related about him in the Holy Qur'an.

A. Birth of Jesus Son of Mary in the Holy Qur'an

What is mentioned about Jesus Son of Mary (peace be upon them) in the Holy Qur'an is summarized in these four points:

1. He is a human being, a servant of God Almighty, whom Mary conceived and gave birth to by the will of God.
2. He is a Messenger, whom God sent to the Children of Israel.
3. Allah granted him the Book, which is the Gospel.
4. He exonerated his mother from the accusation of fornication cast upon her by her people, just as he declared his own innocence from the claims of divinity, the trinity, the crucifixion, and other falsehoods attributed to him by people.

These four points are mentioned in the Holy Qur'an. Allah says in Surah Maryam (Mary):

{وَادْكُرْ فِي الْكِتَابِ مَرْيَمَ إِذِ اتَّيَدَتْ مِنْ أَهْلِهَا مَكَانًا شَرِيفًا (16) فَاتَّخَذَتْ مِنْ دُونِهِمْ حِجَابًا فَأَرْسَلْنَا إِلَيْهَا رُوحَنَا فَتَمَثَّلَ لَهَا بَشَرًا سَوِيًّا (17) قَالَتْ إِنِّي أَعُوذُ بِالرَّحْمَنِ مِنْكَ إِنْ كُنْتَ تَقِيًّا (18) قَالَ إِنَّمَا أَنَا رَسُولُ رَبِّكِ لِأَهَبَ لَكِ غُلَامًا زَكِيًّا (19) قَالَتْ أَنَّى يَكُونُ لِي غُلَامٌ وَلَمْ يَمْسَسْنِي بَشَرٌ وَلَمْ أَكُ بَغِيًّا (20) قَالَ كَذَلِكَ قَالَ رَبُّكَ هُوَ عَلَيَّ هَيِّئٌ وَلْنَجْعَلْهُ آيَةً لِلنَّاسِ وَرَحْمَةً مِنَّا وَكَانَ أَمْرًا مُقْضِيًّا (21) ﴿ فَمَلَأْنَاهُ فَانْتَبَذَتْ بِهِ مَكَانًا قَصِيًّا (22) فَأَجَاءَهَا الْمَخَاضُ إِلَى جِذْعِ النَّخْلَةِ قَالَتْ

يَا لَيْتَنِي مِتُّ قَبْلَ هَذَا وَكُنْتُ نَسِيًّا مِّنْهُمْ (23) فَتَنَادَاهَا مِن تَحْتِهَا أَلَا تَحْزَنِي قَدْ جَعَلَ رَبُّكِ تَحْتَكِ سَرِيًّا (24) وَهَزَيَ إِلَيْكِ الْجَنَّةَ تَسَاقُطُ عَالِيكَ رُطْبًا خَبِيثًا (25) فَكُلِي وَاشْرَبِي وَفَرِي عَيْنًا ۖ فَإِمَّا تَرَيِنَّ مِنَ الْبَشَرِ أَحَدًا فَقُولِي إِنِّي نَذَرْتُ لِلرَّحْمَنِ صَوْمًا فَلَنْ أُكَلِّمَ الْيَوْمَ إِنْسِيًّا (26) فَأَنْتَ بِهِ فُؤَمَهَا خِمْلًا ۖ قَالُوا يَا مَرْيَمُ لَقَدْ جِئْتِ شَيْئًا فَرِيًّا (27) يَا أُخْتُ هَؤُلَاءِ مَا كَانَ أَبُوكَ امْرَأَ سَوْءٍ وَمَا كَانَتْ أُمُّكِ بَغِيًّا (28) فَأَشَارَتْ إِلَيْهِ ۖ قَالُوا كَيْفَ نُكَلِّمُ مَنْ كَانَ فِي الْمَهْدِ صَبِيًّا (29) قَالَ إِنِّي عَبْدُ اللَّهِ آتَانِي الْكِتَابَ وَجَعَلَنِي نَبِيًّا (30) وَجَعَلَنِي مُبَارَكًا أَيْنَمَا كُنْتُ وَأَوْصَانِي بِالصَّلَاةِ وَالزَّكَاةِ مَا دُمْتُ حَيًّا (31) وَبَرًّا بِوَالِدَتِي وَلَمْ يَجْعَلْنِي جَبَّارًا شَقِيًّا (32) وَالسَّلَامُ عَلَيَّ يَوْمَ وُلِدْتُ وَيَوْمَ أَمُوتُ وَيَوْمَ أُبْعَثُ حَيًّا (33) ذَلِكَ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ ۚ قَوْلَ الْحَقِّ الَّذِي فِيهِ يَمْتَرُونَ (34) مَا كَانَ لِلَّهِ أَنْ يَتَّخِذَ مِنْ وَلَدٍ ۚ سُبْحَانَهُ ۚ إِذَا قَضَىٰ أَمْرًا فَإِنَّمَا يَقُولُ لَهُ كُنْ فَيَكُونُ (35) وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبُّكُمْ فَأَعْبُدُوهُ ۚ هَذَا صِرَاطٌ مُسْتَقِيمٌ (36) }

Translation of the Verses Maryam (Mary):

And mention, [O Muhammad], in the Book [the story of] Mary, when she withdrew from her family to a place toward the east. (16) And she took, in seclusion from them, a screen. Then We sent to her Our Spirit, and he represented himself to her as a well-proportioned man. (17) She said, "Indeed, I seek refuge in the Most Merciful from you, [so leave me], if you should be fearing of God." (18) He said, "I am only the messenger of your Lord to give you [news of] a pure boy." (19) She said, "How can I have a boy while no man has touched me, and I have not been unchaste?" (20) He said, "Thus [it will be]; your Lord says, 'It is easy for Me, and We will make him a sign to the people and a mercy from Us. And it is a matter [already] decreed. (21). So, she conceived him, and she withdrew with him to a distant place. (22) And the pains of childbirth drove her to the trunk of a palm tree. She said, "Oh, I wish I had died before this and was in oblivion, forgotten." (23) But he called her from below her, "Do not grieve; your Lord has

provided beneath you a stream. (24) And shake toward yourself the trunk of the palm tree; it will drop upon you ripe, fresh dates." (25) "So, eat and drink and be contented. And if you see any human being, say, 'Indeed, I have vowed to the Most Merciful a fast [from speech], so, I will not speak to [any] human being today.'" (26) Then she brought him to her people, carrying him. They said, "O Mary, you have certainly done something unprecedented. (27) O sister of Aaron, your father was not a man of evil, nor was your mother unchaste." (28) So, she pointed to him. They said, "How can we speak to one who is in the cradle as a child?" (29) [Jesus] said, "Indeed, I am the servant of God. He gave me the Scripture and made me a prophet. (30) And He has made me blessed wherever I am and enjoyed upon me Prayer and Zakah as long as I remain alive. (31) And [made me] dutiful to my mother, and He has not made me a wretched tyrant. (32) And peace is upon me the day I was born and the day I die and the day I am raised alive." (33) That is Jesus, the son of Mary - the word of truth about which they are in dispute. (34) It is not [befitting] for God to take a son; exalted is He! When He decrees an affair, He only says to it, "Be," and it is. (35) [And Jesus said], "Indeed, God is my Lord and your Lord, so worship Him. That is the straight path." (36). (Surah Maryam), 19:16-36.

In His mention, God says:

"When Jesus said that to his mother, her heart was reassured, and she submitted to the command of God. She carried him until she brought him to her people."

As Ibn Humaid narrated to us, who said: Salamah narrated to us, from Ibn Ishaq, from one who is not accused (of lying), from Wahb Ibn Munabbih, who said: Maryam forgot the distress of the affliction and the fear of the people what she had heard from the angels of the glad tidings of Jesus, until he spoke to her, meaning

Jesus, and the fulfillment of what God had promised her came to her. Then she carried him and came with him to her people.

Al-Saddi said concerning this, as narrated to us by Musa, who said: Amr narrated to us, who said: Asbat narrated to us, from Al-Saddi, who said: When she gave birth to him, Satan went and informed the Children of Israel that Mary had given birth, so they came rushing, and they called her {Then she brought him to her people, carrying him}.

And His saying {They said, "O Mary, you have certainly done a thing unprecedented"}, God Almighty says: When they saw Mary, and saw the child she had given birth to with her, they said to her: O Mary, you have indeed brought a strange matter and committed a terrible deed. (19)

B. Birth of Jesus, Son of Mary in the Holy Books of Christians

Matthew said at the beginning of his Gospel about the birth of Jesus Son of Mary: (Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded putting her away privily. But while he thought about these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fears not to take unto the Mary thy wife: for the conceived in her is of the Holy Spirit. And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us. Then Joseph being raised from sleep did as the angel of the Lord

had bidden him and took unto him his wife: And knew her not till she had brought forth her firstborn son: and he called his name Jesus.) (20)

Matthew says: (Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And then he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea: for thus it is written by the prophet, and thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the least among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people, Israel.) (21)

When Herod learned of the Messiah, he resolved to kill him, as Matthew related. The Angel appeared to Joseph in a dream and commanded him to take the child and his mother and leave Jerusalem. So, they left at night and went to Egypt. Matthew mentions that after the death of Herod, the Angel came to Joseph commanding him to return to Palestine, so, he departed to the region of Galilee and settled in the city of Nazareth. This is why the Christians are called "Nazarenes" (Nassara) who follow the Messiah of Nazareth, and their religion is called "Christianity".

In the Gospel of Luke: "And the child grew and became strong in spirit, filled with wisdom. And the grace of God was with him. And his parents went every year to Jerusalem for the Passover. And when he was twelve years old, they went up to Jerusalem according to the custom of the festival. And when the days were over, on their return, the child Jesus stayed behind in

Jerusalem, and Joseph and his mother did not know. And thinking that he was among the company, he went on a day's journey. And they looked for him among their relatives and acquaintances, and when they did not find him, they returned to Jerusalem to look for him. Three days later they found him in the temple, sitting among the teachers, listening to them and asking them questions. All who heard him were amazed at his understanding and his answers. (22)

Here, Paul Shabat says: "The Gospels have summarized the life of Jesus from his birth to his calling, mentioning only a few details, and the Gospel writers only wrote that he was engaged in trade." (23)

Will Durant also says: "The Gospel writers mention very little about the youth of Christ. They say that he was circumcised when he was eight years old, and that Joseph was a carpenter, and the inheritance of professions in that era suggests that Jesus practiced this gentle craft at some point." (24)

Christians themselves acknowledge that the Gospels mention little about a significant period in the life of Jesus (peace be upon him), from his childhood to his ministry. Some have stated that Jesus worked as a merchant, while others have said he was a carpenter. It can be argued that Jesus may have practiced both professions - merchant and carpentry - or each separately at different times.

The Gospels mention that the Messiah began his call (mission) after the death of John the Baptist (Yahya son of Zechariah, peace be upon them).

The Messiah lived among people, being exposed to the same hardships that tire them, the sorrows that grieve them, and the joys that delight them. He was affected, and his soul was stirred

by various emotions and reactions known to all people. In fact, he was more embracing of life than his predecessor, John's son of Zechariah (peace be upon them), and this was testified to by the Messiah himself, as well as by the writers of the Gospels. (25)

The Messiah, Son of Mary, was subject to what afflicts any human being: he ate, drank, and loved. The hardships and sorrows of life pursued him, and he was subject to weakness, he would get angry, reprimand, fear, become agitated, and be frightened, which confirms his humanity. And God Almighty spoke the truth in the Holy Qur'an when He said:

"مَا الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ وَأُمُّهُ صِدِّيقَةٌ ۖ كَانَا يَأْكُلَانِ الطَّعَامَ ۗ انظُرْ كَيْفَ بُيِّنُ لَهُمُ الْآيَاتِ ثُمَّ انظُرْ إِلَىٰ يَوْمِ الْقَوْلِ".

It means:

"The Messiah, son of Mary, was no more than a messenger. Other messengers had passed away before him. His mother was a woman of truth. They both used to eat food. Look how We make the signs clear to them, then look how they are deluded."

Habib Saeed summarizes the life of Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon them both), in a few lines, saying: "It is an established historical fact that Christ was born in Palestine to a pure virgin who had not been touched by a man, from the village of Bethlehem, during the reign of Augustus, the Roman emperor, and at the beginning of his public ministry, which lasted for nearly three years, during which he taught people about the Kingdom of God, the Kingdom of righteousness, truth, love, and goodness, and he healed the sick and performed dazzling miracles. He was opposed by the Jewish Pharisees, who were the guardians of the Law, the Sadducees, who were the aristocratic priestly class, and the Romans, who feared for their authority from his new teachings, and they sentenced him to death." (27)

There are many Islamic sources for learning about the life of Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon them both). We have written a brief account of his life here before explaining the Christian doctrine of the Trinity, because they believe in the divinity of Jesus through union and incarnation. They say he is one of the three, and the three are one, and they have not yet been able to resolve this dilemma. Therefore, it was necessary to shed light on the character of Christ to reveal his true nature. He is Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon him), the Spirit of God and His Word, which He bestowed upon Mary, causing her to conceive and give birth to him without a father. He spoke in the cradle, acknowledging and affirming his servitude to God (Exalted is He) and his obedience to His commands, exonerating his mother and being exonerated by her. He grew up as other young men do, acquiring knowledge, working in trade and carpentry, and experiencing the same human experiences as all others. He ate, drank, slept, rejoiced, grieved, became angry, and was pleased. Revelation descended upon him from God when he was thirty years old and continued for three years and a few months. The Jews plotted against him to get rid of him, but God saved him from them. There is a significant difference of opinion among Christians regarding the true nature of Jesus, son of Mary, between his humanity like us and his divinity according to Christian doctrine. We will attempt to present the views of both groups concerning his humanity and divinity, so that the true nature of Christ (peace be upon him) may be revealed.

Chapter Four:

Doctrine of Trinity among the Christians

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

The Christianity was not the only religion to believe in the Trinity, nor was it the first religion to embrace this doctrine; its roots extend back to ancient times.

Muhammad ibn Tahir al-Tanir quoted Morris on the doctrine of the Trinity: "Most of the extinct pagan nations had religious teachings that included the doctrine of Trinitarianism, meaning that God has three persons" (Hypostases).

Duane stated: If we look towards India, we see that their greatest and most famous theological worship is the Trinity, meaning the assertion that the worshipped Deity has three Persons. The Hindus call this Trinity in their language "Trimurti," meaning three forms/Persons, namely: "Brahma," "Vishnu," and "Shiva." These are three Persons inseparable from unity: the Lord, the Savior, and Shiva. The sum of these three Persons (Hypostases) is one God.

It is stated in the sacred and authoritative books of the Hindu Brahmins that this holy trinity is indivisible in essence, action, and mixture, and they explain it by saying: Brahma represents the principles of formation and creation, and he is still a divine creator, he is: (the Father), Vishnu represents the principles of protection and preservation, he is: (the Son) who is separated and turned away from the divine state, and Shiva is the originator, destroyer, annihilator, and restorer, he is: (the Holy Spirit).

Buddhists in China and Japan worship a Triune God (with three Persons) whom they call (Fo), and they state that (Fo) is one, but possesses three forms.

Ancient pagan Romans believed in a Trinity, which consisted of first, God; then, the Word; then, the Spirit.

The Persians worshipped a Triune God whose Persons were: (Ahura Mazda, Mithra, and Ahriman). "Ahura Mazda" is the creator, "Mithra" is the son of God, the savior and mediator, and "Ahriman" is the annihilator - as mentioned earlier.

The Scandinavians worshipped a Triune God whom they called (Odin, Thor, and Frey), and they asserted that these three Persons constitute one God.

The ancient inhabitants of Siberia worshipped a Triune God. They called the first Person of this Holy Trinity: The Creator of Everything. The second Person: The God of Armies. And the third Person: The Spirit of Heavenly Love. They then asserted that these three Persons are one God.

The scholar Squire said: "The Canadian Hindus worship a Triune God, and they depict him in the form of an idol with three heads on one body. They say he possesses three people with one heart, and one will." (28)

Thus, the great similarity between these pagan religions and Christianity regarding the doctrine of the Trinity clearly indicates that this doctrine preceded Christianity, and that Christianity adopted and incorporated it into its teachings from those pagan religions. The existence of a connection between the East and the West and cultural exchange among nations, both ancient and modern, is undeniable.

As for the issue of belief in the existence of the Necessary Existent (God) among Christians, they do not differ from other schools of thought in believing in the existence of an essence who is the Necessary Existent, possessing all perfect attributes. As Morris Rylands writes:

"The "Christianity believes in the existence of a God who has always existed and will always exist, who possesses all possible attributes of perfection. We can sense His existence, but we cannot fully comprehend Him. He is not limited or conceived by the perceiving powers of our minds. We do not know His essence with certainty except what has been mentioned about Him to humankind in the divine revelation."

1. Doctrine of Monotheism among the Christians

Sheikh Muhammad Al-Ghazali said: "It is known that the relationship between the Persons of the Holy Trinity did not assume its final form until after major councils were held by the Church Fathers, in which they issued resolutions resulting from their studies.

The Council of Nicaea inaugurated this series by issuing a decree establishing the divinity of Jesus, the Son of God - as they claim.

Then another council issued a decree establishing the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Subsequently, the councils differed - whether the unity of the Son's and Father's nature implies they have a single will or if their wills are distinct??. Both views were adopted by different groups.

The last stage of this belief was the published declaration by Pope Pius of Rome, which effectively elevated Mary to the ranks of the deities." (29)

However, their belief in the three Persons is complex, their views are contradictory, and the details are illogical. Christians believe that the worshipped God is composed of three Persons (Hypostases/Personalities): the (Father), the (Son), and the (Holy Spirit). This is known as the Trinitarian Doctrine, but what are the

three Persons that collectively form the worshipped God according to them? The statements made by Christian scholars in response to this question are varied and contradictory, making it difficult to precisely define the three Persons that collectively form the worshipped God.

Some say: God is the name for the totality of the (Father), the (Son), and the (Holy Spirit).

Others say: God is the name for the totality of the (Father), the (Son), and (Virgin Mary). (30)

2. Monotheism in the Christian Doctrine of Trinity

Christians, despite their different schools of thought and denominations, have agreed upon the doctrine of Trinity. This doctrine was first affirmed at the Council of Constantinople held in 381 CE, which completed what the Council of Nicaea (held in 325 CE) began. Nicaea only decreed the doctrines of deification and sonship, with no mention of the Holy Spirit's divinity. The Council of Constantinople then decreed the divinity of the Holy Spirit. Thus, Christianity reached the Trinitarian assertion in dogma. They claimed that God consists of three Persons, meaning three elements or parts. These three Persons or elements - the (Father), the (Son), and the (Holy Spirit) - constitute the divine Essence. If God manifests as the Essence, He is called the Father; if He speaks, He is the Son; and if He appears as Life, He is the Holy Spirit. (31)

They then differed regarding the identity of each of these three people and their relationship to Trinity. Some said: each is a complete God, meaning the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are complete Gods. However, the Catholic Church does not believe in three separate gods.

Furthermore, The three Persons are not merely names given to God or attributes ascribed to Him, but three distinct, inseparable, and equal Persons, beyond comprehension. This is what we call the unity of the Trinity.

1. Some have said that each of these Persons is an independent and separate God, but each is of a lesser degree than the unified God. However, each is called God in its broadest sense. (32)

2. Others have said that each of these three Persons is not God, but rather that God is only the unified God of these three Persons. This view is attributed to the Marcionite sect. (33)

3. A great scholar of the Christians, St. Augustine, who lived in the third century AD, addressed this topic in his book known as (On the Trinity), in English, saying: I studied the Catholic Christian scholars who wrote about the Trinity and wanted to teach, in light of the holy scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, that the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit constitute a “unity” that does not accept division or separation in terms of its essence and reality. The three persons are not three gods, but rather, in their entirety, they are one God. Although the father created the son, the father is not the son, nor is the son the father, for the son was created from the father. Similarly, the Holy Spirit, which is the Spirit of the Father and the Son, also has an equal role and a part in the unity of the Trinity. However, it should not be imagined that this unity of the Trinity was created from the womb of the Virgin Mary, who was crucified and then buried, and on the third day after her burial rose and entered Paradise. These events were not specific to the unified Trinity but rather occurred only to the Person of the Son. Likewise, it should not be imagined that this unity is the same as that which descended upon Jesus Christ in the

form of a dove. (See the detailed explanation in the book "Izhar al-Haqq" by Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi.) Rather, that event was specific to the Holy Spirit. By the same token, it is incorrect to imagine that this unity of the Trinity called to Him when He was standing with His disciples on the mountain and said to Him, "You are My Son" (referring to the Transfiguration in Matthew 1:5). These were words spoken by the father. Just as the three Persons—Father, Son, and Holy Spirit—cannot be divided or fragmented, this unity of the Holy Trinity also performs unified actions. This is my belief, because it is a Catholic belief, and I belong to it. (34)

What justification is there for this Unified Trinity among the Christians? To answer this question, we must understand the reality of each of these three Persons: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.

1. The Father

By "The Father," the Christians mean the essence of the worshipped God alone, without considering His attribute of speech or His attribute of life.

This divine Essence is the principle for the existence of the Son's essence. According to the expression of the famous Christian philosopher St. Thomas Aquinas, "The Father" does not mean that God gave birth to Jesus or anyone else, nor does it mean that God existed while the Son did not. Rather, this is a divine term meant to demonstrate that the father is the source (principle) of the son, just as the essence is the source of the attribute. It also does not mean that the existence of the Son is temporally linked to the existence of the Father. That is, it does not aim to establish a priority for either of them: the father or the son. (35)

Here, we understand that God is the Essence and Jesus is His attribute, and the essential attributes of God are eternal and

inseparable from the essence of God Almighty. These essential attributes cannot exist apart from the essence.

But why is the Essence of God Almighty called "The Father"?

Alfred E. Garvie wrote in response to this question: The word "Father" affirms several realities, including:

a. All created beings are dependent on God (Glorified and Exalted be He) for their existence, just as a son is dependent on his father.

b. God is merciful and compassionate towards His servants, like the mercy and compassion of a father for his son. (36)

2. The Son

The term "Son" among Christians refers to the attribute of the Word of God (may He be glorified and exalted), but it differs from the attribute of speech of man. As Aquinas writes to differentiate between the attribute of speech of man and the attribute of speech of God, may He be glorified and exalted: The attribute of human speech has no essential existence, and therefore the attribute of human speech is called a son or a child. But the attribute of the Word of God is an essential attribute, and it has an existence in the essence of God's being. Therefore, it is truly called the Son of God, not metaphorically, and its origin is called "the Father," meaning the divine being.

According to Christian doctrine, knowledge is gathered through this attribute; meaning this attribute has a direct connection to God's knowledge (Glorified and Exalted be He). This attribute of God is eternal and ancient, just like His Essence. This attribute of God incarnated in the human personality of Jesus

the Messiah, which is why he is called the Son of God. The doctrine of Incarnation/Indwelling is an independent doctrine that we will discuss in some detail shortly.

3. The Holy Spirit

By the Holy Spirit, they mean the attribute of Life and the attribute of Love for the Father and the Son. Through this attribute, the Essence of the Father (God) loves the attribute of Knowledge (the Son), and likewise, the Son loves the Father. This attribute also has a substantial existence like His attribute of speech, and this attribute is also eternal and ancient. Thus, it has an independent Person (independent personality), as mentioned in Augustine's book, *The City of God*. (37).

Christians believe that this eternal attribute incarnated in the form of a dove and descended upon the Messiah (peace be upon him). (38)

When the Messiah was raised to God, the attribute of the Holy Spirit descended in the form of tongues of fire upon the disciples of the Messiah (peace be upon him). (39)

The summary of the Doctrine of Unity in Trinity is that the worshipped God among Christians is referred to as three Persons (personalities):

A. The Essence of God, which they call "The Father."

B. The Attribute of God's Speech, which they call "The Son".

C. The Attribute of Life and Love, which they call "The Holy Spirit".

Each of these three Persons is an independent God, but the totality of these three Persons, meaning the Holy Trinity, is not considered by them to be three gods, but rather one God.

Here, we must pause to reflect on the distinction between the Divine Essence and its Attributes. For the Divine Essence is one, but his essential attributes are numerous, including the attributes of speech and knowledge. These attributes are integral parts of His Essence (may He be glorified and exalted), not separate from it. Conceiving of the Divine Essence without these eternal essential attributes is impossible, for they are inseparable from it.

It is neither reason nor sound logic to accept that some divine attributes could be transformed into three independent deities (three persons or distinct personalities), because this belief implies a plurality of ancient beings, and consequently, the association of other deities with the worship of the one and only God.

For if we say that each of these three persons is an independent god, as the Christian doctrine does, how can we say that God is one, since it would then become three?

3. Christian doctrine of union and incarnation

The scholar Al-Maqrizi said in his book entitled "Explaining the Doctrine of Unity among the Christian Sects of His Time": "The Christians are of many sects: The Melkites, the Nestorians, the Jacobite, the Bodhisattvas, the Marcionites (who were the Edessanians in the vicinity of Harran), and others." Then he said: "The Melkites, the Jacobite, and the Nestorians all agree that their God is three Persons, and these three Persons are one, an eternal essence, meaning Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, one God." Then he said:

"They said: The Son united with a created human being, and thus He and what He united with became one Christ. And that Christ is the God and Lord of mankind, but they then differed on

the nature of the Union. Some claimed that the Union occurred between a Divine Essence and a Human Essence, and this Union did not strip either of them of its essence or element. And that Christ is the worshipped God, and that he is the Son of Mary whom she conceived and gave birth to, and that he was killed and crucified. Others claimed that Christ, after the Union, had two natures, one divine and the other human, and that the killing and crucifixion occurred through his human nature, not through his divine nature. And that Mary conceived and gave birth to the Messiah through his human nature. This is the view of the Nestorians."

- Some people claimed that the union was due to the Son's indwelling in the body and His mixing with it.

- Some of them claimed that the union was in terms of appearance, like the appearance of the writing of the seal and the inscription, if it falls on clay or wax, and like the appearance of the image of a person in the mirror, and other such differences that do not exist in others.

- The Melkite faith is attributed to the king of the Romans, and they say: God is a name for three meanings, so He is one three, and three one.

- The Jacobite say that He is one eternal being, and that He was neither body nor man, then He became incarnate and human.

- The Marcionites say that God is one, His knowledge is other than Him, and He is co-eternal with Him. Therefore, Christ is the Son of God in terms of mercy, just as Abraham is called the friend of God.

- Thus, it becomes clear that their views on how the Person of the Son and the Body of Christ are united were vastly different, and therefore we find the proofs in Islamic books to be varied.

4. Christian Evidence for the Trinity Doctrine

The Christians base their doctrine of the Trinity on what is stated in the texts of their Holy Bible. In the First Epistle of John, it says: "For there are three that bear witness in heaven: the Father, the Word, and the Holy Spirit; and these three are one." (40)

It is written in the Gospel of John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." (41)

Paul wrote in his letter to the Colossians: "For in him, that is, Christ, all things were created: things in heaven and on earth, visible and invisible, whether thrones or dominions or rulers or authorities - all things were created through him and for him, who is all things and in whom all things hold together." (42)

In the Gospel of Luke, in the Annunciation to Mary of Christ, it says: "The Holy Spirit will come upon you, and the power of the Highest will overshadow you. So, the child to be born will be called holy, the Son of God." (43)

Father Wadi' Mikhail says: "There can be no clearer expression of the reality of the Trinity than what Christ said concerning the ordinance of baptism: 'Go therefore and make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Spirit.' He adds: We note that the Lord said 'in the name' and not 'in the names,' because they are Persons; there are three equal Persons." (44)

Reverend Elias Maqar also expressed the same opinion, saying: "Perhaps it is necessary to point out that Christianity adhered to the formula of unity in the baptismal creed which is 'in the name of (the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost).'"

However, the entanglement of the one in three and the three in one remains beyond the comprehension of the mental faculties of any rational person. Major Christian thinkers have tried for years to escape this entanglement, but no reasonable and convincing solution has emerged so far. Morris Rylands discussed the studies that appeared among various Christian sects at the end of the second and beginning of the third century to address this issue in his book, *Studies in Christian Doctrine*, stating:

When the Ebionites sect attempted to offer a solution to this problem, they surrendered at the first step, saying: "The doctrine of Monotheism cannot remain sound after the belief that the Messiah (peace be upon him) is God." (Then they said:) "We must admit that he was not a complete God; rather, we should say that he is similar to God or that he is the moral image of God, but we cannot say that in terms of his reality and quiddity, he was a God like 'The Father'."

That sect attempted to solve this problem by striking at the foundation of Christian belief, and thus it opposed the Church, which deemed its solution a heresy and an apostasy. Thus, it was not acceptable to Christians.

Then some from that sect said: "Do not completely deny the divinity of the Messiah (peace be upon him) explicitly, and admit that he was God, but to avoid the accusation of polytheism, it can be said that he was not God by Himself, but the Father granted him divinity. Monotheism is achieved from this perspective in that the original God is the Father alone. However, the doctrine of the Trinity is also correct, because the Father granted the Son and the Holy Spirit the attribute of divinity."

But this theory contradicted the general beliefs of the Church, which holds that the Son is a complete God in essence, just like the Father. Thus, this group was also deemed a heretical sect. No solution to this complex issue has been satisfactory to Christians.

A third group, called the Patri-schism (Monarchianism) and led by Praxes, Callistus, and Zephyrinus, presented a new philosophy to solve this issue. They said: "The personality of both the father and the son is not a separate and distinct personality; rather, there are two different aspects of one single personality, and each aspect is called by a different name. The original God is the Father, and He is eternal in His essence, not perceived by sight, and not subject to the accidents that befall human beings, but He is All-Powerful. Since He is powerful, He wished to manifest in human form and appear subject to what affects man, and no one can prevent Him. People can see Him in the form of a human being, and He can even feign His death. Once, God wished to manifest in human form, so He appeared to people in the form of Jesus Christ in the world. The Jews harmed Him, even crucifying Him one day. In reality, the Person of Jesus Christ or the Son is not a separate Person (or personality) from the Father, but He is the Father, who changed His form and then called Himself the Son." (45)

This attempt contradicted the Church's theory, which believes that both the Father and the Son have an independent and equal personality, and each is a God with a separate existence. This attempt was considered a heresy because it made the Father and the Son one God.

As for the Christian theologians and the senior officials in the Catholic Church in Rome, the majority of them explicitly

denied providing a solution to this conundrum, stating that the subject of the Trinity or Unity in Trinity (meaning the worshipped God consists of three Persons, and these three Persons are originally one) is a secret beyond the power of human comprehension.

Some Indian Christian theologians claimed that the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is one of the Ambiguous Verses (Similarities), just as we see the separate letters (like Alif, Lam, Mim) in the Qur'an and the verse {The Most Merciful [God] ascended [established Himself] above the Throne} and other ambiguous verses in Islam. We respond to this fallacy:

First: The ambiguous verses that we are unable to comprehend never contain the fundamental tenets of faith, belief in which is a preliminary condition for salvation. The dogmas that God has mandated His servants to believe in have been clearly explained, and no rational evidence can challenge them.

Second: The ambiguous verses belong to matters whose incomprehension does not harm a person's salvation, and whose comprehension is not the basis for practical religious rulings or dogmas. However, the Christian doctrine of the Trinity is the opposite; it is the primary and essential doctrine without which human salvation is impossible. If we incorrectly assume that the doctrine of the Trinity is among the ambiguous matters, this wrong assumption means that God (Glorified and Exalted be He) has mandated His servants to comprehend or believe in what is beyond the power of human comprehension. That is, the Trinity among Christians is the basis of their faith and a condition for their salvation, yet they are incapable of comprehending it. As for the ambiguous verses in the Qur'an, Islam and faith do not depend on

them, and a believer's faith is not affected even if he remains ignorant of their meanings throughout his life.

Furthermore, considering the doctrine of the Trinity as one of the ambiguous matters is evidence of ignorance about the true nature of ambiguous matters or the true nature of the Christian religion. The purpose of ambiguous matters is what man cannot comprehend, not that it contradicts reason. The ambiguous is beyond human comprehension, but it does not contradict reason. Ambiguous matters are of two types:

The first type: Is what cannot be comprehended, such as the separate letters: Alif, Lam, Mim} and others. The second type: Is what whose apparent meaning is comprehended, but it contradicts reason. It is then said that what is intended is not its apparent meaning that contradicts reason, and its original meaning is not comprehended, such as the Almighty's saying: {The Most Merciful [God] ascended [established Himself] above the Throne}. The Christian doctrine of the Trinity does not fall under the first type of ambiguous matters, because the words used in it have a comprehensible apparent meaning. Likewise, it does not fall under the second type either, because its apparent concept explicitly contradicts reason. The conscious mind that perceives the realities of things says that $1 \times 3 = 3$, and $3 \times 1 = 3$. However, the Christian belief that the three Persons equal one clearly contradicts reason, as they are essentially saying that $1 \times 3 = 3$, and $3 \times 1 = 1$, which reason neither asserts nor accepts. How can reason accept that three equals one, especially when these three appeared in disparate sequences, varying periods, and distant times, and did not exist simultaneously?

It is not unlikely that the Christian scholars from India did not fully understand the details of the Christian religion due to

their distance from the original centers of Christianity. For example, Pope Qa'im al-Din explains the doctrine of Unity in Trinity in a short treatise titled (Unveiling the Trinity), printed in Lahore in 1927 CE, using an example: that the human being is composed of material parts in his formation, and material eyes observe the nature of this material formation. We see that the human body is composed of three things: bone, flesh, and blood. The body is formed only by their totality, and if any one of these three parts is absent, the human body cannot be formed. (46)

We respond to him by saying: The doctrine of Unity in Trinity is not fit to be a religious doctrine that any human being should believe in, because this doctrine contradicts reason as it is based on contradictions and impossibilities. Reason cannot conceptualize a single God being composed or constructed of three parts or elements. A composite thing is only formed, and its existence is only completed after the existence of those parts and elements; thus, the existence of the parts precedes their formation and composition. God was not preceded by anything; He alone is the Eternal. So, how can He be composed of parts or elements? Furthermore, a composite thing is dependent on every single one of its parts for its realization and formation. If some parts were not dependent on the others, the singular essence could not be formed from them. God is not dependent on anything or in need of anyone; He alone is the Self-Sufficient, and all need Him. Likewise, a composite thing must have a composer who undertakes the assembly of its parts and joins them together until the whole is formed and becomes complete. God (Glorified and Exalted be He) was not formed or composed by anyone, and He has no cause; He exists by Himself eternally. Just as a composite thing is limited by the quantity, elements, and size of its parts, it is limited by the boundaries of the parts from which it was composed, and

consequently, it is possible to see and define it. God (Glorified and Exalted be He) is not limited by boundaries, is Infinite, and is not contained by place or time. No one has seen Him. He is not composite, but absolutely One.

Moreover, true composition necessitates dependency. There can be no dependency among Necessary Existents, as dependency is a characteristic of possible existence. The Necessary Existent is not dependent on another, and every part is separate from the other, and so is the other, even if it is included in the whole. God, in the doctrine of the Trinity, is composed of three parts, and every composite thing is dependent for its realization on the realization of every one of its parts, and the part is self-evidently not the whole. Thus, every composite thing is dependent on another, and everything dependent on another is a possible existent by itself. This necessitates that God be a possible existent by Himself, which is false, because the worshipped God is the Necessary Existent, not a possible existent by Himself. (47)

We also note that Pope Qa'im al-Din understands the three Persons to mean three parts, and that anything composed of three parts becomes one in its collective composition. Similarly, the Divine Essence is one, despite being composed of three Persons. However, the Christian religion does not believe that the three Persons are three parts; rather, it sees that each of these three Persons has an independent existence. That is why the word "Person" (Hypostasis) was chosen to express the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit instead of the word "parts." There is no doubt that the human body is composed of bone, flesh, and blood, but no one calls the bone alone, or the flesh alone, or the blood alone, a human being. Christianity believes that each Person has an independent existence and is a God by Himself.

The Indian Christian scholars who seek to prove the Trinity with rational evidence are unaware of the details of the realities of their religion, and thus their evidence is not worthy of attention. Let us examine what the earlier Christian scholars said on this matter. The book authored by the famous scholar St. Augustine in the third century CE, titled *On the Trinity*, has been the source for everyone who came after him, as it is comprehensive and detailed. The book that appeared under the name *Basic Writings of St. Augustine* (printed in New York in 1948) is part of a collection of Augustine's essays.

A large part of the venerable author Augustine's book contains quotations, but he attempted to prove the theory of Unity in Trinity through some examples to explain this theory rationally, as we see in this example:

"The human brain is an instrument for acquiring knowledge. The knower, the known, and the instrument for acquiring knowledge (the brain) seem to be three separate things, with differences between them. If Zayd's existence is in your brain, then you are the knower, Zayd is the known, and the brain is the instrument for acquiring knowledge. We see:

The Knower = You

The Known = Zayd

The Instrument of Knowledge = The Brain

Since the brain also knows that it exists, the Knower is originally the Brain, the Known is the Brain, and the Instrument of Knowledge is also self-evidently the Brain.

The Knower is the Brain, the Known is the Brain, and the Instrument of Knowledge is the Brain.

Thus, we can say that the Knower, the Known, and the Instrument of Knowledge are originally three separate things, with difference

between them, but they became one, represented and gathered in the brain. The Knower has an existence, the Known has an existence, and the Instrument of Knowledge has an existence. This means that the brain carries three attributes, and whoever carries one of these three attributes can be described as the brain. Therefore, we cannot say that the brain has three separate things. By analogy, God consists of the three Persons, and each Person is God, but that does not mean that the worshipped God is three, but rather He is one God." (48).

There is no doubt that Augustine proved his intellectual genius by presenting this example. However, if we examine this example impartially, we must say that the entanglement of Unity in Trinity remains, because the brain in the mentioned example is fundamentally one, and its trinity is a conceptual trinity, not a real one. In response to this argument, we say that the Christian religion, conversely, believes that both Unity is real and Trinity is also real; meaning, Unity and Trinity are both real at the same time.

In the mentioned example, the brain has three states: being the knower, being the known, and being the means or instrument for acquiring knowledge. However, the brain, in terms of its external existence, is one. That is, the external reality of the Knower is the Brain, and likewise, the external reality of the Known and the Instrument of Knowledge is also the Brain. The Knowing Brain does not have an independent existence, the Known Brain does not have an independent existence, and the Brain that is the means of acquiring knowledge does not carry an independent existence. However, the three Persons in the Christian religion are not three conceptual states of one God; rather, each Person has an independent existence. Thus, the Father, the Son has

the Holy Spirit each have a real, not conceptual, independent existence.

In conclusion, we state that the Christian religion claims that both Unity (Monotheism) and Multiplicity (Trinity) are real in the existence of the Necessary Existent's Essence (the worshipped God). In the example presented by Augustine (cited earlier), we see that the Unity is real, but the Multiplicity is not real; rather, it is conceptual. Thus, the Union between the One and the Three is not proven by it. It is known that the multiplicity of attributes for the existence of the One God is not a point of contention. All religions believe that God is fundamentally One, but has many attributes, such as: the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful, the Omnipotent, the Forgiving, the Knower of the Unseen, the Absolute Powerful, and other beautiful attributes of God (Glorified and Exalted be He). The establishment of both real Monotheism and real Trinity is impossible, as it would necessitate the co-existence of two real opposites, which is an impossibility. Thus, the proponent of the Trinity cannot be a true monotheist of God Almighty due to the multiplicity of necessary existents and the certain loss of true monotheism.

The assertion that the real Trinity and real Monotheism - even though they are real opposites in beings other than the Necessary Existent, despite their existence not being non-necessary - is a pure sophistry. If it is established that two things, when viewed in their essence, are real opposites or contradictions, they cannot coexist in one thing at one time from one perspective, whether that thing is necessary or non-necessary. Furthermore, the real one does not have a proper third, while three has a proper third, which is one, and three is the sum of three units. The real one is not the sum of units at all, and the real one is a part of three. If

these three units were to unite, it would necessitate the part being a whole and the whole being a part. This union would necessitate God being composed of infinite parts due to the union of the reality of the whole and the part under this estimation, and the whole is composite, so every one of its parts is also composed of the parts that constitute the essence of this part, and so on. The state of a thing being composed of infinite parts is false. This union also necessitates the one being one-third of itself, and the three being three times itself, and the one being three times the three. (49)

Rahmatullah Al-Hindi, in his book *Izhar al-Haqq* (The Manifestation of Truth), refuted the Christian doctrine of the Trinity with rational arguments, including:

1. If a real distinction is established among the three Persons, then the matter by which this distinction occurred must either be one of the attributes of perfection or not. In the first case, not all attributes of perfection would be shared due to the distinction among them, which contradicts their established premise that every one of these Persons is characterized by all attributes of perfection. In the second case, the characterized one is described by an attribute that is not one of the attributes of perfection, which is a deficiency that God Almighty must be far removed from.
2. If the Union between the Divine and Human Essences was real, the Person of the Son would be limited and finite. Anything that is so is susceptible to increase and decrease, and anything that is so must be specified by a specific quantity due to a specifier and a measurer. Anything that is so is contingent (created). This necessitates that the Person of the Son is contingent, and His contingency necessitates the contingency of God due to the union of the three unified Persons.

3. If the three Persons were distinguished by a real distinction, the distinguishing factor must be other than the Self-Subsistent Necessity, because that is shared among the three Persons. What is shared is different from what distinguishes. Thus, each of them would be composed of two parts, and every composite is a possible existent by itself. This necessitates that every one of these Persons is a possible existent by himself, yet God is the Necessary Existent by Himself, not a possible existent by Himself.
4. The Jacobite doctrine is clearly false, because it entails the transformation of the eternal into the temporal, and the immaterial into the material. As for the doctrine of others, it is said in refutation: This union is either by incarnation or by something else. If it is by incarnation, then it is false for several reasons, including:
 - As for the doctrine of others, its refutation is: This Union is either by Indwelling or by something else. If it is by Indwelling, it is false on several grounds, including that the indwelling is like the indwelling of rose water in a rose, or oil in sesame, or fire in coal. This is false because it would only be valid if the Person of the Son was a body, and they agree with us that He is not a body. Or that the indwelling is like the color indwelling in a body. This is also false, because the understood meaning of this dependency is that the existence of the color in space is the existence of its locus in space, and this also requires bodies. Or that the indwelling is like the existence of relational attributes to the essences of beings. This is also false, because the understood meaning of this dependency is need or poverty. If the indwelling of the Person of the Son were established in this sense in something, He would be needy, and if He

were needy of another, He would be a possible existent, and thus dependent on an efficient cause, which is impossible. If the falsehood of all premises is established, then the assertion of indwelling is prohibited.

- Because if the Person of the Son indwelt in the body of Jesus (peace be upon him), He is either remaining in the Essence of God also, or not. If He is remaining in the Essence of God also, it necessitates the presence of the singular indweller in two places. If He is not remaining in the Essence of God, it necessitates that the Essence of God is empty of Him, which negates the Union, because the negation of the part necessitates the negation of the whole. And if that Union was without Indwelling, we would say that if the Person of the Son united with the Messiah (peace be upon him), then in the state of Union, if they are existent, they are two, not one.

5. Falsity of Trinity Doctrine by the Sayings of Jesus Christ

Following these rational arguments, Sheikh Rahmatullah made a serious attempt to present brilliant textual proofs from the sayings of Christ himself, as follows:

First Statement: It is mentioned in verse three of the seventeenth chapter of the Gospel of John: (And this is the eternal life, that they might know thee the only true God, and Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.) Jesus (peace be upon him) clarified that the eternal life consists of people knowing that God is the One True God, and that Jesus Christ (peace be upon him) is His Messenger.

Jesus (peace be upon him) did not say: "The Eternal life is that your essence is three Persons distinguished by a real distinction, and that Jesus is a man and a God, or that Jesus is an embodied God."

If belief in the Trinity was the basis of salvation, Jesus (peace be upon him) would have clarified it without the slightest fear of the Jews. Thus, it is proven that the eternal life consists of believing in the True Monotheism of God, and believing in the Messiah's message, and the opposite of both is considered eternal death and plain misguidance. True Monotheism is the opposite of True Trinity, and the Messiah being a messenger is the opposite of himself being a God, because the distinction between the sender and the messenger is necessary.

Second Statement: It is mentioned in the twelfth chapter of the Gospel of Mark: (And one of the scribes came, and having heard them reasoning together, and perceiving that he had answered them well, asked him, which is the first commandment of all? Then Jesus answered him, the first commandments of all is, Hear, O Israel; The Lord our God is one Lord; And thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength: this is the first commandment. And the second is like, namely this, thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. There is no 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 neighbor 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.)

After stating the two commandments, it is mentioned in his saying (peace be upon him) in the Gospel of Matthew: (On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets.) It is understood from "on these two commandments hang all the law and the

prophets" that the first of all commandments, which is explicitly stated in the Torah and all the books of the Prophets, is the Truth, and it is the cause of proximity to the Kingdom: to believe that God is one and there is no God besides Him.

If belief in the Trinity was the basis of salvation, it would have been clarified in the Torah and all the books of the Prophets, as it is the first commandments. And Jesus (peace be upon him) would have said: The first commandments is that the Lord is One with three Persons distinguished by a real distinction. But it was not explicitly clarified in any book of the Prophets, nor did he clarify the basis of salvation. Thus, it is proven that the basis of salvation is the belief in True Monotheism, not the belief in the Trinity. Furthermore, if the belief in the Trinity had the slightest connection to salvation, the Prophets of the Children of Israel would have clarified it clearly, just as they clarified Monotheism in the fourth chapter of the Book of Deuteronomy / 35: (That thou mightiest know that the Lord he is God; there is none else beside Him), and Deuteronomy / 39: (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).

Then in the sixth book of the book/4: (Hear, O Israel, that the Lord our God, for he is one Lord) and from the book/5: (Love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your strength).

Then in the forty-fifth chapter of the book of Isaiah/5: (I am the Lord, and there is no other besides me; there is no God apart from me. I strengthened you, and you did not know me.) And in the book of Isaiah/6: (Let those who are from the east of the sun and those who are from the west know that there is no other besides me; I am the Lord, and there is no other.)

Therefore, it is incumbent upon the people of the East and the West to know that there is no god but God alone, not to know that God is the third of three. And in the ninth verse of the forty-sixth chapter of the Book of Isaiah: (I am God, and there is no god besides me, and I have no likeness).

Third Statement: This statement is mentioned in the thirty-second verse of the thirteenth chapter of the Gospel of Mark: “But about that day or hour no one knows, not even the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but only the Father.” This statement indicates the invalidity of the Trinity, because Christ (peace be upon him) attributed the knowledge of the Resurrection to God, and denied it for himself as he denied it for other servants of God, and made himself equal to them in this regard. This is not possible in the case of him being God, especially if we consider that the Word and the Person of the Son are expressions of the knowledge of God, and we assume their union with Christ, and we take this union according to the doctrine of those who believe in incarnation or transformation. Since knowledge (of the Resurrection) is not one of the attributes of the body, the well-known excuse that he denied it for himself in terms of his corporeality does not apply to him. Thus, it appears that he is not God, neither in terms of corporeality nor in terms of anything else.

Fourth Statement: It is mentioned in the nineteenth chapter of the Gospel of Matthew as follows: “And behold, one came to him and said, ‘Good Teacher, what good deed must I do to have eternal life?’ He said to him, ‘Why do you call me good? No one is good except God alone.’” This statement refutes the Trinitarians, for out of humility, he did not accept being called “good” either. If he were God, what would be the meaning of his saying, “Do not call me good”? If he were God, he would have clarified and said, “No

one is good except the Father, and I, and the Holy Spirit.” If Christ (peace be upon him) did not accept the questioner calling him “good,” how could he accept the Trinitarians’ words in their prayers, such as, “O Lord and God Jesus Christ, do not forsake those whom you have created with your own hands”? Far be it from him to accept such a thing.

Fifth Statement: It is mentioned in Matthew 27:46: “About the ninth hour Jesus cried out with a loud voice, ‘Eli, Eli, why did you leave me?’ which means, ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’” Matthew 50: “Then Jesus cried out again with a loud voice and gave up his spirit.” And in Luke 23:46: “And Jesus cried out with a loud voice, ‘Father, into your hands I commit my spirit.’” This statement completely negates the divinity of Christ, especially according to those who believe in incarnation or transmigration, because if he were God, he would not have called upon another god, saying, “My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?” nor would he have said, “Father, into your hands I commit my spirit,” since he is incapable of weakness and death. Isaiah 40:28: “Have you not known or heard of an eternal God, the Lord, who created the ends of the earth? He will not grow faint or weary, and his wisdom is not to be tested.” Isaiah 44:46: “Thus says the Lord, the King of Israel and his Redeemer, the Lord Almighty: I am...” The first and I am the last, and there is no God besides Me. And the tenth verse of the tenth chapter of the Book of Arsiya is like this: (But the Lord is the true God, the living God and the eternal King) etc. And in the twelfth verse of the first chapter of the Book of Rights is like this: (O Lord, my holy God, and you shall not die) and in the seventeenth verse of the first chapter of the First Epistle to Timothy is like this: (And the King of ages who does not perish shall not see the wise God alone).

So, how can He who is an eternal God, free from weakness and fatigue, the living, holy, immortal, and the only God, be incapable and die? Can a mortal, powerless be God? Absolutely not! Rather, the true God is the one whom Jesus (peace be upon him) was calling upon at that very moment, according to their claim.

Then what is astonishing is that the Trinitarians are not content with the death of God alone but also believe that after his death he entered Hell. Jawad ibn Sabat transmitted this belief from the book of prayers printed in 1506 CE as follows: “Just as Christ died for us and was buried, so too must we believe that he entered Hell.” The quote ended ... (50)

As the monk Philip Quadnuls wrote in his book, *Philip's Fantasies*, in response to a letter from Ahmad al-Sharif ibn Zayn al-Abidin al-Isfahani, these words were used: “He who suffered for our salvation and descended into Hell, then on the third day rose from the dead.” (Sheikh Rahmatullah obtained an old copy of this book, printed in 1669 CE in the Great Roman Library in Basluqit, on loan from the English National Library in Delhi.)

As mentioned in the “Worship” of “Prior Book” in the explanation of the Athanasian doctrine held by Christians, the word “Hell” is used, meaning Hell. Jawad ibn Sabat said that the priest Martyrus told him, in explaining this doctrine: “When Christ accepted the human body, he had to endure all human afflictions, so he entered Hell and was also tormented. When he came out of Hell, he brought out all those who had been tormented there before his entry. So, I asked him if (you) had any transmitted evidence for this belief. He said that it did not need evidence. Then a Christian man from that party said, in a humorous way, that the father was hard-hearted, otherwise he would not have left the son in hell. The

priest became angry and expelled him from the party. This man came to me and converted to Islam after he took a promise from me not to reveal his conversion as long as he lived.

Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi quoted some well-known priests as saying, "Yes, Christ entered Hell and was tormented, but there is nothing wrong with that because this entry was for the salvation of his nation." Then Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi mentioned the doctrine of the Marcionite sect, which believes that Jesus (peace be upon him) entered Hell after his death and saved the souls of Cain and the people of Sodom because they were present with him and were disobedient to the God who created evil. He left the souls of Abel, Noah, Abraham, and other righteous people of old in Hell because they disagreed with the first sect. (This sect believed that the Creator of the world was not limited to the God who sent Jesus, and therefore they did not accept that the books of the Old Testament were divinely.) The quote ended.

The doctrine of this sect included the following:

1. All souls, whether those of prophets and righteous people or the wicked, were tormented in Hell before the entry of Jesus (peace be upon him).
2. That Jesus (peace be upon him) entered Hell.
3. That Jesus (peace be upon him) saved the souls of the wicked from torment and left the souls of the prophets and righteous people there.
4. That these righteous people opposed Jesus, while the wicked followed him.
5. That the Creator of the world is two Gods: the Creator of good and the Creator of evil. Jesus (peace be upon him) is the first messenger, and the other well-known prophets are second

messengers. Therefore, the books of the Old Testament are not divinely inspired. (51)

The author of "Mizan al-Haq" said in his book called (Solving the Problem in the Answer to Kashf al-Astar) as follows: (The truth is that in the Christian belief there is that Christ entered Hell and rose on the third day, and ascended to Heaven, but what is meant here by Hell is "House," which is a place between Hell and the original sphere, and the meaning is that he entered "House" to show its people his glory, and to alert them that I am the owner of life and that I gave atonement for sin by the death of the cross, and I made Satan and Hell defeated and for the believers like non-existent) The text is ended.

Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi responded to him as follows: "I say: Firstly, it has been established from the apparent meaning of the Book of Prayer, the words of Philip Quadrone, the acknowledgments of Martyrus and Joseph Wolf, and the doctrine of Athani Sish that the word 'Hell' is used in its literal sense, and that it is part of the Christian faith. However, this doctrine is not acceptable without evidence from their holy books indicating that there is a place called 'House' between Hell and the original sphere, and that Christ's entry into Hell was for the aforementioned purpose of demonstrating and warning that there are no spheres according to the sages of Europe and later Protestant scholars who follow them in this view. So, how can this interpretation be valid according to their claim?

Then I say: Secondly, this 'House' is either a place of joy and reward or a place of trials and punishment. If it is the former, then there is no need to warn its inhabitants, because they were already in joy and contentment in the former. If it is the latter, then there is no benefit in interpretation, because the Hell of souls can only be a place of their torment...".

Thirdly, I say: The notion that the crucifixion is an atonement for sin is certainly unreasonable, because what is meant by this sin, according to their claim (the original sin), is the original sin committed by Adam (peace be upon him), not the sin committed by his children. It is not permissible to punish his children for this original sin, because prophets are not held accountable for the sins of their fathers, nor vice versa; rather, it is contrary to justice. (For it is stated in) verse 20 of chapter 18 of the Book of Ezekiel: (The soul who sins shall die, and the son shall not bear the iniquity of the father, nor the father the iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the just shall be upon him, and the hypocrisy of the hypocrite shall be upon him).

Fourthly, I say: What is the meaning of making Satan defeated by death? Because, according to their Gospel, he was bound in eternal chains before the birth of Jesus (peace be upon him), (as it is stated in) verse 6 of the Epistle of Jude: (And the angels who did not keep their own domain but abandoned their dwelling place, He has kept in eternal chains under darkness until the judgment of the great day). Then, the wonder is that they are not satisfied with the death of their alleged god and his entry into hell, but they add to that that he has also become cursed, God forbid, and his curse is accepted by the Christians, and the author of the book (The Balance of Truth) also accepts it with complete satisfaction, and declares it in his books, and their holy Paul also declared it (as mentioned in) the thirteenth verse of the third chapter of his letter to the Galatians thus: (Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us, for it is written: "Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree"). And with us, the use of such a word is very heinous, rather, cursing God is obligatory according to the Torah, and a person journeys take in the time of Moses (peace be upon him), as is stated in the twenty-fourth

chapter of the Book of Chronicles, rather, cursing the parents is also obligatory to kill, let alone cursing God, as is stated in the chapter twentieth of the aforementioned journey.

The sixth statement: In verse seventeen of chapter twenty of the Gospel of John, Jesus (peace be upon him) says to Mary Magdalene: “Do not cling to me, for I have not yet ascended to the Father. But go to my brothers and tell them, ‘I am ascending to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.’” He equated himself with the people in this statement, “my Father and your Father, my God and your God,” so that they would not falsely attribute to him the attribute of God or the Son of God. Just as his disciples were servants of God, but not truly children of God, only metaphorically, so too he was a servant of God and not truly the Son of God.

Since this statement was made after Jesus (peace be upon him) had risen from the dead, according to their belief—shortly before his ascension—it is established that he was declaring himself a servant of God until the time of his ascension. This statement aligns with what God recounted about him in the Glorious Quran: “I said nothing to them except what You commanded me: ‘Worship God, my Lord and your Lord.’”

The seventh statement: In verse 28 of chapter 14 of the Gospel of John, Jesus (peace be upon him) says: “My Father is greater than I.” This also negates his divinity, because there is nothing like God, let alone anything greater than Him.

The eighth statement: In verse 24 of chapter 14 of the Gospel of John, Jesus (peace be upon him) says: “The words you hear are not mine, but the Father’s who sent me.” This also confirms his prophethood and that the words you hear are revelation from God.

The ninth statement: In chapter 23 of the Gospel of Matthew, verses 9-10, Jesus (peace be upon him) addresses his disciples, saying: "Do not call anyone on earth 'father,' for you have one Father, and he is in heaven," and "Do not be called 'teachers,' for you have one Teacher, the Messiah." Here, too, he explicitly states, "God is one, and I am your teacher."

Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi cited further evidence from definitive texts transmitted from the Gospels indicating the servitude of Christ and denying his divinity. He then said: "When His noble self-came into the world and was incarnate to save the world from the torment of Hell through His precious blood, what is the meaning of sorrow and despair, and what is the meaning of this supplication: 'If it is possible, let this cup be taken from me'?"

Among these pieces of evidence is that it was His noble custom, when referring to Himself, to often refer to Him as the Son of Man, as is evident to anyone who reads this widely circulated Gospel, including the Gospel of Matthew and others. It is self-evident that the Son of Man can only be a human being. In the third chapter of his book "Izhar al-Haq" (The Manifestation of Truth), Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi, in refuting the Trinitarians, said: "The statements that Christians often cling to are general and taken from the Gospel of John, and they fall into three categories:

1. Some do not indicate their intended meaning according to their true sense. Their deduction of divinity from these statements is based solely on their claim, and this deduction and claim are not valid, nor is it permissible to believe in them when there are rational proofs and definitive texts against them.

2. Some statements can be understood from other Christian sayings and from some texts found in the Gospels, so their opinion on these is not valid.
3. Some statements must be interpreted, both by us and by them. If interpretation is necessary, we say: this interpretation must not contradict the proofs and texts, and how can they possibly do that? Therefore, there is no need to quote all of them; it suffices to quote most of them so that the reader can understand their reasoning and measure the rest against it."

The first point concerns the application of the term "Son of God" to Christ (peace be upon him). The evidence for this is extremely weak for two reasons. Firstly, this application is contradicted by the application of the terms "Son of Man" and "Son of David." Therefore, it must be interpreted in a way that does not contradict rational proofs or lead to absurdities. Secondly, the term "Son" cannot be taken in its literal sense, because its literal meaning in all languages of the world is that which is born from the sperm of parents. This is impossible here, because Christ was born without a father. Therefore, the term "Son" must be understood metaphorically, in a sense appropriate to Christ's status (peace be upon him). It is known from the Gospel that this term, in his case, means "the righteous one," as mentioned in verse 39 of chapter 15 of the Gospel of Mark: "When the centurion, who was standing opposite him, saw that he had declared this and breathed his last, he said, 'Truly this man was the Son of God.'" Luke quotes the leader's words in verse 47 of chapter 23 of his Gospel: "Truly this man was righteous." In Mark's Gospel, the term "son of God" is used, while in Luke's Gospel, the term "righteous" is used instead. This same term is also used for righteous individuals other than Christ. Similarly, the term "son of the devil" is used for

righteous individuals in Matthew's chapter 5: "And long will be the peacemakers, for they will be called children of God." (44) "But I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who see you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who persecute you, that you may be children of your Father in heaven." (45) Jesus (peace be upon him) called peacemakers and those who perform the acts "children of God," and he referred to God as "Father" in relation to them. In John's chapter 8, the conversation between the Jews and Christ is recorded as follows: (41) "You are doing the works of your Father." They replied, "We were not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God." (42) Jesus said, "If God were your Father, you would love me," etc. 44 "You are of your father, the devil, and you want to know the desires of your father. He was a murderer from the beginning and does not stand in the truth, for there is no truth in him. When he lies, he speaks his native language, for he is a liar and the father of lies."

The Jews claimed that they had one father, God, while Jesus (peace be upon him) said: "No, your father is Satan." Neither God nor Satan is their father in the literal sense, so the statement must be interpreted metaphorically. The Jews meant that they were righteous and obedient to God, while Jesus (peace be upon him) meant that they were not, but rather righteous and obedient to Satan.

In the third chapter of the First Epistle of John, it says: 9 (Whoever is born of God does not sin, because God's seed remains in him; he cannot sin, because he is born of God.) and (By this we know who the children of God are and who the children of the devil are...etc.). In verse 7 of the same epistle, it says: (And everyone who loves is born of God.) In the fifth chapter of the same epistle, it says: (Everyone who believes that Jesus is the Christ is born of God. Everyone who loves the Father loves the

child born of him.) 2: (By this we know that we love the children of God, if we love God and keep his commandments.) In verse 14 of the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, it says: (For all who are led by the Spirit of God are children of God.) And in the second chapter of Paul's Epistle to the Philippians, it says: 14 (Do everything without grumbling or arguing.) 15 (So that you may be blameless and pure, the children of God without fault.)

After Sheikh Rahmatullah Al-Hindi studied these texts from their holy books, he stated that the meaning of these statements is not hidden. If the meaning of divinity is not understood from the use of the word God and the like, then how can the meaning of divinity be understood from the word Son of God and the like, especially if we note the frequent occurrence of metaphor in the books of the Old and New Testaments, and especially if we note that the use of "Father" and "Son" in the books of the two Testaments has been mentioned in countless places in them.

6. Terms: Father and Son in Old and New Testaments

In the third chapter of his Gospel, Luke, in explaining the genealogy of Jesus (peace be upon him), states: "He is the son of Joseph, and Adam is the son of God." Adam (peace be upon him) is not the son of God in the literal sense, nor is he a god. However, because he was born without parents, he is attributed to God. Luke is correct in this, for he attributes Jesus (peace be upon him) to Joseph the carpenter simply because he was born without a father, and he attributes Adam (peace be upon him) to God because he was born without parents.

David's words (peace be upon him) are recorded in God's address in Psalm 88 as follows: 9: "Then I spoke to your prophet by revelation, saying, 'I have set a helper upon the mighty one, and I have exalted one chosen from my people.'" 20: "I found David my servant and anointed him with my holy oil." 26: "They will call

upon me, 'You are my Father and my God, and the One who helps me to save me.'" 27: "I will also make him my firstborn, the most exalted of all the kings of the earth." Thus, God is referred to as "Father," and David is called "the mighty one," "the chosen one," "the Messiah," "the firstborn son of God," and "the most exalted of all the kings of the earth."

God's words in the ninth verse of the thirty-first chapter of the Book of Arsā' are as follows: "I have become a father to Israel, and Ephraim is my firstborn." He called Ephraim the firstborn son of God. If the use of such words were a cause for divinity, then Israel, David, and Ephraim would all be deserving of divinity, because the firstborn son is more deserving of honor than others according to previous laws and according to general marriage as well. If they say that the word "only son" was used in relation to Jesus (peace be upon him), we say that "only" cannot be in its literal sense, because God established that he had many brothers, and He called the firstborn son of three of them. Rather, it must be in its metaphorical sense, like "son."

God Almighty said concerning Solomon (peace be upon him) in the seventh chapter of the Second Book of Samuel: "I will be his father, and he will be my son." If this title were a basis for divinity, then Solomon (peace be upon him) would have been more deserving of it than Jesus (peace be upon him), given his precedence and his status as one of Jesus's (peace be upon him) ancestors.

Similarly, the term "sons of God" is applied to all the children of Israel in the first verse of the fourteenth chapter, the nineteenth verse of the thirty-second chapter of the Book of Exceptions, the second verse of the first chapter, the first verse of the thirtieth chapter, the eighth verse of the sixty-third chapter of the Book of Isaiah, and the tenth verse of the first chapter of the

Book of Hosea. Thus, it is clear that the term "sons of God" is applied to the righteous, to believers in Christ, to those who love God, to those who obey His commands, and to those who perform good works.

Likewise, the term "your Father" is used in many places in the Gospel to refer to God in addresses to the disciples and others.

The terms "son" and "father" may be used to refer to something related to or associated with their literal meaning, as in the phrase "the father of lies" referring to Satan, and in the words of Jesus (peace be upon him) in the twenty-third chapter of the Gospel of Matthew, "the children of hell and the children of Jerusalem" referring to the Jews. Similarly, the term "children of this world" is used to refer to the people of this life, while "children of God" and "children of the resurrection" are used to refer to the people of Paradise, as in the words of Jesus (peace be upon him) in the twentieth chapter of the Gospel of Luke. In the fifth verse of the fifth chapter of the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, the term "children of light" and "children of the day" is used to refer to the Thessalonians. Likewise, in the twenty-third verse of the eighth chapter of the Gospel of John, it is stated: "He said to them, 'You are from below; I am from above. You are of this world; I am not of this world.'" From this statement of Jesus (peace be upon him), Christians understood that he was a god who descended from heaven and took on physical form.

To refute this flawed understanding and consequently erroneous reasoning, we quote some excerpts from the book "Izhar al-Haq" by Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi, who says: "Since this statement contradicts the apparent meaning, because Jesus (peace be upon him) was from this world, the Christians interpreted it with this interpretation (meaning that he is a god who descended

from heaven and took on a physical form). This interpretation is incorrect in two ways:

First: It contradicts rational proofs and the texts found in their holy books.

Second: Jesus (peace be upon him) said something similar about his disciples as well. As it is recorded in the seventh chapter of the Gospel of John, verses 14-16: "For they are not of the world, just as I am not of the world." He said about his disciples that they were not of the world, and he equated himself with them in expressing their lack of connection to this world. If this statement implied divinity - as they claimed - then they would all have to be gods, God forbid.

This argument is incorrect for two reasons:

First, they also consider Christ (peace be upon him) to be a human being with a rational soul, and therefore he cannot be united with God in his human nature. They needed to resort to interpretation, so they said: Just as he is a perfect human being, so too is he a perfect God. Thus, in the first respect, he is distinct, and in the second, he is united with God. This interpretation is invalid because there is a fundamental difference between a human being and the God who is worshipped. The former is a contingent being, while the latter is a necessary being.

Second, the concept of equality is found in the Gospel of John, chapter 17, concerning the apostles: 21: "That they all may be one, just as you, Father, are in me, and I in you, that they also may be one in us, so that the world may believe that you sent me"; 22: "And I have given them the glory that you gave me, that they may be one as we are one"; and verse 33: "I in them and you in me, that they may be brought to complete unity."

Rather, the correct interpretation of his statement is: "You are seekers of this lowly world, while I am not. I seek the Hereafter and God's pleasure." This metaphor is common; it is said of ascetics and righteous people that are not of this world. Similarly, in verse 30 of the tenth chapter of the Gospel of John, it is stated: "I and the Father are one." Christians have used this statement as evidence that it indicates the union of Christ with God.

Jesus's (peace be upon him) statement, "that they may all be one," and his statement, "that they may be one as we are one," as well as his statement, "that they may be brought to complete unity," indicate their unity. In the second statement, he equated his unity with God with his unity with them. His unity with them is not literal, and likewise, his unity with God is not literal. Rather, the truth is that unity with God is expressed through obedience to His commandments and the performance of righteous deeds. From this perspective, Christ, the apostles, and all believers in God are equal. The difference between them lies only in strength and weakness. Christ's unity in this sense is stronger and more profound than the unity of others. The meaning of unity here is equality in obedience to divine law. The proof that unity here expresses this meaning is found in John's words in the first chapter of his first epistle, specifically verse 5: "This is the message we have heard from him and declare to you: God is light, and in him there is no darkness at all." Verse 6: "If we claim to have fellowship with him and yet walk in darkness, we lie and do not practice the truth." Verse 7: "But If we walk in the light as He is in the light, we have fellowship with one another."

It becomes clear from these verses that union with God, or communion with God, is what we have mentioned: the belief of all in God and His message, and the performance of good works.

Similarly, in the fourteenth chapter of the Gospel of John, verse 9 states: “He who has seen Me has seen the Father; so how can you say, ‘Show us the Father’?” and verse 10: “Do you not believe that I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me? The words I speak to you I do not speak on My own authority, but the Father who dwells in Me does the works.”

His statement, “He who has seen Me has seen the Father,” and his statement, “I am in the Father, and the Father is in Me,” and his statement, “the Father who dwells in Me,” if it is understood from the reasoning of these statements that they indicate the union of Christ with God, we would say that this reasoning is weak in two respects.

First: Because they believe that seeing God in this world is impossible, they interpret it as knowledge. However, knowing Christ in terms of his corporeality does not imply union. Therefore, they say that what is meant by knowledge is knowledge in terms of divinity. The incarnation mentioned in the second and third statements must be interpreted by most Trinitarians as referring to an inner union.

After these interpretations, they say that since he was a perfect human being and an active God, his three statements are valid in the second sense. This is false, because interpretation must not contradict proof and texts.

As for the second point, the twentieth verse of the chapter reads: “On that day you will know that I am in my Father, and you are in me, and I am in you.” Christ’s statement concerning the disciples, “I am in them and you are in me,” is self-evident proof that the state of the state is inherently present within the subject matter.

Verse 19 of chapter 6 of the First Epistle to the Corinthians reads: “Or do you not know that your body is a temple of the Holy

Spirit within you, whom you have received from God? You are not your own.”

Verse 16 of chapter 6 of the Second Epistle to the Corinthians reads: “And a sign of agreement between the temple of God and the idols: for you are the temple of the living God,” etc. Verse 6 of chapter 4 of the Epistle to the Ephesians reads: “One God and Father of all, who is over all, through all, and in all.” If incarnation implied union and affirmed divinity, then the apostles, indeed all the Corinthians, and likewise all the Ephesians, would have to be gods. But this is not the case. Rather, the truth is that when the lower is a follower of the higher, such as his messenger, servant, disciple, or close relative, then the attributes ascribed to the lower - such as veneration, contempt, love, and so forth - are metaphorically ascribed to the higher. Therefore, Jesus (peace be upon him) said concerning the disciples: “Whoever receives you receives me, and whoever receives me receives him who sent me,” as mentioned in verse 40 of chapter 10 of the Gospel of Matthew. And he said concerning the little child: “Whoever welcomes this child in my name welcomes me, and whoever welcomes me welcomes him who sent me,” as explicitly stated in verse 48 of chapter 9 of the Gospel of Luke. And he said concerning the seventy men whom he sent out two by two to the various regions: “Whoever listens to you listens to me; whoever rejects you rejects me; and whoever rejects me rejects him who sent me,” as recorded in verse 16 of chapter 10 of the Gospel of Luke. Similarly, it is mentioned in the Glorious Quran: “Those who pledge allegiance to you, [O Prophet], are pledging allegiance to God. The hand of God is over their hands.”

Therefore, knowing Christ in this sense is like knowing God. As for the indwelling of others in God or God indwelling of others, and likewise the indwelling of others in Christ or Christ

indwelling of Him, this is an expression of obedience to their commands. This corresponds to what is mentioned in the third chapter of the First Epistle of John: “Whoever keeps his commandments abides in him, and he in them. And by this we know that he abides in us, by the Spirit whom he has given us.” But the Spirit is the true religion of God. Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi says: “The Christians may cling to some of his attributes to support their claim to his divinity. Sometimes they argue that he was born without a father, but this argument is very weak, because the entire world is created, and according to their claim, only six thousand years have passed since its creation. Every creature in the heavens and the earth, inanimate objects, plants, animals, and even Adam, was created in a single week, according to them. All animals are created without a father and mother, so each of these shares with Christ the characteristic of being created without a father, and surpasses him in being created without a mother. Various types of insects are born every year during the rainy season without a father and mother. How can this be a basis for divinity? And if we consider humankind, Adam (peace be upon him) surpasses Jesus, son of Mary.”

They also argue based on his miracles, but this is also weak, because one of his greatest miracles is raising the dead—regardless of its veracity.

In response to this type of argument, Sheikh Rahmatullah says: Jesus (peace be upon him), according to what is mentioned in the Gospels, only resurrected three people up to the time of his crucifixion, as is well known. Ezekiel (peace be upon him), however, resurrected thousands, as is stated in chapter thirty-seven of his book. Therefore, he is more deserving of being considered a god. Elijah (peace be upon him) also resurrected a dead man, as is stated in chapter seventeen of the First Book of Kings. Elisha

(peace be upon him) also resurrected a dead man, as is stated in chapter four of the Second Book of Kings. This miracle of Elisha occurred after his death; a dead man was thrown into his grave and, by God's permission, was resurrected, as is stated in chapter thirteen of the same book. He also healed the leper of his leprosy, as is stated in chapter five of the same book.

They may also cling to some verses from the Old Testament and some sayings of the apostles to argue for the divinity of Christ (peace be upon him). (Sheikh Rahmatullah Al-Hindi. *The Book of Izhar Al-Haq*. pp. 13-23) Sheikh Rahmatullah Al-Hindi collected their claims and responded to them with a convincing scholarly response in his book entitled: (*Izalat Al-Awham*). Whoever wants to see it should refer to it.

There is no doubt that the doctrine of the Trinity, or the Holy Trinity, is not established in the Holy Gospels of the Christians. Rather, it is a result of their misunderstanding of the verses contained in the Gospels and their flawed reasoning. Certainly, if the premises are corrupt, the conclusions will be corrupt as well. Their writings and letters are undoubtedly not divinely inspired, and they contain many errors, discrepancies, and contradictions with absolute certainty. Furthermore, the sayings of Paul have no basis in truth, and neither they nor their author are considered trustworthy. He is not a Muslim in our view because he was not one of the apostles—as we will see shortly. We have quoted the sayings of the Christian religion with their interpretations to complete the argument and establish that their adherence to them is weak, as is their adherence to the sayings of the apostles, even assuming they accept that these are indeed their sayings. We do not find it established that these are the sayings of Christ (peace be upon him) and the apostles, due to the lack of chains of transmission for these books and their susceptibility to

distortion in general, and in matters such as the Trinity, the Union, and the Incarnation in particular. There is no doubt that Christ and the disciples were certainly innocent of this heretical belief. We must bear witness that there is no god but God, that Muhammad is His servant and messenger, that Jesus is the servant of God and His messenger, and that the disciples were messengers of a messenger sent to them by God.

It is useful to mention here a debate that took place between Imam Fakhr al-Razi (may God have mercy on him) and some priests in Khwarazm to demonstrate the falsehood of the Christians' claims that Christ (peace be upon him) is a god to be worshipped or that he is one of three. Here is the dialogue in detail, in the words of Imam al-Razi himself:

"When I was in Khwarazm, I was told that a Christian had come, claiming to be investigating and delving deeply into Christianity, so I went to him, and the conversation between us began as follows:"

The Christian asked me, "What is the proof of the prophethood of Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him)?"

I replied, "Just as we have been told of miracles performed by Moses, Jesus, and other prophets (peace be upon them), we have also been told of miracles performed by Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him). Whether we accept or reject this widespread transmission, if we say that miracles do not prove truthfulness, then the prophethood of all other prophets (peace be upon them) would be invalidated. However, if we acknowledge the validity of this widespread transmission and recognize that miracles do prove truthfulness, and that both are present in the case of Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him), then we must definitively acknowledge his prophethood. For when the proof is equal, the proof must also be equal." The Christian then said, "I do

not say that Jesus (peace be upon him) was a prophet; rather, I say that he was God."

I replied, "Discourse on prophethood must be preceded by knowledge of God, and what you are saying is false."

The first proof:

of its invalidity is that God is a necessary being, existing in and of Himself, and therefore cannot be a body, nor occupy space, nor be an accident. Jesus, however, is this physical human being who came into existence after being nonexistent, and was killed after being alive, according to your own account. He was first a child, then a child, then a young man, and he ate, drank, defecated, slept, and woke. It is self-evident that that which is created cannot be eternal, that which is needy cannot be self-sufficient, that which is contingent cannot be necessary, and that which changes cannot be eternal.

The second proof:

of its invalidity is that you acknowledge that the Jews seized him, crucified him, and left him alive on the cross, tearing out his ribs. You also acknowledge that he was trying to escape from them and hide from them, and that when they treated him in this way, he displayed extreme distress. If he were God, or if God were incarnate in him, or if a part of God were incarnate in him, why did he not defend himself against them? Why did he not destroy them completely? What need would he have to display distress from them and try to escape from them? I am truly astonished that any rational person could utter such a statement and believe it to be true. Common sense almost testifies to its falsehood.

The third proof of its invalidity is that it must be said either that God is this visible physical body, or that God incarnates entirely within it, or that some part of God incarnates within it. All three of these are invalid:

As for the first, if the God of the world were that physical body, then when the Jews killed it, it would be tantamount to saying that the Jews killed the God of the world. How then could the world remain without a God? Moreover, the Jews are the most abject and lowly of people, so the God they killed was a god utterly powerless.

As for the second, that God incarnates entirely within this body, this is also invalid. If God is neither a body nor an attribute, then it is impossible for Him to incarnate within a body. If He is a body, then His incarnation within another body would be a mixture of His parts with the parts of that body, which would necessitate the separation of the parts of that God. If He is an attribute, then He would be dependent upon a locus, and God would be dependent upon something else. All of this is absurd. The third argument, that some of God's attributes and parts reside within him, is also impossible. For if that part were essential to divinity (the divinity of God), then upon its separation from God, God would cease to be God. And if it were not essential to the realization of divinity (the divinity of God), then it would not be a part of God. Thus, the invalidity of these three arguments is established, and it is self-evidently proven that the Christians' claim to the divinity of Jesus (peace be upon him) is false.

The fourth proof of the Christians' falsehood is what has been established through continuous transmission: that Jesus (peace be upon him) had a great desire to worship and obey God Almighty. If he were a god, this would be impossible, because a god does not worship himself. These are extremely clear and evident proof demonstrating the corruption of their claim. Then I said to the Christian: What indicates to you that he (peace be upon him) was a god? He replied: What indicates it is the miracles that occurred through him, such as raising the dead and healing the

blind and the leper. This could not have happened except by the power of God Almighty. I said to him: Do you concede that the absence of evidence does not necessarily imply the absence of what is evidenced? If you do not concede it, then denying the existence of the world in eternity necessitates denying the existence of the Creator. If you concede that the absence of evidence does not necessarily imply the absence of what is evidenced, then I say: Since you permit the incarnation of God in the body of Jesus (peace be upon him), how do you know that God did not incarnate in my body, your body, and the bodies of every animal, plant, and inanimate object? He replied: The difference is clear, because I only judged this incarnation based on the occurrence of those miraculous acts through him. The miracle did not occur through my hand or yours, so we knew that the proof of God's incarnation was absent here.

I said to him, "It is now clear that you did not understand my statement that the absence of evidence does not necessitate the absence of proof. This is because the occurrence of those miracles indicates the incarnation of God in the body of Jesus (peace be upon him). The absence of those miracles from me and from you simply means that the proof did not exist. If it is established that the absence of evidence does not necessitate the absence of the proof, then the absence of those miracles from me and from you does not necessitate the absence of God's incarnation in my case and yours, or even in the case of the dog, the cat, and the mouse." Then I said that a doctrine that leads to the permissibility of God's essence incarnating in the body of a dog or a fly is utterly base and absurd.

Furthermore, the transformation of a staff into a living being is more logically implausible than the resurrection of a dead body, because the similarity between the body of the living and the

body of the dead is greater than the similarity between a piece of wood and the body of a snake. If the transformation of the staff into a living being does not necessitate that Moses (peace be upon him) was a god and the son of God, then the resurrection of the dead should not indicate divinity: the divinity of Jesus (peace be upon him). That was the first thing, and at this point the Christian stopped and had nothing left to say (see: Volume Two of Al-Fajr Al-Razi's interpretation under the interpretation of the Almighty's saying: {So whoever disputes with you concerning him after knowledge has come to you} from Surah Al Imran).

7. Christian Doctrine of Crucifixion and Redemption

The second Christian doctrine is the crucifixion of Christ, which states that the Jews crucified Christ (peace be upon him) to carry out his death sentence by order of Pontius Pilate. Thus, they crucified and killed him.

It is worth noting that the crucifixion was carried out by tying the hands and feet to the cross, or, more brutally, by nailing the flesh to the body. (52) Redemption, according to Christians, is salvation from death resulting from the sin that entered humanity through Adam. (Principles of Christian Doctrines, p. 16) As stated in the Dictionary of Biblical Theology: "Jesus died crucified, and the cross, which was an instrument of redemption, death, pain, and blood, became one of the fundamental pillars that help remind us of our salvation. It was no longer a source of shame but became a requirement and a symbol of glory, first for Christ and then for Christians after him." (53) Thus, Christians consider the cross a symbol of their faith and take pride in it, despite the shame and disgrace that befell Christ. The cross has become an object of veneration for most Christians and a sign that they are followers of Christ.

It is worth noting that the crucified one was not the Son (of the Godhead), who is God according to Christians, but rather the human aspect (of humanity), who was not God but a created being.

This doctrine is considered one of the most important foundations upon which Christian beliefs are based; indeed, it is the very foundation around which these beliefs revolve. The issue of sonship and divinity, in their view, is the reason for the crucifixion. (54) The crucifixion of Christ (peace be upon him) is mentioned in the four Gospels, but the Holy Quran has refuted it decisively, saying: "They did not kill him, nor did they crucify him, but it was made to appear so to them." (55) However, we must understand how Christians explain this doctrine of crucifixion and redemption. The Encyclopedia Britannica explains this doctrine as follows:

"In Christian theology, redemption refers to the redemption of Christ, who suddenly brings sinners closer to God's mercy. This doctrine rests on two premises:

1. Humanity had been deprived of God's mercy after the sin of Adam (peace be upon him).
2. The attribute of the Word of God entered the body of Christ to bring humanity closer to God's mercy once again. It then lists a series of further premises based on these two main assumptions:"
 - A. God (Exalted is He) had bestowed upon Adam (peace be upon him) every blessing while he was in Paradise, and He did not forbid him anything except that he should not approach the forbidden tree. Thus, he had absolute freedom to obey or disobey in Paradise.
 - B. However, Adam (peace be upon him) wronged himself by exercising that freedom and committed the great sin when he ate from the forbidden tree.

This sin was great in both quality and quantity, for obedience was easy. Adam lived comfort, enjoying delicious food and drink, and abstaining from the forbidden tree was simple. He lacked the desires and passions that drive people to sin. If obeying commands is easy, then the punishment for disobeying them is very severe.

Furthermore, this sin was the first of its kind in human history. Just as obedience is the foundation of all good deeds, disobedience is the foundation of all sins. Adam's sin is the root of all sins in human life.

Quantitatively, this sin was also very great, and other sins were added to it, until humanity became a collection of sins and transgressions. Therefore, it is said that infallibility is not for humankind.

Augustine explains this doctrine, writing:

"That sin encompassed several sins: pride, rudeness, disbelief in God's commands, disobedience to His orders, murder (because man made himself deserving of death), betrayal (because he believed the serpent's seductive and misleading words and betrayed his loyalty to God), theft (because he consumed what was forbidden to him), and greed (because he had been given all blessings and was eager to acquire even more). Several consequences resulted from Adam's sin, including:

1. "Eternal death or perpetual torment, because God (may He be glorified and exalted) said to him when He commanded him not to approach the forbidden tree: 'When you eat of it, you will surely die.'" (56)
2. He was deprived of absolute free will. The question then becomes: why was man afflicted with other sins instead of the punishment for one sin? Saint Thomas Aquinas answered this question, writing:

“In reality, the punishment for sin was that God (may He be glorified and exalted) distanced man from His mercy. This punishment was expected, but as a result, instincts to commit other sins arose within him.” Human sins are the result of the first sin: (57) Then, everyone who was born or will be born from the loins of Adam inherits this original sin, as Augustine writes: Everyone who came after him carried by nature that first sin, because he was born from the loins of Adam and from the womb of his wife Eve, who was the cause of Adam's trial with that sin, and who shared in its punishment. (58)

Everyone who is born from his mother's womb is born sinful, because he carries the sin of his parents by instinct. The question then becomes: if the parents commit a sin, how is the child considered sinful? Jean Calon answers this question: “If we say that we deserve divine punishment because of Adam's sin, it does not mean that we were infallible. Adam's sin was imposed upon us without any fault of our own. We did not, in fact, merely inherit the punishment for Adam's sin, but rather that disease afflicted us and spread among us like a plague from Adam. For this reason, we deserve the punishment for that sin. The infant, when born from its mother's womb, is born deserving of punishment, and this punishment is its own due to that deficiency and imperfection in its nature.” The Catholic scholar and philosopher, Thames Ikonas, also answered this question, saying: “The sin of our parents has also been passed on to us, because it is the soul that commits sins and transgressions, but the sin is transferred to the whole body.” (59) Thus, all of humanity is tainted by original sin. Original sin is the foundation of all sins, so every human being is deprived of free will and then commits sin after sin. He was

burdened with the sins he himself had committed, in addition to the original sin he had inherited from his fathers.

All of humanity was thus in perpetual torment because of that sin, deprived of free will and without any means of forgiveness. For salvation from sin is only possible through good work, and humans are incapable of good work without free will.

Therefore, the only way forward was for God to forgive their sins through His boundless mercy. However, this too was unlikely, for God is just and loves justice, and He does not break His promises. The punishment, as stated in the Book of Sin, was death, and exempting them from the death penalty would contradict His divine justice. (60) But God is merciful; He could not leave humanity in this perpetual torment. So, He chose a way for His mercy to be universal for all His servants without compromising His justice. The legal punishment for sin was that all people would die once and then be resurrected, so that in their second life, they would regain the free will that had been taken from them because of original sin. He is freed from the burden of original sin and performs good works in his freedom. (61) But the process of reviving man after his death was contrary to the law of nature, so there was a great need for someone to bear the burden of the sins of all people, and he is free from original sin, so that God would kill him once in execution of the punishment for sin and then revive him, so that this punishment would be sufficient for all, and all people would be freed.

God chose His Son for this great purpose and sent Him into our world in human form to sacrifice Himself for the atonement of humanity's sins. His crucifixion was the atonement for the sins of all people. Through this sacrifice, God forgave all people their sins, both small and great. Then, after three days, His Son rose from the dead, and all people found new life, possessing the power

of free will in this new life. Whoever does good deeds will be rewarded according to their good deeds, and whoever does evil will be punished according to their evil deeds. However, this sacrifice of Jesus Christ benefits only those who believe in Him and follow His teachings.

8. The Doctrine of Baptism

Baptism is a ritual washing. Anyone who wishes to enter the Christian faith must be washed or baptized. Without this baptism, no one is called a Christian. This practice is fundamental to Christianity, and its basis is the doctrine of redemption or atonement. The Christian doctrine is that man dies for Christ once and is then resurrected through this baptism. By dying, he receives punishment for his original sin and then receives the power of free will in his second life.

Anyone wishing to enter Christianity undergoes a transitional phase, learning basic teachings. They are called "Kit Chomins" and are not yet considered Christians, nor are they permitted to participate in the Eucharistic Supper. They then undergo the baptismal rite, which takes place at a specific time, usually before a feast called Pentecost or before Easter celebrations.

A designated room in the church is used for baptism, and the process is overseen by designated individuals. They hypnotize the person being baptized in this room (the Baptistry), with their face towards the west. The person stretches out their hands and says, "O Satan, I renounce you and all your works." They then face east and profess their faith in the Christian doctrines. They are then taken to an inner room, stripped of all their clothing, and anointed from head to toe with holy chrism, usually made from cloves, cinnamon, saffron, and aloeswood. The priests prepare this oil, and

then the person is immersed in the baptismal font. Those responsible for this dyeing process then ask him three questions:

Does he believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit in all their details? He answers each question by saying, "Yes, I believe in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." Then they take him out of the basin and anoint his forehead, ears, and chest with the special oil. Next, they dress him in white, signifying that he has been cleansed of all his past sins through this baptism. Those who have undergone the baptism then enter the church building and participate in the celebration of the Lord's Supper.

9. Doctrine of the Lord's Supper

The Lord's Supper is a cornerstone of the faith and has several names, such as: Eucharist, Sacred Meal, and Holy Communion. The special celebration of the Lord's Supper takes place after conversion to Christianity, commemorating the redemption of Christ (peace be upon him). He had eaten with the disciples the day before his arrest, as mentioned in the Gospel of Matthew: "While they were eating, Jesus took bread, broke it with God's blessing, and distributed it to the disciples, saying, 'Take and eat; this is my body.' Then he took the cup, and when he had given thanks to the Lord, he gave them that cup, saying, 'Drink from it. This is the blood of my covenant, which is poured out for the atonement of many for their sins.'" (62)

Luke added a sentence to this text: "Then Jesus said to the disciples, 'Do this in remembrance of me.'" (63) This celebration is held in accordance with what Jesus commanded. Justin Martyr writes about this special celebration of the Lord's Supper:

"The celebration begins with prayers and hymns, after which the attendees exchange kisses, and then the bread and wine are brought. A prayer of blessing is then read over the bread and wine, and the attendees say 'Amen' at the end. The bread and wine

are then distributed by the church servants, and by this act, the bread is transformed into the body of Christ and the wine into the blood of Christ. Finally, the attendees renew the doctrine of atonement for their sins." (64) However, the Protestant denomination acknowledges that the Lord's Supper is merely a commemoration of Christ's redemption. They do not, however, acknowledge that the bread is transformed into the body of Christ and the drink into the blood of Christ. (65)

10. Doctrine of the Veneration of Cross

Historical evidence regarding the veneration of the cross shows that the cross was not considered sacred by Christians and did not hold social significance until 3 AD. The well-known account in this regard is that Emperor Constantine was at war with an enemy in 312 ADs when he saw (likely in a dream) the shape of the cross in the sky. His mother, Saint Helena, then..." A cross was found somewhere. People said about it: It is the cross on which Christ was crucified (according to the Christians' claim). So the Christians began to celebrate every year on May 3rd the anniversary of finding the cross, and after that the cross became a symbol of Christianity.

This is the doctrine of the crucifixion and the cross among Christians, and in this doctrine they rely on several texts, including what was mentioned in Paul's letter to the Romans (For God, in sending his Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, so that the law might be fulfilled in us who do not walk according to the flesh but according to the Spirit) (66), (But God demonstrated his love for us in this: While we were still sinners, Christ died for us; much more, then, since we are justified, because by his blood we are saved from God's wrath). (Romans 5:8-9) Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way, death came to all

people, because all sinned (Romans 5:12). And it is stated in Paul's other letters: (Christ redeemed us from the curse of the law by becoming a curse for us, for it is written: "Cursed is everyone who is hung on a tree") (Galatians 3:13). (He saved us and called us to a holy calling, not according to His own purpose, but according to the grace that was given to us in Christ Jesus before the ages began) (Timothy 1:9).

Christians believe that Christ died on the cross as a redemption for creation, because (God, in His great love for mankind, sent His only Son to save the world from the sin that Adam committed when he ate from the forbidden tree, and that Jesus was crucified willingly, thus overcoming sin, and that he was buried after his crucifixion, and rose again after three days, overcoming death, and then ascended to heaven. Whoever does not believe in the crucifixion is not considered a Christian. Therefore, they incorporated the crucifixion into their creed, which encompasses all their beliefs. Thus, God descended from heaven and was incarnate by the Holy Spirit and the Virgin Mary, and became human and was crucified, to lift the burden of Adam's sin from mankind by shedding His blood). (67)

11. Doctrine of Inheriting Original Sin

God created Adam and Eve (peace be upon them) and placed them in Paradise and permitted them to enjoy its good things and what was in it and forbade them one tree and commanded them not to approach it. But Adam and Eve disobeyed their Lord and ate from the tree, and as a result they fell into error. Then they repented to God and regretted their action, so God Almighty accepted their repentance. The Qur'an has indicated this, as God Almighty said: "Then Adam received from his Lord words [of revelation], and He accepted his repentance. Indeed, He is the Accepting of Repentance, the Merciful." (Surat Al-Baqarah: 37). The Holy

Quran rejects the notion that the sin of Adam and Eve should be imposed on all people, as Christian theologians believe. In the Quran, religious responsibility is purely personal. God Almighty says: "For her is what she has earned, and against her is what she has committed" (68) and "Whoever commits a sin only commits it against himself" (69). However, Christians believe that God did not forgive Adam his sin, and that this sin was not limited to Adam and Eve, but extended, by virtue of the blood tainted with sin, to all of humanity across generations. (70) This is confirmed by Father Elias Maqar, who says: "It is not hidden that the first parents not only became sinners but also bequeathed sin to all their descendants in succession and continuity." (71) Paul alludes to this when he says: "Therefore, just as sin entered the world through one man, and death through sin, and in this way death came to all people, because all sinned" (Romans 5:12).

When Adam committed the sin, God did not punish him or exact retribution from him, for the penalty for sin is death. However, God did not carry out the sentence of physical death on Adam, which He had warned him of in the event of disobedience (when you eat of it, you shall surely die). Rather, He saved him from this death by decreeing the death of an animal in his place. Although this animal sacrifice in itself was insufficient for redemption, because it was a symbol of a greater sacrifice in God's eyes, it then acquired the power of redemption. (72) Christians claim that sin is not erased except by the shedding of blood, based on Paul's statement: "And almost everything is cleansed according to the law by blood, and without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness." (73) But what is the ransom that can atone for Adam, and what blood is sufficient to redeem Adam, his wife, and his descendants from sin? Abraham Luke says: "The ransom must be pure, free from all blemish and stain, holy and blameless. And

there is no creature in all the world that is pure and holy." And without fault except for God Almighty, and it must also be of great worth, equal to the price of the whole world except for God).

Therefore, it was necessary for God to take on a body in which the divine and human natures would be united. This occurred in Jesus Christ, as God appeared in the flesh. In Christ, the perfection of the two attributes of justice and mercy is found. Thus, it was necessary for God to become incarnate and take on human form to die for humanity. (74) The Christian scriptures have elaborated extensively on the theory of the crucifixion and described the process of torture and suffering that Jesus, the "incarnate God," endured before his crucifixion. The Gospels accepted by the churches agree that Christ was crucified, that he knew this would happen to him, the time of his crucifixion, and that his disciple Judas Iscariot would betray him to those who would crucify him. The Gospels even state that Christ knew beforehand the condition of each of his disciples: Judas would betray him to his enemies to be crucified, Peter would deny knowing him three times, and all of them would doubt him on the night of his betrayal. (75)

12. Invalidity of This Illusory Doctrine

1. "Was Adam's sin an exploratory experiment or a sin?" This topic deserves research and investigation.
2. Adam's sin was first passed on to his descendants, and then from them to Christ (peace be upon him). Is it conceivable that a just God would punish someone who did not sin in place of someone who did?

If God is the one who created creation and instilled in them this way, and knows from eternity that some will be wicked and some righteous, and has prepared a just recompense for each, then why does He grieve, despair, and deny His heart because of their

sins? Wouldn't it have been more fitting for the Almighty God to create something that would not grieve Him in the first place? If they say that He did not know from the beginning what would happen, then they have attributed ignorance to Him, and this contradicts the divine nature.

3. If Adam sinned, what is the fault of his descendants that they should inherit his sin after him? This is a principle that all laws have prohibited, and the Torah explicitly states: "Fathers shall not be put to death for their children, nor children put to death for their fathers. Each one shall be put to death for his own sin." (Deuteronomy 24:26)

The prophet Ezekiel rejected the principle of inherited sin, saying: "And you say, 'Why should the son not bear the iniquity of the father?' Yet the son has done what is just and right and has kept all my statutes and observed them. He shall surely live, but the soul that sins shall die. The son shall bear no iniquity of the father, nor the father bear any iniquity of the son. The righteousness of the righteous shall be upon him, and the wickedness of the wicked shall be upon him." (Ezekiel 18:19-20) Furthermore, Christ considers children righteous and devout, not born sinners. The Gospel of Matthew states: "And they brought little children to him so that he might touch them. But the disciples took advantage of those who brought them. When Jesus saw this, he was indignant and said to them, 'Let the little children come to me, and do not hinder them, for the true kingdom of God belongs to such as these...' Then he embraced them, laid his hands on them, and blessed them." (Mark 10:13-16) Is it just that all of humanity should suffer because of a sin committed by Adam? And how could God allow Moses, Abraham, and all the other prophets and messengers to be eternally condemned to Hell because of Adam's sin?

Then why should Christ bear the burden of Adam's transgression and endure the torment from which he so vehemently cried out? And if only it were only Christ, but God - according to the Christians - for sin was not limited to humankind, but extended to God, who then tasted the bitterness of various forms of suffering.

4. If the Word was incarnate in Christ to atone for original sin, what about the sins that followed? Some of these sins are greater than Adam's, such as denying God's existence (may He be glorified and exalted), mocking and ridiculing Him, or even killing Him—as they claim. What was the point of his crucifixion for one sin while leaving sins far greater than unpunished?

5. Christians claim that the crucifixion of Christ was for the sake of justice and mercy. But what justice or mercy is there in crucifying and torturing the innocent? Punishments in divine laws are only meant to discipline criminals so that others will refrain from committing crimes. It is just then that punishment falls on the wrongdoer and not on others, otherwise it would be pointless. How then can it be right for Christ, the "incarnate God," who committed no wrong, to be punished? If they say that he consented to it, we say that anyone who examines the story of the crucifixion will find that he was deeply distressed by the horror of the death he was about to face. This is what is mentioned in the Gospel of Matthew: (Then Jesus went with them to a place called Gethsemane. He said to the disciples, "Sit here while I go over there and pray." Then he took Peter and the son of Zebedee with him. And he began to be sorrowful and troubled, and said to them, "My soul is overwhelmed with sorrow to the point of death. Stay here and keep watch with me." Going a little farther, he fell with his face and prayed, "Father, if it is possible, may this cup be taken from me. Yet not as I will, but as you will.") (Matthew 26:38-39)

If Christ, the "incarnate God," willingly surrendered himself, why did he experience such distress and fear, and why did he call upon God to relieve him of this affliction? With all this, could he still be God? Does God experience distress? Or does he speak to himself?

Furthermore, why was Christ alone, among all humanity, held responsible for Adam's sin? The Christian Bible states that God forgave and accepted the repentance of the people of Nineveh when they fasted and repented. (76) However, Christians say that fasting, prayer, almsgiving, and repentance are ineffective because they are human methods. True repentance requires a divine means, namely, Christ's crucifixion, the wisdom of which is unknown.

It is also noteworthy that neither Christ nor any of the prophets before him, directly or indirectly, ever mentioned this original sin inherited from Adam and Eve, nor did they mention the secondary sins that people commit with their tongues and hands.

Furthermore, the Gospels that recount the crucifixion differ significantly and contradict each other in their narration of the story of the cross. They differ on whether the one carrying the cross was Christ or someone else, whether the drink the crucified man drank was ordinary wine or wine mixed with gall, whether the crucifixion occurred at the third or sixth hour, whether the crucified man cried out or simply breathed his last, and whether the women who witnessed the crucifixion were countless or a few known women. (All these contradictions are found in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.) These Gospels differ in every detail of the texts that spoke about the crucifixion incident, and this difference is sufficient to reject what is stated in these Gospels, because they are subject to truth and falsehood as they are merely reports, and therefore doubt and falsehood are required of them all.

Furthermore, Christians have exonerated the Jews from the crime of killing and crucifying Christ, because they crucified someone other than Christ, and it is not certain that it was Christ. Moreover, the historical reality of the veneration of the cross shows that the cross was not sacred to Christians until 325 CE, and the apostles did not venerate it until Constantine came and gathered the Christians at the Council of Nicaea, introducing paganism into Christianity and beginning the veneration of the cross. (77) It is mentioned that the Gnostic philosophers held that Christ was not crucified, and that the one crucified was someone else whom the Jews mistook for Christ. Even today, a group in America still adheres to Gnostic views. (78) The texts that tell us the story of the crucifixion of Christ (peace be upon him) do not definitively state beyond any doubt that the one crucified was Christ himself; rather, they are open to interpretation, because the one crucified was someone else.

Chapter Five:

The Sacred Books of Christianity

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

The holy books of Christians refer to the Old Testament and the New Testament.

A. The Old Testament

It is the book that Jews and Christians hold sacred, and it includes thirty-nine books, which are: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, 1 Samuel, 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Job, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel, Hosea, Jonah, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkum, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.

Historians have differed on the language in which the Old Testament was written. Some say it was written in Hebrew, while others say it was written in Chaldean, considering that Aramaic is a branch of Hebrew. The Old Testament has been translated into many languages.

Among the most famous ancient translations is the Septuagint (or the Translation of the Seventy), which is considered the oldest translation of the Old Testament books from their Hebrew version into the prevailing Greek (Hellenistic language) in the city of Alexandria.

As for the Latin translation, the Vulgate, it was translated from the Greek Septuagint version in 404 CE. The oldest complete Arabic translation of the entire Bible was carried out by Yuhanna (John), who translated it from Greek. The American Protestant translation of the New Testament from the original languages (Hebrew, Chaldean, and Greek) was printed in 1860 CE. The Old Testament translation was printed in Beirut in 1865 CE.

Another translation was later published by the Jesuits in Beirut between 1872 and 1880 CE. A third Arabic translation appeared in 1851 CE, produced by Ahmad Faris al-Shidyaq before his conversion to Islam. (79)

The Reverend Habib Saeed states: "It was natural for the Jews to believe that Moses was the author of the five books [The Pentateuch], and that God revealed the Law through him. When Christians received the Old Testament from the Jews, they adopted this theory... However, over the last one hundred years, scholars have expanded their research and inquiry and proven the error of this theory... Scholars say that some parts of it date back to different times and later eras, and that three of these books: Genesis, Exodus, and Numbers, contained three types of writings, and we sometimes find two different accounts of the same incident." (80)

Therefore, the Old Testament is not the Book of God revealed to Moses (peace be upon him), but rather it is an invention of the rabbis and monks and a fabrication by those who:

{يَكْتُبُونَ الْكِتَابَ بِأَيْدِيهِمْ ثُمَّ يَقُولُونَ هَذَا مِنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ لِيَشْتَرُوا بِهِ ثَمَنًا قَلِيلًا ۖ فَوَيْلٌ لَهُمْ مِمَّا كَتَبَتْ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَوَيْلٌ لَهُمْ مِمَّا يَكْسِبُونَ}.

[Translation of the meaning of the verse derived from the Holy Qur'an, Surah Al-Baqarah (2:79)]

"... then woe to those who write the Book with their own hands, and then say, 'This is from God,' to purchase with it a small price! Woe to them for what their hands have written, and woe to them for what they earn."

A careful examination of the Old Testament books reveals that they differ from one another; some are long, some are short,

and they vary in style and composition. All this clearly indicates the intrusion of human artistry, meaning they are not a divine revelation. Moreover, religious scholars agree that the Old Testament has been corrupted, altered, and contains contradictory texts.

B. The New Testament

The New Testament is the second division of the Holy Bible. It comprises twenty-seven books and is divided into three sections. The first section consists of the Historical Books, known as the Gospels. These are the four Gospels: Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, which are accepted by Christians. The second section consists of the Didactic Books, which include twenty-one Epistles, mostly attributed to Paul. The third section consists of the Book of Revelation by John the Divine.

After Christ was raised up and the original Gospel revealed to him was lost, many Gospels were written, exceeding one hundred. The Church selected four of these: the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John. These are the Gospels referred to by Christians today. The Gospels do not contain laws or rulings, because Christ (peace be upon him) followed the Torah. (81)

1. Gospel of Jesus, Son of Mary

Barnabas mentions in his Gospel that Jesus came with a book from God known as The Gospel. Sheikh Muhammad Abu Zahra states, "We found among the liberal Christian historians - whose research was only constrained by knowledge and historical facts - those who explicitly state that in the first century there was an Epistle that was considered the original source for these Gospels regarding what Christ brought and the summary of his life." He provides a translation of what Norton said in one of his books, and what Eichhorn said in his book: (That at the beginning of the Christian

religion, there was a brief epistle detailing Christ's life, which can be called the Original Gospel. It is likely that this Gospel was for the disciples who had not heard Christ's sayings with their own ears or seen his life with their own eyes. This Gospel was like the core, and Christ's life events were not written in it in order). Sheikh Abu Zahra concludes: "Therefore, these liberals confirm that there was a Gospel that served as the core of Christianity, but it is no longer extant." (82)

The persecutions faced by the Christians in the first and second centuries had the greatest effect in the loss of Jesus's Gospel (peace be upon him) and the severing of its chain of transmission among Christians. This is why many Gospels appeared after the loss of the Gospel of Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon him).

The First Council of Nicaea convened in 325 CE for Christians to consult on these Gospels, but they only affirmed the four Gospels still accepted by Christians today: Matthew, Luke, Mark, and John. Subsequent Christian councils followed to confirm the recognition of these Gospels. Reverend Habib Said notes: (According to the historical evidence available to us, the Council of Carthage, which convened in 397 CE, was the first council to approve the complete collection of the New Testament books. The Council of the Eastern Churches did not finally approve the canon of the books recognized as authentic by St. Athanasius until 692 CE, three hundred years after that date (397 CE)). (83)

It is therefore natural to observe that we do not know the reason for the rejection of the books dismissed by the Church councils. Did their content contradict what was in the accepted Gospels? What caused people to abandon them, even though they

were popular and adopted by certain Christian sects before their rejection? We wish we knew them and could examine them. (For examining them would allow us to know the beliefs of people concerning Christ, and what he was like, especially among those who lived close to his era, met his disciples, and drank from their sources. If history failed to preserve copies of them, we wish the Church would inform us of their contents that differed [from the accepted Gospels] and the reason for their rejection, so that we may see the justification for the rejection to establish that Christianity, by this act, preserved Christ's religion and did not change it. But history withheld this information from us, folding up those Gospels, and the Church withheld those statements. We are left only to study what is in our hands, perhaps finding sufficiency if we reflect deeply on inference and grant authority to the intellect, making its axioms a proof.] (84)

2. Reality of the Four Gospels among the Christians

After studying the four Gospels, it becomes clear to the researcher that they were not written during the lifetime of Christ (peace be upon him). Christians themselves have acknowledged this. Reverend Habib Saeed says:

"If the earliest Christian documents were written after the life of Christ, how can you be certain that they were accurate historical records? Furthermore, most of these documents were written by individuals other than the original disciples who lived with Christ (meaning the Apostles). Paul did not see Christ in the flesh, so how then can we place our trust in the New Testament documents, and how can we rely on mere memories stored in the minds of the early followers, and how did they record those facts? Today we record our reports and notes in various ways, but in the first century, the world only had human voices to record historical events." (85)

Reverend Habib Saeed added: (We do not know when this written collection was begun or how it was written, because nothing remains of those earliest collections of Jesus' sayings and deeds, at least in a specific format. Jesus himself wrote nothing, nor did his followers think of writing down a story about their master and handing it down to subsequent generations. Due to the lack of direct evidence, we are compelled to resort to conjecture and speculation.) (86)

He then said about the four Gospels: (The writers of the Gospels themselves do not claim to have been under divine inspiration when they wrote. It appears on the surface that they wrote them on their own initiative according to the requirements of the circumstances.) (87)

As for Father Abdul-Ahad Daoud, he says: These twenty-seven books were not included in the list of holy books in terms of their official collection until the fourth century with the approval of the Council of Nicaea in 325 AD. Therefore, none of these letters were acceptable and approved by the Church before the date. Rather, the four Gospels were chosen at the Council of Nicaea from more than forty or ninety Gospels, then the twenty-one letters were chosen from countless letters, and they were approved. The body that chose the New Testament was the same body that said about the divinity of Christ, and the selection of the books of the Testament was based on rejecting the books that contained teachings that did not agree with the doctrine of Nicaea and burning them. (88)

The four Gospels were chosen because they agreed with the doctrine of a group of Christians, and not because they were books divinely inspired by God. Therefore, anything that did not align with their doctrine of the divinity of Christ (peace be upon him)

was burned, even though they were considered sacred by some and were prevalent and accepted just like the four Gospels before they were destroyed.

The oldest original copies of the four Gospels date back to the third century CE. As for the original copies, they were subjected after they were written to deliberate corruption intended to reconcile them with the sect to which the copyist belonged or to conform to their theological objectives for special purposes, and they were also exposed to errors in transmission over the course of two centuries. (89)

It is worthwhile to shed light on the four Gospels accepted by Christians in particular, to ascertain the authenticity of what is contained therein and the veracity of the sayings attributed to Christ (peace be upon him).

3. Gospel of Matthew

This Gospel consists of twenty-eight chapters. It is attributed to Matthew, as Christians state, who was one of Christ's disciples (peace be upon him), known as Levi's son of Alphaeus. He was a tax collector for the Romans in Capernaum in the region of Galilee in Palestine. (90) Matthew mentions in his Gospel that Christ (peace be upon him) chose him as a disciple: "As Jesus passed on from there, he saw a man named Matthew sitting at the tax collector's booth. 'Follow me,' he told him, and Matthew got up and followed him. (Matthew 9:9).

Zaki Shenouda mentions that "the believers (after the ascension of Christ) asked him (Matthew) to write the Gospel for them in Aramaic, and he responded to their request. He preached in Palestine, in Tyre and Sidon, then he went to the land of Abyssinia, and many believed at his hands, so the king sent his

soldiers against him, and they seized him and beat him severely until he died a martyr.” (91)

Some Christians mention that Matthew was a Jew, and he wrote his Gospel for the Jews in Greek, to show them that their Jewish heritage had been passed on to the Christians, and that Matthew was not one of the twelve disciples of Christ.

Reverend Habib Saeed mentions (That this Gospel does not mention any stories or events narrated by an eyewitness, but rather it is copied from the Gospel of Mark. If the writer had been a disciple of Christ, he would have narrated much of what he saw, witnessed, and heard from his original stories. However, Matthew took Mark as a source for his Gospel, and furthermore, he wrote this Gospel after a period of fifty or sixty years had passed since the events he narrated. It is highly improbable that an eyewitness from the early disciples would wait this long before recording these memories). (92)

It is also mentioned that this Gospel was not arranged chronologically according to the events, but rather thematically, grouping the deeds and sayings of Christ according to their similarity to one another. Nevertheless, it proves that Jesus of Nazareth is the Messiah, and Matthew frequently highlights evidence from the prophecies of the Old Testament.

He then asks and says: (It is not known whether this Gospel is the first in terms of its time of composition, yet it deserves to be placed at the beginning of the New Testament because it is the connecting link between the Old and New Testaments, and between the Law and the Gospel.) (93)

Some doubt the identity of Matthew and state (That it is no longer acceptable to say that he (Matthew) was one of Jesus's companions). (94)

There is a difference among Christians regarding the date of this Gospel's composition, with several opinions mentioned: 37, 38, 41, 43, 48, 61, 63, or 64 CE. Opinions also differed concerning the language in which it was written: Hebrew, Syriac, or Greek?

The Bible Dictionary states: (Opinion differed regarding the original language of this Gospel. Some (Christians) held that it was first written in Hebrew or Aramaic, which was the language of Palestine in those days. Others held that it was written in Greek... and that this Gospel was written before the destruction of Jerusalem. Some of the ancients held that it was written in the eighth year after the Ascension, and others held that it was written in the fifteenth. Some believe that it was written between 60 and 65 CE.) (95)

If Matthew, to whom the Gospel is attributed, is himself disputed, it means that the source of this Gospel is unknown, as are the original copy in which it was written, the date of its composition, the translator who translated it, and the language in which it was written and translated. The source from which it was translated is required to know whether the translation was faithful to the original or contained deviations, and to know whether the translator understood the meanings of the phrases. However, most of their scholars said that the translator is unknown. From where, then, is the trust in the translation when the translator is unknown? The trustworthiness of the translation is linked to the trustworthiness of the narrator and the translator of the narratives. (96)

“The Christians rely on the conjecture, and the conjecture is of no use in the scientific research, nor it is useful in this field which requires certainty in all matters. After all that, it can be said that it is strange and foolish for the Christians to claim that this Gospel is a holy book.” (97)

4. Gospel of Mark

This Gospel consists of sixteen chapters. It is the shortest and most concise of the four Gospels and is the second in order. (98) It is attributed to Mark, whose name was John, and who was nicknamed Mark. He was one of the Jews who lived in Jerusalem in Palestine, and he was the son of Barnabas's sister, a companion of Christ (peace be upon him), as mentioned in Paul's Epistle to the Colossians: “... and Mark, the cousin of Barnabas.” (Colossians 4:10). (99)

It is mentioned that Mark was among the first to believe in Christ, being one of the seventy apostles. He preached in Antioch, Asia Minor, and five Western cities, then went to Egypt, then left for Rome, then returned to Alexandria, and died there. (100)

Mark accompanied his uncle Barnabas and Paul on their journey to Antioch, then returned to Jerusalem, then met his uncle again and took him to Cyprus, then they parted. He went to North Africa, then entered Egypt in the middle of the first century, then was imprisoned, tortured, and killed in 62 CE. (101)

Many Christian scholars believe that Peter wrote this Gospel, but it is attributed to Mark, as Irenaeus says: “After the death of Peter and Paul, Mark, Peter's disciple and interpreter, handed over to us his book, which Peter had declared.” Ibn al-Batriq says: “Peter, the chief of the apostles, wrote the Gospel of Mark at Peter's direction in the year 61, so that Peter could use it in his preaching.” Jerome stated that some of the early (Christian)

scholars had doubts about the last chapter of the Gospel of Mark. (102)

Reverend Habib Saeed, talked about this Gospel, quoting a Church Elder from 140 CE: (Mark, who was Peter's interpreter, wrote down all that he remembered, but he did not write it in historical sequence. This is because he himself did not hear our Lord (Christ) nor was he one of His close followers, but he was a follower of Peter and adapted his sayings according to circumstances, not as one who narrates an organized, coordinated biography. Mark had only one goal: not to omit anything he heard Peter say, and not to add anything to it. After Peter died, there was no person more suitable and qualified to write all that Peter had taught). He concludes his discussion of this Gospel by saying: (All these are Peter's touches, as if he signed them in the Gospel of Mark). (103)

William Barclay mentions that Mark emphasized the human side of Christ, to the extent that the writers who followed him were forced to introduce some amendments in many of his phrases. While Mark mentions that Jesus was a carpenter, Matthew avoids mentioning it; Christ was hungry, tired, and needed rest. (104)

Maurice Bucaille observes in the text of this Gospel: (That the text of this Gospel reveals a primary, undeniable defect: it was written without any regard for the chronological succession of events... Furthermore, this evangelist displays a complete lack of reasonableness. Father Rogue quotes as saying: "Mark was an unskilled writer and the most trivial of the evangelists; he never knows how to write a story.") (105)

As for the language in which the Gospel of Mark was written, Christian writers are almost unanimous that it was written in Greek. Zaki Shanudah states in his discussion of Mark (He wrote his Gospel in the Greek language). (106)

Furthermore, (The evangelist's use of many Latin words in their Greek form favors the opinion of those who say the Gospel was written in Rome). (107)

Christians differed on the time of the Gospel of Mark's composition. Some said it was written between 56 and 65 CE... Others said it was written in 60 or 63 CE, and some said 61 CE. Many Christian scholars believe that what Mark wrote in Chapter 13 was recorded after 70 CE. (108)

Therefore, no one knows with certainty who wrote this Gospel, where it was written, or when it was written.

5. Gospel of Luke

This Gospel is the third in order. The writer of this Gospel is Luke, born in Antioch, who studied and practiced medicine as a physician. He accompanied Paul on his travels, especially to Rome, and wrote his Gospel in Greek, as well as the Book of Acts. (109)

Luke was neither one of the Apostles nor one of their disciples, but rather he was a disciple of Paul. Christians differed on his nationality: some said he was Antiochene, and others said he was Roman. They also differed on his profession: Some said he was a doctor, others said he was a literary artist, and others said he was a portraitist and painter, and that he was the person who painted the Virgin Mary, as Christians claim. (110)

As for the language in which this Gospel was written, Christian historians agree that it was written in Greek - as

mentioned - and there is something in the first chapter of this Gospel that confirms that Luke wrote this Gospel for a person named Theophilus, as he says in its first verses: "Many have undertaken to draw up an account of the things that have been fulfilled among us, just as they were handed down to us by those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses and servants of the word. So I also thought it good, having investigated everything carefully from the beginning, to write an orderly account to you, most excellent Theophilus, so that you may know the certainty of the things you have been taught." (Luke 1:1-4)

This statement makes it clear that there were certain and things that were doubtful among Christians from what many were writing. His orderly account was directed at a person dear to him named "Theophilus." Some Christians say that Luke wrote his Gospel for the Greeks, and others say he wrote it for the Egyptians.

Christians differed on the time of this Gospel's composition. It was said to have been written during Paul's imprisonment in 58-60 CE, or in 53 CE, 63 CE, or 64 CE. (111)

Christians differed regarding this Gospel just as they differed regarding others. They disagreed on the identity of "Luke," its author, his profession, and for whom he wrote. They only agreed that Luke was neither one of the Apostles nor one of their disciples, but rather a disciple of Paul, and that he wrote his Gospel in the Greek language.

6. Gospel of John

This Gospel is the fourth among the Gospels of the New Testament and consists of twenty-one chapters. As for its author, Christians say it is John the Apostle, the son of Zebedee the fisherman, whom

Christ loved, to the extent that He entrusted his mother to him while He was on the cross - as they believe.

Since the Gospel of John explicitly mentions the divinity of Christ clearly, Christians have greatly differed on its author. The first text in its chapters says: “(In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was in the beginning with God. Without Him nothing was made that has been made.)” (John 1:1-3)

Since this Gospel clearly states the divinity of Christ and the Trinity, which are among the most important doctrinal matters for Christians, they attributed this Gospel to John, the companion of Christ, one of the Apostles and the most beloved disciple of Christ. (112)

It appears from the text in the Gospel of John that the founder of the doctrine of the divinity of Christ, Incarnation, and Anthropomorphism was not only Paul, but also John, one of the Apostles, who also affirmed this doctrine.

However, the Gospel of John is the only Gospel whose authenticity was doubted by a large group of Christians, who denied that its author was John the Apostle, so much so that its authenticity eventually became a complex problem. Christian scholars in the second century CE denied the attribution of this Gospel to John the Apostle.

We mention regarding the group of Christians who denied the attribution of this Gospel to John the Apostle: Professor Linn said: (That the entirety of the Gospel of John is the composition of a student at the Alexandrian School, and the Alogi sect in the second century denied this Gospel and everything attributed to John).

The Encyclopedia Britannica, which was co-authored by five hundred Christian scholars, states: (As for the Gospel of John, it is undoubtedly a forged book whose author intended to set two of the Apostles, St. John and St. Matthew, against each other. This forged writer claimed in the text of the book that he was the Apostle whom Christ loved, so the Church accepted this sentence at face value, asserted that the writer was John the Apostle, and explicitly put his name on the book, even though the author is certainly someone other than John). (113)

Furthermore, some phrases in the texts of this Gospel indicate that its author is not John the Apostle, but rather a Jewish scholar who was knowledgeable about the Jewish religion. However, John, son of Zebedee was uneducated and did not know Jewish beliefs. Likewise, it appears from the Gospel of John that its writer belonged to a family that had influence and prestige, whereas John, son of Zebedee the Apostle was a fisherman and was financially humble. Moreover, this Fourth Gospel contradicts the texts found in the previous three Gospels and differs from them in style.

The first person to affirm that its author was John the Apostle was Irenaeus, whom Christian scholars consider having lacked accuracy in criticism, so his opinion on this Gospel is not given credence by them.

There are many reasons - as mentioned - based on which a large group of Christian scholars asserted that the Gospel of John is a forged book and is not considered an inspired text. However, those Christian scholars who believe that it is not a forged book agree that the writer of this Gospel is not John, son of Zebedee the Apostle, but rather John the Elder.

James MacKinnon writes: "It is not improbable that Irenaeus, who was not accurate in criticism and investigation, confused John the Apostle and John the Elder." (114)

A great Christian scholar, Archdeacon, also wrote: "We have reached the conclusion that the narrative attributing the Fourth Gospel to John, son of Zebedee is incorrect." (115)

He continued: "The truth is that scholars are not prepared to accept the opinion that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was John, son of Zebedee without supporting evidence, and critics generally oppose this view.

He attempted to prove his claim in some detail that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was not John the Apostle, but rather John the Elder, because those who believe that John son of Zebedee wrote the Gospel do not recognize its historical importance, as it is devoid of historical events, and the phrases contained therein are the expressions of the writer who wanted to insert his own phrases into the words of God (meaning Christ)." (116)

The implication is that if we say the Fourth Gospel was written by John's son of Zebedee, its authenticity would be in danger. "Archdeacon" tried to prove that it was written by John the Elder, who was a disciple of Jesus (peace be upon him). However, his name is not listed among the twelve Apostles. This is because Christ included him among the Apostles in His final days. John the Elder was a young, educated man who was knowledgeable about the Torah and belonged to a family of notables. This is the information currently prevalent in the Christian world, and it is based on this information that they denied that John the Apostle was the writer of the Fourth Gospel.

However, this information is also incorrect, and the motive behind it is merely an attempt to protect the authenticity of the Gospel of John. The question that arises is: If John the Elder was another disciple of Jesus (peace be upon him) besides the twelve Apostles, why was his name absent from the previous three Gospels, even though Jesus (peace be upon him) loved him intensely and he had a close connection with Christ, as is understood from his Gospel? He did not mention his name in his Gospel but instead referred to himself as "the disciple whom Jesus loved." He wrote at the end that the person meant by these words is the writer of the Fourth Gospel himself. (John 21:24).

The question then is: Why did Christ not include him in the company of His disciples, despite him being close to Him? Whereas Judas Iscariot (who was a thief according to the Gospel texts (John 12:6) and who led to Christ's arrest (Luke 22:3, etc.)) was one of the close Apostles of Christ. Why was the writer not one of the twelve Apostles, even though Peter was thinking about him more than anything at the time of Christ's ascension to heaven, i.e., how he would bear the separation from Christ (peace be upon him)?

Furthermore, why do the three Gospels mention everything that happened in Christ's life, both small and great, except the name of the beloved disciple "John the Elder"? If there was a person named "John the Elder," why did the writers of the four Gospels not clearly distinguish between "John son of Zebedee" the Apostle and "John the Elder," so that there would be no ambiguity, confusion, or mixing of their identities, just as they distinguished between the identities of James son of Zebedee and James son of Alphaeus, and between the identities of Judas son of James and

Judas Iscariot, to avoid suspicion and confusion between them?
(117)

Moreover, if there was a person named "John the Elder" who was Christ's beloved disciple, where did he disappear after Christ's ascension to heaven? Why was his name absent from the Gospels, which mention the news of all the outstanding disciples of Christ in detail and accuracy? Did he die immediately after Christ's ascent to heaven? This is impossible, as the Gospel of John was written a long time after Christ's ascent to heaven. As mentioned in this Fourth Gospel, the writer of this Gospel will not die until the Resurrection (John 21:23). Those who believe that John the Elder was a different person from John's son of Zebedee say that John the Elder lived a long time after the death of Jesus (peace be upon him).

The claim that there was a person named "John the Elder" is baseless, and many Christian investigators believe that the sentence mentioned at the end of the Gospel of John, which is: "This is the disciple who testifies to these things and who wrote them down. We know that his testimony is true." (John 21:24) is not by the writer of the Gospel of John but was added by someone later. Even the renowned Gospel commentator Westcott, who was known for his methodological caution and precise referencing, also writes here: "It seems that in reality, the two verses were in the margin and were later added to the Gospel before printing, because this testimony is not for the one who wrote this Gospel. It is most likely that the great men of Ephesus are the ones who added these two verses to the Gospel." This is the clear result of a comparative study between verse 24 and verse 19:35. It cannot be said based on these two verses that their writer was a disciple of Jesus (peace be upon him). This view was supported by the famous author Bishop

Gore, and therefore these two verses were removed from some copies of the Fourth Gospel.

It is proven from these excerpts that the writer of the Fourth Gospel is neither John's son of Zebedee the Apostle nor a known disciple of Christ, but rather a person who lived a long time after the era of the Apostles and learned from Paul or his disciples. As Westcott said: "The great Christian clergy of 'Ephesus' added sentences to this Gospel to attribute it to John the Apostle, to indicate that his testimony was an eyewitness account, in order to argue against the Gnostic sect which did not believe that Christ was the worshipped God." Thus, the undeniable truth emerged in the scientific world that operations of change and alteration in the Holy Scriptures were continuous during the debates of the various sects at that time. The Christian investigator Professor B.H. Streeter writes with complete clarity in his scientific book, *The Four Gospels*:

If we find a new addition in the text of the Fourth Gospel, clearly indicating its writer, and it has been acknowledged that this addition is not from the writer, then should it not be inferred that this addition was inserted later, and perhaps other similar additions were inserted in other places in this Gospel, with the intention of making those who denied a certain point mentioned therein accept it? We will mention that disputed point that concerned Christians in the second century shortly.

Considering this clear statement, we understand that the sentence: "This is the disciple who wrote it" (this Gospel) was an attempt to resolve a disputed issue, and it also proves that there were differences and doubts among Christians regarding the correctness of the attribution of this book to its writer in that early period. (118)

It is not unlikely that the Gospel of John and his Epistles were written by one of Paul's disciples, and those who came after him added sentences to indicate that the writer was an eyewitness to Christ.

It can be said, in good faith regarding this Gospel, that "The writer of this Fourth Gospel is John the Elder, but he was not one of Jesus's disciples (peace be upon him), but rather one of his disciples" - as Dr. Bacon believes. (119)

However, Papias made John the Elder a disciple of Christ, and Polycarp said about him that he was a person who saw Christ and knew Him (John 1:2). But all he gained from Christ was sight; he may have been 12 years old at the time, brought by his parents to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Passover. It is possible that he was part of the crowd that witnessed the crucifixion... He may have been 77 years old in 95 CE. There is no doubt that the First Epistle of John was written by an old man, who could use the words "my brethren" and then "my children" when addressing others (John 13:33, 1 John 2:1, 18), because the word "my children" is usually used only by someone who is at least seventy years old. Therefore, there is no difficulty in accepting that John the Elder wrote this Gospel (the Fourth) between 90 CE and 95 CE, having surpassed seventy years of age at that time. (120)

We conclude the following from the statement of Polycarp:

1. The writer of the Gospel of John is not John's son of Zebedee the Apostle, but rather John the Elder.
2. John the Elder was not one of the Apostles of Jesus (peace be upon him).

3. John the Elder saw Jesus (peace be upon him) only once, when he was 12 years old, and therefore did not have the opportunity to benefit from Christ's teachings (peace be upon him).
4. John the Elder saw Jesus (peace be upon him) for the last time during the crucifixion.
5. John the Elder was not a resident of Jerusalem, but rather a resident of the southern regions of the land of Canaan.
6. Nothing is known about him after Christ until 95 CE: Where did he live? From whom did he learn? Who was his companion? What was his connection to the Apostles?
7. He wrote the Gospel of John around 95 CE, at which time he was approximately 77 years old. He mentioned the doctrine of Incarnation and Anthropomorphism for the first time.
8. Then the men of Ephesus added a sentence to that Gospel indicating that the writer of this Gospel was John's son of Zebedee or another disciple beloved by Christ.
9. However, his name is not listed in the list of the twelve Apostles.

These results are not derived from our words but rather inferred from the statements of Christian scholars who attempted to prove that the Gospel of John is not forged.

Considering these results, the following is proven:

1. The doctrine of Incarnation is not established by Christ (peace be upon him) nor by the Apostles.
2. This doctrine was first written within the biography of Christ by a person who saw Christ at the age of 12 but did not learn anything from him.
3. The person who introduced this doctrine is unknown and his news is cut off, meaning nothing is known about his nature, morals, or belief, other than these writings. Was it he who invented

this doctrine, or did he hear it from someone else? Where did he live? What was his connection to the Apostles?

4. When he introduced this doctrine into the Gospel in 95 CE, he was 77 years old, meaning 28 years after the death of Paul (who died in 67 CE, according to historians' estimation).

This means that Paul had died before the writing of this Gospel, and that Paul mentioned the doctrine of Incarnation and Anthropomorphism in his Epistles with complete clarity. It is established that the one who first mentioned this doctrine was Paul, and not John the Elder.

Therefore, the French Encyclopedia contains a complete proof in these words: The entirety of the Gospel of John was authored by Paul, who attributed it to John the Apostle. (121)

7. Gospel of Barnabas and Crucifixion of Christ

Christians only recognize the four Gospels we mentioned, namely: (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John), and all Christian sects accept and adopt them.

However, history tells us that in ancient times there were other Gospels that were adopted by older sects and were popular among them, with each sect only embracing its own Gospel, which differed from the others. The number of Gospels became exceedingly large, and Christian historians agree on this. The Church then decided in the early fourth century CE to preserve the true Gospels, so they claimed (the reality is that they rejected all Gospels and Epistles that conflicted with the doctrine of the Trinity) - and thus selected these four Gospels from all the Gospels that were prevalent at that time.

Among the books of the New Testament that the churches do not recognize are more than seventy Gospels and Epistles

attributed to Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon them), the Apostles, and their followers... such as:

1. The Gospel of the Nativity of Mary and the Infancy of Christ..., of which a copy was printed in 1832 CE and is preserved in the National Library in Paris.
2. The Gospel of Thomas the Israelite..., found by the scholar Costlier, of which two differing copies exist, one in Paris and the other in the Vienna Library.
3. The Gospel of James the Less..., found by Guillaume Postel, and printed by him in Basel, Switzerland, in 1552 CE, then printed in Strasbourg, Germany, in 1570 CE. Then the scholar Neander printed it in a form that differed from Guillaume.
4. The Gospel of Nicodemus..., which was accepted and widespread throughout Europe until the fifteenth century and was printed in England seven times in 25 years between 1507 and 1532 CE and translated into Italian and German numerous times.
5. The Gospel of the Infancy, considered the Fifth Gospel, attributed to Peter the Apostle and written in Greek. Henry Sike found an Arabic copy of it in the seventeenth century and published it in Europe.
6. The Gospel of the Seventy, attributed to his disciples.
7. The Gospel of Marcion, adopted by the Marcionite sect, which is like the Gospel of Luke.
8. The Gospel of the Ebionites.
9. The Gospel of the Hebrews.
10. The Gospel of the Gnostics (Script readers).
11. The Gospel of James, thought to have been written in the second century.
12. The Gospel of the Egyptians.
13. The Gospel of the Reminder.

14. The Gospel of Cerinthus.
15. The Gospel of Barnabas, which is the one currently in our hands, and many others. (122)

As for the Gospel of Barnabas, it was found in the library of a European prince and is attributed to Saint Barnabas, one of the disciples of Christ (peace be upon him). It was discovered by a Christian monk, Father Fra Marino, in a purely Christian environment far from Islam and Muslim countries—the library of Pope Sixtus V at the end of the sixteenth century CE. This Gospel agrees with the Holy Qur'an in affirming the Oneness of God and the denial of the crucifixion of Christ, and that he was a prophet who prophesied the coming of Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him). Christian churches generally do not recognize this Gospel, claiming it is a forgery, even though it is mentioned in books from the second and third centuries CE, meaning it was written and existing hundreds of years before the appearance of the Prophet of Islam (peace and blessings be upon him).

It is said that it was a canonical book for the Church of Alexandria since the earliest Christian ages, where the doctrine of Monotheism was the dominant and prevalent belief in Christianity. This situation continued until the convening of the Council of Nicaea, which was called for by the Roman Emperor Constantine in 325 CE, where the doctrine of the Trinity was imposed and the doctrine of Monotheism was abolished. The Church prohibited the Gospel of Barnabas; among other books it deemed to be contrary to the Trinitarian doctrine.

If we look back at history, we find that Gelasius I, who ascended the papal throne in 492 CE, issued a decree listing the names of books forbidden to be read, and among them was the "Gospel of Barnabas." This decree was also issued at the end of the

fifth century, i.e., before the appearance of the Prophet of Islam Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him), and even about a century before his birth (peace and blessings be upon him).

This publication was referenced by two Christian scholars:

1. Khouri Ni'mat Allah from Lebanon in the last page of his book: (The Treasure of Minds), printed in Beirut at the Catholic Press in 1882 CE.
2. Jurji Zaydan, the owner of Al-Hilal magazine, also mentioned the time of the aforementioned prohibition at the beginning of the tenth issue of the fifteenth year of this monthly magazine, after saying: "Scholars of the Bible believe that it - meaning the Gospel of Barnabas - is an artificial fabrication composed by some Christian heretics in the early centuries of the CE, or corrupted from its original, because it contradicts the other Gospels on some important issues." End of quote in his own words. (123)

Now, who was Barnabas? The Book of Acts in the New Testament testifies to the following:

First: Barnabas was one of the Apostles testified to for his sincerity in the Christian call.

Second: He was the one who originally testified to Paul's faith after the disciples and Apostles of Christ feared him.

Third: He was a good man, full of the Holy Spirit and faith, so much so that the Holy Spirit distinguished him with His care among the Apostles and teachers.

As a result of the above, we see that since Barnabas held such importance among the disciples and Apostles, he must have

had codified teachings, which supports the attribution of this Gospel to him.

Fourth: As for the belief of the Bible scholars that the Gospel of Barnabas is an artificial fabrication, this belief is not based on any sound foundation. Furthermore, historical facts confirm that what was disputed was what the Council of Nicaea affirmed in 325 CE - namely, the books that contradicted the doctrine of Monotheism were fabricated to align with the doctrine of the Trinity, the doctrine that the aforementioned Council affirmed after expelling the advocates of the doctrine of Monotheism, who were the majority at the Council.

Sheikh Muhammad Abu Zahra comments on this by saying: The copy of the Gospel of Barnabas that was found was discovered in a purely Christian environment, so there is no suspicion that it was fabricated or inserted against them, for the following reasons:

1. The first one to find it in his library was a high-ranking religious leader (Pope Sixtus V).
2. The one who discovered it was a Christian monk (Father Fra Marino).
3. When it circulated among the hands, it was transferred to a Christian counselor of the King of Prussia.
4. It then devolved to the Royal Court in Vienna, which was the court of a Christian royal family that held the throne of Austria.

It is also ruled out that Muslims had any hand in its creation. It is attributed to one of the Saints whom Christians acknowledge for his sincerity to the call of Christ (peace be upon him), and no one else of this name is known to have his religious status. Furthermore, the existence of a Gospel by him was a known

matter among Christian clergymen, as evidenced by the fact that Father Fra Marino, who discovered it, mentions his own astonishment at the Gospel of Saint Barnabas.

This (Irenaeus) is the disciple of Polycarp... and Polycarp is the disciple of Saint John, one of Christ's disciples and Apostles. (124)

Sheikh Abu Zahra continues by saying: Based on the previous statements, the view that attributes that Gospel to Saint Barnabas is highly probable, especially since the existence of a Gospel by Barnabas was known centuries before its discovery.

From the language of this Gospel, it is evident that its author had a complete familiarity with the Torah, a knowledge not possessed by the non-specialist Christian in religious sciences. Moreover, Barnabas was one of the earliest proponents who worked in the Christian mission in a manner no less significant than Paul's work, according to the Book of Acts, so he must have had at least a message or a Gospel.

It is also evident from the foregoing that this Gospel was not known to Muslims, neither in their past nor present, because debates and arguments between them and the Christians were ongoing in all eras, and no Muslim is known to have used the Gospel of Barnabas to argue with a Christian, despite it containing the crushing evidence that would grant the Muslim victory over the Christian. (125)

We take a well-known stance regarding this Gospel and other scriptures in the hands of Christians. Almighty God informed us that the People of the Book altered and changed their books, so that the truth became mixed with falsehood, and sincerity with lies. The Muslim position on them is as follows: (126)

1. We affirm what is in accordance with the Qur'an and the Sunnah, because this agreement is proof that the corresponding part has not been affected by alteration or change.
2. We reject what is found in their books that contradicts the Qur'an and the Sunnah, because this contradiction is proof that their hands have tampered with and altered it.
3. As for what our Sharia (Law) neither affirms nor rejects, and which might be true or false, it is addressed by the Hadith in Sahih al-Bukhari on the authority of Abu Hurayrah, who said: The People of the Book used to read the Torah in Hebrew and interpret it for the Muslims. The Messenger of God (peace and blessings be upon him) said:

"Do not affirm the People of the Book, nor deny them, but say: 'We believe in God, and what has been sent down to us, and what has been sent down to you; our God and your God is One, and to Him we submit.'" (127)

The wisdom behind the prohibition of affirming or denying this class of their reports was made clear by the Hadith of Abu Namlah al-Ansari on the authority of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him), which states:

"When the People of the Book tell you something, do not affirm it, nor deny it, but say: 'We believe in God, His Books, and His Messengers.' For if it was true, you would not have denied it, and if it was false, you would not have affirmed it." (128)

Barnabas's Testimony Against the Crucifixion

Barnabas testified to the falsity of the crucifixion doctrine. He was one of the Apostles and is known among Christians as "Son of Encouragement" (Barnabas means "Son of Consolation" or "Encouragement" in Aramaic, cf. Acts 4:36), and his name was

Joseph. He used to preach to the people and denied the incident of crucifixion. His Gospel states that Christ was raised and was not crucified. He says:

"When the soldiers approached Judas in the place where Jesus was, and God saw the danger to His servant, He commanded Gabriel, Michael, Raphael, and Uriel, His ambassadors, to take Jesus from the world. The holy angels came and took Jesus from the window overlooking the south." (Gospel of Barnabas / 215: 1-5)

He also says:

"Judas entered violently into the room from which Jesus had been ascended. The disciples were all sleeping. Then the wondrous God performed a wondrous deed, and Judas was changed in speech and face, becoming so similar to Jesus that we believed he was Jesus." (Barnabas / 216: 1-9)

There is much other evidence - besides what we have mentioned - in this Gospel that conclusively proves that the one who was crucified was not Christ, but another person named Judas, while Christ was raised up to God, and this is what is mentioned in the Holy Qur'an.

Chapter Six:

Paul and His Role in Distorting Christianity

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

1. Paul and his role in distorting Christianity

Paul was called Saul before his conversion, as mentioned in the Book of Acts: "Now Saul was attacking the church" (Acts 4:8). "Now Saul was constantly breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord" (Acts 1:9).

The Book of Acts contains extensive information about Paul, including his birth, citizenship, religion, and other details of his life. However, a review of the texts related to Paul reveals contradictions and inconsistencies. At one point, it states that he was born in Tarsus of Jewish parents, where he says of himself: (I am verily a man which am a Jew, born in Tarsus, a city in Cilicia, yet brought up in this city) (Ac 22:3) - meaning Jerusalem. In another place, he is mentioned as a Pharisee, and in yet another chapter, he explicitly states that he is a Roman. Charles Guignebert comments on Saul (Paul), stating: "Thus we can find an explanation for the matter that concerns us most directly: Paul's knowledge of the primary principles of Stoic philosophy and the popular methods of Greek rhetorical styles among Greek thinkers. It was sufficient for him that he spent his youth in this environment saturated with the Greek heritage under the tutelage of these philosophy professors who combined philosophical thought with rhetorical style." (129)

Therefore, Paul's pre-conversion name was Saul, and he was from Tarsus. He was a Jew who later adopted Christianity. He described himself sometimes as a Pharisee and at other times as a Roman. Furthermore, he was intellectually influenced by Stoic philosophy - as we shall discuss.

A. Paul's Intense Hostility Towards Christians

Paul was one of the fiercest enemies of Christianity, as stated in the Book of Acts, in which Luke devoted a large part to talking about Paul. It contains detailed statements that show that he was extremely hostile and antagonistic to Christianity, and that he severely tortured and abused its followers and converts. Among what was stated therein: "Now Saul was still breathing threats and murder against the disciples of the Lord. So he went to the high priest and asked him for letters to Damascus to the synagogues, so that if he found any of the Way, men or women, he might bring them bound to Jerusalem." (Acts 9:1-2).

In the eighth chapter: (And at that time there was a great persecution against the church which was at Jerusalem; and they were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judaea and Samaria, except the apostles. And devout men carried Stephen to his burial and made great lamentation over him. As for Saul, he made havoc of the church, entering every house, and haling men and women committed them to prison) (Ac 8:1-3).

Paul himself cries out in his Epistle to the Galatians: (For ye have heard of my conversation in time past in the Jews' religion, how that beyond measure I persecuted the church of God, and wasted it: and profited in the Jews' religion above many my equals in mine own nation, being more exceedingly zealous of the traditions of my fathers). (Galatians 1:13-14).

Paul was thus a sworn enemy of Christ's followers, inflicting upon them the severest forms of persecution and torture, as attested by their own Holy Book and by Paul's own confession. Further confirmation is that Christ's followers remained suspicious of him even after his declared conversion, due to their knowledge of his enmity towards them. In the Book of Acts: (And when Saul

had come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself in the disciples: but they were all afraid of him and believed not that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way). (Ac 9:26-27).

This is Paul, the Apostle of Christians and the Apostle of Jihad, as Pastor Habib Said calls him - this is Paul, the deceptive, cunning hypocrite who adapted his color to every person to effectively disseminate his atheistic Jewish thought.

Charles Guignebert says of Paul: "We must note here that Paul never met Jesus during His lifetime; therefore, his contemplations about the personality and teachings of the Master were not confined by the horizons of memory and reality, as was the case with the twelve Apostles who initiated the call." (130)

Zaki Shanouda says of Paul: "He was not one of the twelve or one of the seventy disciples." (History of the Copts, Vol. 1, p. 76)

The Gospels accepted by Christians mention nothing about Paul, his meeting with Christ, or any of His disciples. Nothing is mentioned in the other books except what Luke narrated in the Book of Facts concerning the incident that transformed him from his initial state of hostility towards Christianity and its adherents into the preacher and evangelist of Christ's teachings.

Luke says: *(And Saul yet breathing out threatening and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, went unto the high priest, and desired 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 persecutes thou me? And he said, "Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecute: ... And he trembling said, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do? And the Lord said to him, Arise, and went into the city, and it shall be told there what thou must do. And the men which journeyed with him stood speechless, hearing a voice, but seeing no man. And Saul arose from the earth; and when his eyes were opened, he saw no man: but they led him by the hand and brought him into Damascus. And he was three days without three days, and neither did he eat nor drink.) (Ac 9:1-9)

In the same book, Paul narrates what happened to him, saying: (And it came to pass, that, as I made my journey, came night unto Damascus about noon, suddenly there shone from heaven a great light round about me. And I fell onto the ground, and heard a voice saying to me, Saul, Saul, why persecutes thou me? And I answered, Who art thou, Lord? And he said unto me, I am Jesus of Nazareth, whom thou persecute. And they that were with me saw the light and were afraid; but they didn't hear his voice. And I said, what shall I do, Lord? And the Lord said to me, Arise, and went into Damascus; and there it shall have told thee of all things which are arranged for thee to do. And when I could not see for the glory of that light, being led by the hands of them that were with me, I came into Damascus.) (Ac 22:6-11)

Paul also speaks of it, saying: (Whereupon as I went to Damascus with authority and commission from the chief priests, at midday, O king, I saw in the way a light from heaven, above the brightness of the sun, shining round about me and them which journeyed with me. And when we were all fallen to the earth, I

heard a voice speaking unto me, and saying in the Hebrew tongue, Saul, Saul, why persecutes thou me? it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks. And I said, "Who art thou, Lord? And he said, I am Jesus whom thou persecute. 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). (Ac 26:12-17)

These three accounts are contradictory. In the first account, the travelers with Paul heard the voice but did not see the light, stood speechless, and were not blinded like him. In the second account, the travelers with Paul did not hear the voice but saw the light, were afraid, yet were not blinded like him. In the third, the travelers all fell to the ground when surprised by the light, but Paul immediately received the message, along with a promise to be delivered from the Jewish people and the Gentiles to whom he was sent, so they would not destroy him.

These three accounts contradict each other. In the first, we find that the travelers with Paul heard the voice but did not see the light, and they stood silent, yet they were not blinded like him. In the second, we find that the travelers with Paul did not hear the voice but saw the light, and they were terrified, yet they were not blinded like him. In the third, we find that the travelers fell to the ground when they were surprised by the light, while Paul received the message immediately, along with a promise that he would be saved from the Jewish people and the Gentiles to whom he was sent, and that they would not destroy him.

If Ananias had received anything regarding what happened, the vision would have referred to it, especially since the vision mentioned matters of lesser importance.

The story of Paul's entry into Christianity is questionable and unreliable due to the many contradictions and fabricated narratives it contains.

Paul was harassing Christ's followers, entering houses, dragging men and women, and sending them to prison. By what authority was Paul doing this, if not by a measure undertaken by himself? What he was doing could only be carried out by an official employee executing the instructions of the higher authority. Paul acting in the name of the High Priest also provides evidence of the contradiction in the New Testament sources about Saul, as he describes himself as a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee, while the High Priest was one of the Sadducees. There was always intense enmity between the Pharisees and the Sadducees. The Pharisees were one of the ancient Jewish sects. The word is Aramaic, meaning 'the separated one.' They were one of the three main Jewish factions opposing the latter two, the Sadducees and the Essenes, and were the most narrow-minded in opinion and doctrine: (Dictionary of the Bible, p. 674). In the ninth chapter of Acts, it states that Paul was breathing out threats and slaughter against the disciples of the Lord, and he requested letters from the High Priest to the Jewish communities in Damascus to be authorized to bring bound to Jerusalem any people he found who followed the new religion.

If Saul had the power to raid Christians, what was the necessity of going to Damascus? He had official authority; he was appointed by the High Priest to raid Christians. He was merely an agent for the Jews and a spy for the High Priest.

B. Paul's Personality

What helped Paul disseminate his ideas, gain the trust of Christians, and have his vision believed were the qualities he possessed, including cunning, deception, and shrewdness. He adapted his color to suit and agree with every person.

Paul claims to some that he is a Jew, to others that he is a Pharisee, and to still others that he is a Roman. He accommodated both the pagan and the non-pagan to win them all. (1 Corinthians 9:20-22).

C. Paul and the Disciples of Christ

When Paul announced his conversion and became a follower of Christ, no one believed him due to the persecution and torture he had inflicted upon them. No one defended him except Barnabas, who introduced him to the disciples of Christ: (And when Saul had come to Jerusalem, he assayed to join himself to the disciples: but they were all afraid of him and believed not that he was a disciple. But Barnabas took him, and brought him to the apostles, and declared unto them how he had seen the Lord in the way, and that he had spoken to him, and how he had preached boldly at Damascus in the name of Jesus.) (Ac 9:26-28)

Moreover, Paul did not go up to Jerusalem to meet Christ's disciples until three years after his conversion, where he met Peter and stayed with him for fifteen days. (Galatians 1:18)

Undeniably, his meeting secretly and alone with the influential figures to present his new principles before broadcasting them to the Gentiles is evidence that the new principles were completely different from the principles for which Christ Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon him) came. Otherwise, why the secrecy? Why isolation? And why the private meetings? Especially

when Christ son of Mary said that he spoke to people openly and clearly? (131)

One who was sincerely devoted to Paul was Luke. He was a companion to Paul, served him, and placed him in the position of Christ. The Book of Acts, attributed to Luke, is nothing but a vehicle for Paul's teachings and praise of Paul. Paul himself called Luke (the beloved physician). (Colossians 4:14).

Thus, Paul and Luke exchanged praise and benefit. Luke was placed in the front rank, becoming one of the Gospel writers, even though he and his master never saw Jesus. He became a beloved physician. Luke rewarded his master with his hospitality by becoming the best proponent of Paul's ideas. (132)

Luke accompanied him on most of his missionary journeys. Luke composed two books that complete each other: in the first, he recorded what he knew of the life and teachings of Jesus, and in the second, he recorded some aspects of the Church's life, focusing on the contribution of his mentor Paul in this important historical phase, in the book known as the Acts of the Apostles. (133)

As for Barnabas (who introduced Paul to Christ's followers), he was the one sent by Christ's disciples as their representative to teach others what Christ brought. He also accompanied Paul on many of his missionary journeys. However, Paul soon quarreled with him, and they separated after it became clear that each had his own views on Christian teachings and their propagation.

It is stated in the Book of Acts: (And the contention was so sharp between them, that they departed asunder one from the other: and so, Barnabas took Mark and sailed unto Cyprus; And Paul chose Silas, and departed, being recommended by the brethren

unto the grace of God. And he went through Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches). (Ac 15:39-41).

Paul met Peter after three years and met James after fourteen years. Then he accompanied Barnabas on his missionary journeys, along with Mark (John), and soon parted ways with each of them. Only Luke remained faithful to his teachings, as he stated them in his Gospel and the Book of Acts.

Paul never saw Christ nor heard a single word from Him, yet he claims a direct connection with Christ - the connection by which he entered Christianity and infused its teachings into his soul.

If Paul did not meet Christ, did not receive teachings from Him, and only met His disciples after three years before quickly parting ways with those he knew, from whom did Paul receive the teachings he disseminated everywhere, attributing them to Christ?

Paul did not propagate Christ's true teachings - which called for the pure Monotheism of God, Lord of the Worlds, and advocated for asceticism, forgiveness, and was restricted to the call of the Children of Israel. Instead, he spread his atheistic thought which he held, derived from the culture he absorbed while he was a sworn enemy of Christianity. He exploited his conversion to spread this atheism. Indeed, this was the primary reason the disciples of Christ distanced themselves from him, and why Barnabas and Mark cut short their missionary journeys with him, having become aware of the truth of what he was calling for, which was in opposition to what Christ (peace be upon him) had taught and what the disciples knew.

Will Durant says of Paul: "His father was a Pharisee, and his son was raised on the principles of this fervent religious sect." (134)

D. Paul's Distortion of Christian Doctrine

Undoubtedly, the true Christianity brought by Jesus (peace be upon him) advocated for the pure Monotheism of God, Lord of the Worlds, and belief in all legislative and ethical matters that came from God Almighty - just like any religion brought by any messenger from God Almighty.

Christ's teachings remained followed during his time and after him until Paul entered Christianity. He then corrupted what Christ brought, deleted some parts, and added others until the features of the religion changed in all its doctrinal, legislative, and ethical aspects.

In the realm of dogma, Paul called for the divinity and sonship of Jesus and advocated the doctrines of Crucifixion, Salvation, and Redemption - calling for what Christ never called for. The epistles he wrote included this dogma. Furthermore, the Gospel writers were influenced by these Pauline teachings and expressed the same things Paul did. Paul sometimes mentions Christ as God: (Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever. Amen.) (Romans 9:5). At other times, he equates him with the Father, saying: (Grace to you and peace from God our Father, and the Lord Jesus Christ) (Romans 1:7). He mentions him within the Holy Trinity held by Christians: (The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.) (1 Corinthians 13:14).

He mentions Christ's existence before time: (And did all drink the same spiritual drink: for they drank of that spiritual Rock that followed them: and that Rock was Christ). (1 Corinthians

10:4). (But when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons.) (Galatians 4:4-5).

Paul also mentions that Christ had a role in the creation of things in the heavens and on earth, for whom and through whom they were created: (But to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we in him; and one Lord Jesus Christ, by whom are all things, and we by him.) (1 Corinthians 8:6). (Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: And he is before all things, and by him all things consist.) (Colossians 1:15-17).

Paul thus sometimes mentions Christ as God, sometimes as the Son of God, sometimes within the Trinity, and at other times as the Creator of all things. This indicates a disturbed and inconsistent view of Christ (peace be upon him).

Although the books of both the Old and New Testaments speak of the faithful being "sons of God" in the sense of love and care from God for His creation, not in the sense intended by Paul, Paul's designation of Christ as the Son of God is - as Hunter says - unprecedented. It is something completely different from the language of the Old Testament, the Gospel, and the Epistles of the disciples because it is based on the eternal divinity of Christ.

Paul is the first advocate of the divinity of Christ, a true divinity, not a metaphorical one, but what is the motive behind this?

We previously discussed the intense enmity between Paul and the followers of Christ, how he used every means to destroy Christ's religion, and how Paul hid under his declared adoption of Christianity to demolish it from within. Among the motives that drove Paul to declare this dogma was the pagan culture he was raised in, a culture in which the idea of a single God, the Creator of the universe, did not appear, as Paul's thought was a mixture of various ideas.

Consequently, Paul began to teach and preach a new Christianity derived from the doctrines of Hindus, Buddhists, and Greeks, and some Jewish teachings. He introduced for the first time the idea of the Trinity and the idea that Christ is the Son of God, that he came down to sacrifice himself as an atonement for human sins, and that he ascended to sit at the right hand of his father to judge and condemn humanity. (135)

Christians admit that Paul introduced elements into the theology that were not originally part of it. Habib Saeed says: (It is undeniable that "Paul" introduced much into Christian theology from Judaism and Greek experiments.) (136)

2. Paul and Doctrine of Crucifixion and Redemption

Paul was the first to call for the doctrine of Crucifixion and Redemption (Atonement), which was unknown to the Christians, the followers of Christ (peace be upon him). Rather, it was known among the pagans, known as the doctrine of the "Savior Gods." This pagan culture influenced Paul's thought, leading him to adopt the idea of shedding Christ's blood as an expiation for human sins. He promoted this in his epistles, the oldest of which was not written until more than fifteen years after Christ's ascent (peace be upon him). The crucifixion and the shedding of blood were what Paul resolved to know nothing else of Christianity, crying out: (For

I determined not to know anything among you, save Jesus Christ, and him crucified.) (1 Colossians 2:3)

He says: (Moreover, brethren, I declare unto you the gospel which I preached unto you, which also ye have received, and wherein ye stand... For I delivered unto you first that which I also received, how that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures). (1 Corinthians 15:1, 3).

Paul justifies his belief that Christ was crucified as atonement for the sins of mankind with a flimsy excuse, claiming that there is no righteousness or justice in the divine law (for if there were righteousness in the law, then Christ died for nothing). (Galatians 2:21)

Paul's teachings regarding dogma are false teachings emanating from a spiteful, misguided, and deluded heart, ignorant of his own reality before being ignorant of the reality of God.

In fact, the problem of (the Word) or (the Son) has a long history predating the rise of Christianity, extending from Heraclitus to Christianity.

Heraclitus's intention with the Word (Logos) was the rational power diffused throughout the universe. The visible world is merely a symbolic, manifest aspect behind which the other half of the universe's reality is hidden. This reality is the Holy Spirit of the world, manifested in the endless cycle of life and death and in the continuous change in the phenomena of the universe. The Logos dominates everything, sufficient to explain everything. It is the order of the world and the hidden harmony in existence. (137)

The term was used with a similar meaning under the name of Nous (Mind) in the philosophy of Anaxagoras.

The idea developed in Stoic philosophy, where they referred to the universal mind that governs the universe. They distinguished between the latent (or potential) mind and the manifest (or actual) mind that is revealed in beings. This distinction had an impact on both Jewish and Christian philosophies, in that the Logos in Stoic philosophy is nothing but the inner thought that makes its way outward through the Word. Both the Jewish Philo and the Christian Fathers used the Word with the same distinction between wisdom or knowledge and the Word or utterance. Philo described it in several ways, calling it: the mediator between God and the world - the being who created Adam in His image - the truth of truths. The Jewish theological inquiry into the Word was not merely an extension of the inquiry into the issues of Greek philosophy, as the utterance was mentioned in the Torah in a way that signifies the word of God by which the world was made. The Jews referred to it under the name (Memra), from which, according to the Old Testament, the ideas of creation, revelation, and providence were derived. In Philo's reconciliation of religion and philosophy - and Greek philosophy in many of its features is materialistic, just as the Greek spirit is a spirit of embodiment and personification. Philo described her as the eldest son of wisdom, the first man, and the first of the angels, but this was more of a poetic metaphor than a true, doctrinal statement consistent with Jewish theology.

In Philo's harmonization between religion and philosophy (and Greek philosophy, in many of its features, is materialistic, and the Greek spirit is one of Corporealism and personification), he described the Word as the Eldest Son of Wisdom, the First Man, and the First of the Angels. However, this was more of a metaphorical, poetic statement from him than a real, systematic, doctrinal one, consistent with Jewish theology.

Then the (Logos) became the First Son of God, His image, the spirit pervading the world, the intermediary in the creation of the world, and the Word became personified in the image of Christ through the son, by the son and in the son everything appeared. He is the first of created things in the fourth of Paul's epistles. The Word in the Gospel of John almost agrees with what Philo mentioned about it, except that John means by the Word the Second Hypostasis or Christ, while Philo uses it generally, not confining its meaning to a specific person, nor imagining it incarnated in a human of flesh and blood. However, Philo's conception of the Logos was common among the Gospel writers. (138)

In conclusion, Paul remained in this state, traveling to countries and spreading his teachings, by which he corrupted and changed the religion of Christ (peace be upon him), until he was killed during the reign of Nero in Rome in 64 AD. (139)

Paul faced opposition during his journeys from the Jews who knew that what he was advocating contradicted the law of the Torah brought by Moses (peace be upon him) and followed by Jesus after him... But with the passage of time and succeeding generations, this false ideology prevailed and became the religion professed by Christians. Divine laws began to change, replaced by earthly laws, and truths began to recede, opening the way for illusions. Thus, Christianity gradually moved further away from the great heavenly religion brought by the Messiah (peace be upon him) from the All-Merciful.

Pastor Paul Elias Al-Yasu'i says: "The Church inoculated the pagan thought with Christian thought. Its missionaries carried the wisdom of the Torah and the manners of the Gospel to the Greeks, and in return, they took from them the clarity of

expression and the precision of thinking. This cross-pollination resulted in a new heritage that they transferred to Rome. The Church respected the traditions of the peoples and preserved the diversity of rituals among different denominations; it did not impose a unified formula for prayer." (140)

But how did these individuals grant themselves the right to permit and prohibit in God's Law? This right belongs to God Almighty alone and by His command. However, they justify departing from Christ's teachings by claiming that the disciples' permission of these forbidden matters was by the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Peter explicitly states this: (And when there had been much disputing, Peter rose up, and said unto them, Men and brethren, ye know how that a good while ago God made choice among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should hear the word of the gospel, and believe. And God, which knoweth the hearts, bare them witness, giving them the Holy Ghost, even as he did unto us) (Ac 15:7-8).

3. Statements by Christian Writers about Paul

Statement by William Paton: "The first disciples did not at first grasp that the narrow Jewish boundaries had been abolished, but the genius of the Apostle Paul realized the manifoldness of the message in this respect and knew that it was for the Jew and the Gentile, the Barbarian and the Greek, male and female alike, without differentiation or distinction. It is clear to anyone who reads Paul's epistles that Paul did not cite a single piece of evidence or a single word attributed to Jesus about the universality of Christianity. Rather, his argumentation for this universality came from his own speech and the products of his own thoughts, just as was the case for arguing against the necessity of circumcision and many other teachings." (141)

Statement by Habib Saeed: "It is undeniable that 'Paul' introduced much into Christian theology from Judaism and Greek experiments. It is also undeniable that he was endowed with a sharp, acute foresight into the thought of Christ more than the rest of the early disciples. It can be said that 'Paul' the theologian depicts a picture of Christ that is qualitatively different from His image in the rest of the Gospels, but 'Paul' the Christian deserves great credit for laying the foundation stones of early Christianity." (142)

Statement by Muhammad Majdi Murjan: "Saint Paul, the Apostle of Christianity, speaks with utter frankness and clarity about his theory: he changes, adapts, and transforms with every tendency. He claims to the Jews that he is a Jew, to the pagans that he is a pagan, and to the atheists that he is an atheist. He represents to every group and every individual what is consistent with their desires and wishes - all to win everyone for Christianity, winning them in name, not indeed. Instead of changing them, he changes for them and even changes the heavenly teachings to satisfy them. The Gospels record incidents and situations in which Paul claimed sometimes to be a Jew, sometimes a Pharisee, and sometimes a Roman, and so on." (143)

Statement by Tolstoy (Russian writer and author): "To understand the true teaching of Jesus Christ as He understood it, one must search beyond those long, false interpretations and commentaries that have so distorted the face of Christian teaching that they have hidden it from sight under a thick layer of darkness. Our search goes back to the days of Paul, who did not understand Christ's teachings, but took them to a different way, then mixed them with many traditions of the Pharisees and the teachings of the Old Testament." (144)

Statement by Zaki Shanouda: "He was at first hostile to Christians, and he was called Saul until Jesus appeared to him... even though he was not one of the twelve or the seventy disciples."
(145)

Statement by H.G. Wells: "Paul began to bring to the minds of his disciples the idea that the status of Jesus was like that of Osiris: a Lord who died to be resurrected to grant people immortality... Paul began to bring people to his call, which was compatible with his environment and culture, until he abolished the religion of Christ and brought a new Christianity from himself."
(146)

These are the testimonies of Christian writers about Paul, whether from the West or the East - "a witness from his own people has testified" - and no further comment is needed after their testimony. They explicitly state that Paul transitioned the religion from Monotheism to a Trinitarian Paganism, which deified a human, and from a Divine religion to a terrestrial human one. They affirm how he changed and corrupted the dogma and law until Christianity became what it is today.

4. Constantine and His Role in Distorting Christianity

A momentous event occurred for Christianity that every historian must record and highlight: the ascension of Christianity to the throne of pagan Rome. This happened when Constantine, who embraced Christianity, sat on the throne of the emperors in 305 AD. In him, Christianity triumphed over Paganism, suddenly achieving a vast kingdom, an expansive state, and an uncontested word that it had never dared to dream of. Since Constantine only reached the throne over a bridge of the remains of Christians and rivers of their blood shed in defending and supporting him, he

acknowledged their favor, yielded to them, paved the way for them, and entrusted them with the keys to his kingdom.

However, the Christians were victorious on the battlefield but were defeated in the arena of religions. They gained a great kingdom but lost a noble religion, for Roman Paganism corrupted the religion of Christ and corrupted its followers. The one who corrupted and corrupted it most was Constantine the Great, the protector of Christianity and the raiser of its banner, as Drayer states:

"Paganism and polytheism entered Christianity under the influence of the hypocrites who assumed serious roles and high positions in the Roman state by professing Christianity, never caring about the religion and never being sincere to it for a day. Constantine was likewise; he spent his life in oppression and debauchery, adhering only minimally to the Church's religious commands late in his life.

Although the Christian community had grown strong enough to appoint Constantine as king, it could not completely eradicate paganism and uproot its core. The result of its struggle was that its principles became mixed, giving rise to a new religion in which Christianity and Paganism were blended equally.

This emperor, who was a slave to the world and whose religious beliefs were worthless, saw it in his own interest and the interest of the two competing parties - the Christian and the Pagan - to unite and reconcile them. Even the staunch Christians did not disapprove of this plan, perhaps believing that the new religion would flourish if it was obscured and inoculated with the old pagan beliefs." (147)

Thus, Christian beliefs evolved and changed after being inoculated with old pagan beliefs. Discussing dogma and its development prompts us to quickly dispel a misunderstanding that might arise.

That is, our (Islamic) dogma and acts of worship do not tolerate addition or subtraction, nor are they subject to development that advances or regresses them. There is no room for human thought to add anything of its own or to subtract anything by its effort. The principles of faith and the pillars of worship are (fixed), having come from the Lord of the Worlds, glory be to Him. They have remained to this day just as they were when they came. Regarding Islamic dogma, no one has claimed that its truths have changed in the slightest degree in this century compared to what they were in the first century.

The Qur'an, which was (recorded) during the time of the Messenger (peace and blessings be upon him), is the sole source of dogma and the locus of certainty. The Qur'anic method of establishing dogma is characterized by absolute clarity, is consistent with the self-evidence of reason, and is immune to contradictions and ambiguities. (148)

Conclusion

Following these extensive studies and discussions, we conclude: In the first chapter, we mentioned the theories of the ancient Greek philosophers regarding the conception of God and His divinity. The spirituality of Socrates's sublime thought was too elevated for the flawed thinking of the common people. So, he could not agree with idol worship, and his belief in Monotheism appeared, purified from any trace of Corporealism or similitude. As Maulana Abul Kalam Azad mentions that Socrates was accused of not adhering to the common religion of the people in Greece, but the spirit of his high thought did not surrender to the narrow, limited thinking of his time, so he drank the cup of poison with patience and steadfastness, neither hesitating nor submitting to falsehood. His last words now of death were: "He departs from this vile world to a higher realm."

Plato then recorded Socrates's wise philosophical research under the name (Dialogue). He presented them as complete principles, organized in the form of universals and comprehensive fundamentals through his logical analyses, having based his theoretical and philosophical research on those Abstracts. No issue of his time, whether related to the system of government or the existence of God's essence, was devoid of the guise of thought and philosophy: the IDEA.

Plato tried to go beyond this limit in uncovering the different dimensions of goodness, but he could not add anything new to what his master Socrates brought regarding the theories of the attributes of the Absolute Essence of God (the Universal Soul). That is, both Socrates and Plato described the Universal Soul with Absolute Goodness and Beauty. Then came Aristotle, who wanted to place philosophy within the sphere of the sensible and the visible, away from Socrates's spiritual conception of the Soul. He

divided the rational principle into the First Intellect and the Active Intellect in the conception of the Divine Essence. Thus, the Essence that Socrates and Plato described with Absolute Goodness and Beauty, Aristotle described with the Intellect, and stopped at this point. (Goodness and Intellect) are the summary of Greek philosophy regarding God and His divinity. Plato's dialogues in the (REPUBLIC) are very important for understanding Socrates's conception of the (Divine Attributes) with clarity.

We then discussed the theories of Plato and Aristotle regarding the conception of the existence of God Almighty. The Greek philosophers reached the existence of a God in their research, but their vision of God does not differ from their vision of the world, because they see the Lord of the universe and the world as one reality, as the Eleatics believed, or as the Supreme Ideal, as Plato said: "The Divine Essence is the locus of all Ideals," and he subjected his God to the Ideals, seeing in Him nothing more than a being composed of several Ideals, or that in his theory, God is "not a standing Person in Himself, but represents the superior power of the Ideals in matter," "God the Creator is, as an efficient cause, impressing the forms of the Ideals into matter in a way difficult to describe, and He is the Model as a model cause to be imitated, and He is Beauty and Goodness as a final cause to be loved and sought." "God, according to Plato, is a fundamental cause, and if He is not the creating originator, He is at least the guiding Organizer." "Plato sees that God is not only good, but He is Goodness itself. With him, He is transcendental from motion, because the further a being is from motion, the more it is safe from change, and the more it is so, the more perfect it is. He is Eternal and Everlasting, because time is only a shifting image of the forms of beings and cannot be reflected upon this Great God, limiting His existence in any way." As for the rest of the praiseworthy and

complete characteristics, Plato believes that there is no need to prove their establishment for God, as they are necessarily inseparable from His existence, for He cannot be a true God unless He is perfect in every respect, and He cannot be so unless all complete characteristics are attributed to Him.

We also highlighted the Neo-Platonic school of the Alexandrian philosophers. The Neo-Platonic school of the Alexandrian philosophers appeared in the third century AD. The founder of this doctrine was Ammonius Saccas, whose successor was Plotinus, and whose disciple was Porphyry, who was considered the greatest commentator on Aristotle in his time, and who introduced the principles of Neo-Platonism into Plato's idealist philosophy.

Plotinus achieved what Socrates and Plato had reached in describing Reality as "The Good," but he stopped at this point and did not accept any new imaginative addition to "The Good," because any new addition from imagination would contain some imperfection. He did not even accept describing it as the First Intellect, as Aristotle did in his discovery of the abstract Intellects, and expressed the Cause of all causes as the First Intellect. Plotinus said: "Do not say that He is (Intellect), because if you say so, you divide Him. But why do we call Him (Existence) and (The Good) since He is transcendent from all attributes?" He answers this question himself, saying:

"If we say that He is 'The Good,' the goal is not to personify His Essence with this description that has existence within itself, but we mean by this expression that He is a 'purpose' and an 'ultimate' to which everything ends. This term has a specific purpose. Similarly, if we say that He is described by 'Existence,' by this we mean to place Him outside the boundaries of non-

existence, because He is beyond everything, even above all conceptions of existence."

The theory of Clement of Alexandria can be summarized in a concise phrase as follows:

He said: "What is in its core essence cannot be known, but it can be known by recognizing that 'there is nothing like unto Him.'" He was left with no path but to negate and deny all His attributes, having closed all ways of affirmation and proof.

The Jewish sages in the Middle Ages chose this Neo-Platonic doctrine. Moses Maimonides (d. 605 AH/1204 AD) denied describing Him as The Existing One, because he believed that when we utter this word, we feel that the shadows of the attributes of created beings immediately cover our consciousness, and God's Essence is transcendent from all these attributes. He even refused to say that He is "One without a partner," because the conception of (Oneness) and (absence of partnership) are also not devoid of conceptions of relative proportion. The doctrine of Maimonides was merely an echo of the Neo-Platonic doctrine.

This, then, is the image of God in the ancient conceptions of the ancient Greek philosophers, the Alexandrian school, which we have covered briefly because they have an essential connection to the subject, and because they are very important for studying the following chapters regarding the image of the One God in Judaism and Christianity, and for studying the connection of influence and impact between the ancient religions and the New Testament in elucidating the description of the One God among succeeding peoples and generations.

In the second chapter, we mentioned a historical background about the Children of Israel. We began the discussion by defining the Children of Israel and said that Israel was Jacob's

son of Isaac (peace be upon them). He had 12 sons, so his family was called the family of the Children of Israel, whom God chose for prophethood in the Old Covenant, sending countless messengers among them. Their original homeland was in the regions of Palestine. However, the Children of Israel were forced to live as enslaved subjects under the Pharaohs in Egypt, following continuous attacks by the Amalekites and their occupation of those regions of Palestine. Then, Moses (peace be upon him) rescued them from the bondage of the Pharaohs. However, they were unable to reclaim Palestine from the Amalekites, and Moses (peace be upon him) died. Then came Joshua, and after him Caleb (peace be upon them). Joshua (peace be upon him) succeeded in liberating a large area of Palestine from the Amalekite occupation through Jihad (struggle). However, the Children of Israel were not destined for stability; they lived like the Arabs, carrying their homes on their shoulders in search of water and pasture, and their lives were semi-tribal, far from civilization. They viewed with approval the one who settled disputes among them based on their tribal laws, and if they found military capabilities in him, they appointed him as a commander of their armies, calling him a "Judge." Their book, the Book of Judges, is full of the stories of these judges. Therefore, they call that era the "Era of the Judges."

The Children of Israel succeeded in defending against external attacks but were ultimately defeated and subjugated by the Canaanites. The Canaanites imposed their sovereignty over a vast area of Palestine, and their rule lasted until the time of David (peace be upon him). Finally, God sent Samuel as a messenger to the Children of Israel. They asked him to save them from the suffering of tribal life and to pray to God to make a king among them to organize their affairs, so they could face the Philistines. One of them was appointed king named (Talut), as mentioned in

the Qur'an, though he is mentioned in their books as (Saul) or (Samuel). Talut faced the Philistines. David (peace be upon him) was a young man who coincidentally joined Talut's army. A man from the Philistine army named (Goliath) challenged David (peace be upon him) to a duel, and David killed him. His popularity increased among the Children of Israel until they appointed him king after Saul. God Almighty granted the Children of Israel the message for the first time. The Children of Israel reclaimed all the occupied lands of Palestine during the reign of David (peace be upon him). He was succeeded by Solomon (peace be upon him) in 974 BC. Solomon strengthened the pillars of the Kingdom of Israel. He built a House by God's command, known as Jerusalem, and named his state after his grandfather "Judah." However, his son Rehoboam took the reins of the kingdom after the death of his father Solomon (peace be upon him) in 937 BC, but he was not competent to manage the kingdom's affairs. He ruined the kingdom's religious reputation and severely damaged its political stability. A former servant of his father Solomon (peace be upon him) revolted against him and established an independent kingdom named (Israel). The Children of Israel were divided into two states: (Israel) in the North, with its capital Samaria, and (Judah) in the South, with its capital Jerusalem. A long series of political and sectarian disputes ensued between them, lasting until the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar. Idol worship began to gradually spread among them. God sent prophets and messengers to them. When their deviations exceeded all limits, God Almighty empowered Nebuchadnezzar, the King of Babylon, who launched several invasions against Jerusalem in 586 BC, destroying it in the final invasion. Consequently, King Zedekiah was captured, and the Jews who survived the fighting were also captured and taken to

Babylon. These Jews lived the life of enslaved and oppressed people for a long period.

The Kingdom of Israel had been destroyed by the Assyrians before Judah. Their doctrinal differences had largely diminished, but it was not their destiny to establish an independent state. Thus, all the Children of Israel lived in humiliation and submission to non-consensual kings since 400 B.C. Then, Alexander the Great gained dominion over them in 332 B.C. During that period, they translated the Torah into Greek. This translation is known as the Septuagint (of the Old Testament) and was completed by 72 Jewish scholars in 72 days.

Abul Hasan Ali Al-Hasani Nadwi said in defining the Jews: "There was a nation in Europe, Asia, and Africa, which was the richest of the earth's nations materially in religion, and the closest in understanding its terms and meanings - those are the Jews. However, they were not a factor in civilization, politics, or religion that influenced others. Rather, it was decreed upon them for long centuries that others would rule them, and that they would be exposed to persecution, tyranny, expulsion, exile, torment, and affliction. Their particular history, coupled with what distinguished them among the nations of the earth - long servitude, terrible persecution, national arrogance, pride in lineage, greed, lust for money, and the practice of usury - all bequeathed to them a strange psyche not found in any other nation, and they became unique in certain moral characteristics that were their emblem throughout the ages and generations. Among these were servility in weakness, tyranny and misconduct upon prevailing, cunning and hypocrisy in general circumstances, cruelty, selfishness, wrongfully devouring people's wealth, and hindering the path of God. The Qur'an described them with a precise and profound depiction that

illustrates their moral decline, psychological degradation, and social corruption in the sixth and seventh centuries, which consequently disqualified them from the leadership of nations and the guidance of the world."

Judaism is a religion and a family. A Jew means anyone belonging to the family of Judah, who was one of the brothers of Joseph (peace be upon him). The God of the Jews is the God of the family of Judah from the Children of Israel. The scope of this conception of God was very limited. Although it gradually began to expand, the main features of the familial and geographical specificity of the God of the Children of Israel, in their perception, remained in some form throughout the ages until the advent of Islam. Regarding anthropomorphism and transcendence, their God was characterized by attributes of subjugation, wrath, and vengeance. His attributes were like those of a human in the intensity of subjugation and vengeance, so the primitive representational style was one of the features of the Torah scrolls. Regarding the relationship between man and his deity, its nature was like the relationship of a jealous husband with his wife. A jealous husband can forgive all his wife's sins except if she shares her love for him with someone else; that is an unforgivable sin. The God of the family of the Children of Israel is very jealous, and He chose the family of the Children of Israel from among other families to be His beloved wife, as this fact is manifested in their claim ("We are the Chosen People of God"). It is also mentioned in the Ten Commandments: "You shall not make for yourself any idol, because there is nothing like Him, and you shall not bow down to him (or to others), because your God is a jealous God with intense jealousy." (We will mention these Ten Commandments shortly). This Jewish representation of God in the image of a jealous husband began to appear after the exodus of the Jews from

Egypt and remained until the coming of Islam, though it only represents the primitive, immature thinking of the Old Testament.

In the New Testament of Judaism, elements of expansion were observed in the narrow Jewish conception of their religion, and the intellectual climate of the time was conducive to accepting this new image of the Jewish religion. In contrast to the Jewish conception of God in the Old Testament, which was characterized by intense oppression, anger, and torment, mercy, compassion, pardon, and forgiveness took its place. The God of the Christian conception was not like the tyrannical, oppressive king, nor was He chaste like a jealous husband who was intense in his jealousy and harsh in his revenge. Rather, He was like an ideal father of compassion and tenderness towards his son. There is no doubt that the relationship between parents and children is higher than all relationships in a person's life. It has no place in it for purposes of passion, as we see in the relationship between spouses, because this relationship is about the emotion of mercy, compassion, upbringing, and providing the necessary means for it, even in the case of many and repeated mistakes by the children. The mother never deprives her son of her love and tenderness, just as the compassionate father does not refuse to pardon his mistakes. This Christian representation of the concept of God in relation to man was relatively better than the representation of the brusque husband among the Jews in the absence of a means of expressing the concept of God without using means based on the similarity in the relationships that bind man to man.

However, regarding anthropomorphism and transcendence, the intellectual level of the Christian conception of God is what the Jewish conception ended up with. When the doctrine of Monotheism mixed with the concept of Idol Worship in Rome and the philosophy of Alexandria, the doctrine of the Three Hypostases

(Persons), Atonement, and the Worship of Christ (peace be upon him) prevailed. Thus, the Christian conception of God, embodied as a kind and tender father, after mixing with the Three Hypostases, became a polytheistic concept and far from pure monotheism.

Then we addressed the Ten Commandments among the Jews. It is stated in the Torah that God revealed to Moses (peace be upon him) the keeping of the Ten Commandments, including:

1. Dedication of Divinity to God alone.
2. Not associating other deities in worship with the One and Only God.
3. Not to utter falsehoods in the name of God.
4. Observing the Sabbath.
5. Honoring parents.
6. Loving relatives is like loving oneself.
7. Prohibition of murder, adultery, theft, and bearing false witnesses.
8. Prohibition of looking at women with lust.
9. Prohibition of coveting what God has bestowed upon others. (Exodus 20:2-17 and Deuteronomy 5:6-21).
10. The other commandments relating to the work of the heart and the work of the limbs, as indicated by several texts from the books of the Old Testament.

It is mentioned in the Gospel that Jesus Christ, son of Mary, (peace be upon him), commanded the observance of these commandments. Christ said in the Gospel of Matthew: "If you want to enter life, keep the commandments." He said to him, "Which commandments?" Jesus replied, "You should not murder, you should not commit adultery, you shall not steal, you shall not

bear false witness, honor your father and mother, and love your relative neighbor as yourself." (Matthew 19:18-20).

These commandments, which God Almighty commanded in the law of Moses and Jesus (peace be upon them), God Almighty commanded in the law of Muhammad bin Abdullah (may God bless him and grant him peace). Rather, what came in the Holy Qur'an is more comprehensive and complete than what came in the Torah and the Gospel, because it is the last of the divine books revealed to the last Prophets and Messengers. God Almighty commanded in Surah An-Nisa' to be sincere in worshiping Him (Glory be to Him), and not to associate anything with Him, and to be kind to parents, relatives, orphans, the needy, the neighbor who is near, the neighbor who is far, the companion at your side, the wayfarer, and those whom your right hands possess. And God does not love those who are arrogant and boastful. He forbade stinginess, concealing what He gives of His bounty, injustice, and spending money to be seen by people.

The Christians violated the covenant to keep the first and greatest commandment, which ordered the monotheism of God. Three centuries after the ascension of Christ (peace be upon him), the Christians held a council in Nicaea in 325 ADS, in which they affirmed the divinity of Christ.

We can say briefly, the Divine Revelation sent down to Noah and the Prophets (peace be upon them) after him, until their Seal, Muhammad (peace and blessings be upon him), came with a single law: the fundamentals of religion upon which all divine messages agree. The divine messages agree on three principles:

A. Belief in One God (and in those who brought the divine scriptures, the messengers and angels).

B. Calling for righteous deeds. c. Resurrection after death (for reward and accountability).

C. Resurrection after death (for reward and reckoning).

These three principles of the religion of God Almighty do not change from one religion to another. However, the specific laws and rules (Sharia) that regulate human life differ according to the nature of the time, from the primitive stage to the civilized stage. The first divine law was the Law of the Torah revealed to Moses (peace be upon him). The Law of Moses was then the law for the prophets after him until the last of the Children of Israel's prophets, Jesus Christ, son of Mary, upon whom God revealed the Gospel, confirming the laws of the Torah.

The entire Jewish people had scattered. Jerusalem was subject to the Roman government, and the Jews could not breathe in an atmosphere of freedom. Their eyes were fixed on a positive development in the future, and most Jews were waiting for God (Exalted is He) to send someone to save them from a life of servitude and establish a kingdom and sovereignty for them.

- Birth of Christ in the Qur'an and the Holy Books

What is mentioned about Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon them) in the Holy Qur'an is summarized in these four points:

1. He is a human being, a servant of God Almighty, whom Mary conceived and gave birth to by the Will of God (Exalted is He).
2. He is a Messenger, whom God Almighty sent to the Children of Israel.
3. God (Exalted is He) gave him the Book, which is the Gospel.
4. He acquitted his mother of the slander of immorality the people accused her of, just as he announced his innocence from the divinity, trinity, and crucifixion that the people attributed to him.

As for the birth of Christ in the Holy Books, Matthew said at the beginning of his Gospel that his mother Mary was found pregnant through the Holy Spirit before they came together. An angel appeared to Joseph in a dream and told him not to be afraid to take Mary as his wife, because what was conceived in her was from the Holy Spirit. She would give birth to a son, and he was to be named Jesus, for he would save his people from their sins, fulfilling the prophecy of Immanuel ("God with us").

When Herod learned of the Christ, he resolved to kill him. An angel commanded Joseph in a dream to take the child and his mother and leave Jerusalem, so they went to Egypt. After Herod's death, the angel commanded them to return to Palestine, and they settled in Nazareth. That is why Christians are called Nazarenes (or Nasara).

The Gospels did not mention much about the life of Christ (peace be upon him), especially before his mission. The Evangelists only wrote a small amount, except what is mentioned in the Gospel of Barnabas. Some mentioned that Christ worked in trade, and others mentioned that he was a carpenter. Christ was subject to what any human is subject to; he would eat, drink, and love, confirming his humanity. God Almighty spoke the truth in the Holy Qur'an when He said:

مَا الْمَسِيحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ وَأُمُّهُ صِدِّيقَةٌ كَانَا يَأْكُلَانِ الطَّعَامَ ۗ أَنْظِرْ كَيْفَ نُبَيِّنُ لَهُمُ الْآيَاتِ ثُمَّ أَنْظِرْ أَنَّى يُؤْفَكُونَ.

English Meaning: "The Messiah, son of Mary, was not but a Messenger; [other] messengers had passed on before him. And his mother was a woman of truth. Both used to eat food. Look how We make clear to them the signs; then look how they are deluded." (Qur'an, Surah Al-Ma'idah, 5:75)

- Doctrine of the Trinity: Origins and Controversy

The doctrine of the Trinity was neither exclusive to Christianity nor did it originate with it. Its roots are traced back to ancient periods of human history. Professor Muhammad bin Tahir Al-Tannir quoted (Maurice) that most extinct pagan nations had religious teachings that included the notion of a Trinitarian Godhead.

For instance, in India, the Trimurti consists of Brahma (Father/Creator), Vishnu (Son/Preserver), and Shiva (Holy Spirit/Destroyer), as three persons inseparable from unity, forming one God. Similarly, ancient pagan Romans and Persians had Trinitarian beliefs. This great similarity suggests that this doctrine predated Christianity and was borrowed from those pagan religions.

The relationship between the members of Holy Trinity did not take its final form until major councils. The Council of Nicaea (325 AD) affirmed the divinity of Jesus. The Council of Constantinople (381 AD) completed this by affirming the divinity of the Holy Spirit, thus completing the assertion of Trinitarianism. Christians claim that God (Exalted is He) consists of three persons: (The Father), (The Son), and (The Holy Spirit), which are the Divine Essence. This is what they call Monotheism in the Trinity.

The great Christian scholar, St. Augustine, addressed this topic in his book (On the Trinity), arguing that the three persons constitute a 'unity' that cannot be fragmented, and they are collectively One God.

Regarding the Incarnation and Indwelling, Al-Maqrizi noted the major Christian sects - Melkites, Nestorians, and Jacobite - all agreed that their God has three persons (Father, Son, Holy Spirit) who are one ancient essence. However, they differed on the

nature of the Incarnation of the Son in man. Some, like the Nestorians, claimed Christ had two essences (divine and human), and the crucifixion only occurred on the side of his human nature.

Christians rely on texts in their Holy Book for the Trinity, such as the statement in the First Epistle of John that the Father, the Word, and the Holy Ghost are one, and in the Gospel of John that "the Word was with God, and the Word was God." However, the complexity of One in Three and Three in One remains beyond the comprehension of any rational person.

Rahmatullah al-Hindi, in his book (Izhar al-Haqq - The Manifestation of the Truth), refuted the Christian doctrine of the Trinity. He argued that the Christian arguments, such as Christ being born without a father, are weak because Adam (peace be upon him) was created without a father and a mother, thus surpassing Christ in this regard. Furthermore, the argument based on miracles like reviving the dead is also weak, as other prophets like Ezekiel, Elijah, and Elisha (peace be upon them) also performed this miracle.

There is no doubt that the doctrine of the Trinity is not proven by the Holy Gospels but is a result of their misunderstanding and erroneous inferences. Their writings and epistles are not inspired, and they contain many certain errors and contradictions. Paul has no basis in authenticity. Christ and the Disciples were certainly innocent of this doctrine. Therefore, we must testify that there is no god but God, and that Muhammad is His servant and Messenger, and that Jesus is the servant of God and His Messenger.

- Christ's Miracles and Death

The physical miracles that came from Jesus, son of Mary were all by the Command of God Almighty. God (Exalted is He) grants them to the Prophets and Messengers to support their messages. Jesus (peace be upon him) was a human like other prophets and lived in the world of humans as a human. As for the death of Jesus, son of Mary (peace be upon him), he died like other prophets, because God Almighty said in His Book:

إِنِّي مُتَوَفِّيكَ وَرَافِعُكَ إِلَيَّ.

- English Meaning:

"[Jesus], indeed, I will take you and raise you to Myself..." (Qur'an, Surah Al 'Imran, 3:55, partial verse).

The meaning of the word "Al-Wafah" (in this context, where God is the doer) is the taking of the soul. This means God Almighty took the soul of Jesus, son of Mary, so he died, and then God raised his physical body to Him, and He is over all things powerful. We do not say that he was raised to the sky, because the word 'sky' is not mentioned in the Qur'anic texts. And God knows best what is right.

References and Footnotes

1. Imam of India Abul Kalam Azad. (1990). Delhi: First Edition. pp. 266–273
2. Abul Kalam Azad. (undated). Umm al-Kitab by Abul Kalam Azad. (in Urdu). p. 213
3. Ibid. pp. 210–216
4. Abbas Mahmoud al-Akkad. (1969). "God." Cairo: Dar al-Maarif. pp. 136–137. See: Fawzan Misra al-Muhammadi. The Philosophical Side of Islamic Civilization. p. 192
5. History of Greek Philosophy. p. 18
6. Ibid. p. 193
7. Ibid. p. 194
8. Ibid. p. 195
9. Abul Kalam Azad. (undated). Umm al-Kitab by Abul Kalam Azad. pp. 212–216
10. See the first chapter of the First Book of the Maccabees.
11. Nadwi. Abu al-Hasan Ali (1965). Al-Hasani. What Did the World Lose Due to the Decline of Muslims? Beirut: Dar al-Kitab al-Arabi. Sixth Edition. pp. 35–36
12. Exodus: 23:1–7, Leviticus 19:18–34, Deuteronomy 9:5, 15:11. See: al-Shuaibi. Abdullah bin Abdul Aziz (1423 AH). Messiah, Son of Mary. Mecca: Muslim World League, Department of Da'wah Affairs, Issue: 196, p. 35
13. Mark: 12:32–34
14. Surah al-Nisa, verses: 36–38
15. Surah al-Nisa, verses: 23–38
16. Al-Isra', verse: 39
17. Hanna. Girgis. History of Christian Thought. 4/631. See: al-Shuaibi. Abdullah bin Abdul Aziz. (1423 AH). Jesus, son of Mary, confirming the Torah that came before him. Mecca: Muslim World League, Department of Da'wah Affairs.

18. Surah Maryam. Verses: 16-36
19. 19. Al-Tabari's Interpretation. Pp. 305-308. See:
<https://quran.ksu.edu.sa/tafseer/tabary/sura19-aya25.html#tabary>
20. Matthew: 1/18-25
21. Matthew: 2/1
22. Luke: 12/40-74
23. Shalaby, Ahmed (1983). Christianity. Cairo: Dar Al-Nahda Al-Masryia - Seventh Edition. p. 37
24. Will Durant (undated). The Story of Civilization. Cairo: Translated by Muhammad Badran, Authorship and Translation Committee. League of Arab States. Vol. 11, p. 214
25. Ahmed, Abdel Wahab (1979). Prophecy and Prophets in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. Cairo: Wahba Library. pp. 75-76
26. Surah Al-Ma'idah, Verse: 57
27. Sa'id, Habib (n.d.). Notables of the World. Cairo: Authorship and Publication for the Episcopal Church. p. 256
28. Al-Tanir, Muhammad, ibn Tahir (1989). Pagan Beliefs in Christianity. Cairo: Dar Al-Sahwa. First Edition. pp. 54-68. See also: Shalabi, Ahmad (1989). The Major Religions of India. Cairo: Dar Al-Nahda Al-Masriya. Fifth Edition. p. 48.
29. Al-Ghazali, Muhammad (1987). A Defense of Creed and Sharia - The Evolution of Creed - Beirut: Dar Al-Shorouk. First Edition. p. 104.
30. Hibbert Journal xx 1v No.1. The Encyclopedia Britanica 1950. P. 479V.22 "TRINITY".
31. Marjan, Muhammad Magdi (1975). Christ: Man, or God? Cairo: Dar al-Nahda al-Arabiya. See also: Priest Boulos Mazaj. "God is One or Trinity?" Dar al-Nahda al-Arabiya. p. 9.
32. St. Thomas Aquinas, Basic Writings of Britannica P.479V.22.
33. Al-Maqrizi's Plans. (1959). Lebanon. Vol. 3. p. 408.

34. Basic Writings of St. Augustine, translated by: A.W. Haddan and edited by J. O. Als, New York 1948 p. 672 V. 2.
35. Basic Writings of St. Thomas Aquinas edited by: A. C. Pegi p.p. 324, 15v. New York 1915
36. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics P. 585 V-3
37. The City of God by: Augustine P.168 V-2.
38. Matthew 3:16
39. See Acts 2, pp. 1-22, and Augustine, vol. 2, p. 672. From Babylon to the Qur'an. Urdu translation of "Izhar al-Haqq" by Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi, pp. 47-48.
40. John 5:7
41. John 1:1
42. The Epistle of Paul to the Colossians: 1:16-17
43. Luke 1:35
44. Michael, Wadih (1984). Proofs of the Divinity of Christ. Fourth Edition, p. 46
45. Railton, Morris. Studies in Christian Doctrine: "H. Maurice "Relton: "Studies in Christian Doctrine".
46. The Revelation of the Trinity. (1927). Pakistan-Lahore: p. 24
47. Darwish, Adel Muhammad. (1997). Christianity between Truth and Distortion. Cairo - Sharqiyah: Dar Al-Ilm. First Edition. p. 242
48. Augustine. Vol. 2, p. 92
49. Al-Hindi, Rahmatullah. (undated). Izhar al-Haqq. Casablanca: Arab Unity Library. Vol. 1, pp. 388-390
50. Izhar al-Haqq. Vol. 2, pp. 3-7
51. Izhar al-Haqq. Vol. 2, pp. 8-9
52. Authored by a group of theologians. (1976). Dictionary of the Holy Bible. Second Edition. p. 445
53. Authored by a group of theologians. (1988). Dictionary of Biblical Theology. Dar Al-Sharq: Second Edition. p. 282

54. "Problems of the Christian Faith." p. 113. See also: Al-Baghdadi, Abd al-Rahman ibn Salim (1987). The Difference Between the Creature and the Creator. Library of Religious Culture. p. 400
55. Surah An-Nisa, verse 157
56. Creation/2:17.
57. Original Sin, Aquinas the Summa (Theologica Q.87, Art. 2. P. 710 v.11
58. Augustine: The Enchiridion xxx 1P. 673
59. The Summa Theologica Q.81, Art.3. P. 669 v. 11, Encyclopedia Britannica p. 65
60. Augustine: The City of God II p. 255-259 Book No.14, Chapter No.1.
61. Matthew: 26-26
62. Luke: 22-19
63. Justin Martyr. Apol P. 65-67 Quoted by F. c. Burkitt, The Christian Religion p.149 v.114
64. Cyril Cat. Mist. K. quoted by the Britannica p. 795 v8 "EUCCHARIS".
65. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 265
66. The Book of Religions and Sects by al-Shahrastani. p. 335
67. Surah al-Baqarah, verse 286
68. Surah an-Nisa, verse 111
69. Marjan, Muhammad Magdi. Is Christ Human or God? p. 143. See also: Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 263
70. Major Christian Issues. p. 373
71. Samaan, Awad. The Philosophy of Forgiveness. Cairo: Commercial Press. p. 80
72. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 268
73. Christianity in Islam. p. 162

74. History of the Copts, vol. 1, pp. 57 ff. and The Truth Between Christianity and Islam. p. 46
75. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion p. 275
76. Studies in the Gospel of Mark. pp. 527-531, Muhammad Rajab (1989). Christianity. Muhammadiyah Printing House. 1st ed. See also: A. H. Broadbent (1973). The Expatriate Church. Cairo: Brothers' Library. p. 77. Also: Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 276.
77. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 277
78. Ibid. pp. 186-188
79. Habib Sa'id. Introduction to the Holy Bible. Cairo: Episcopal Library. P. 70.
80. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. P. 194.
81. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 193.
82. Muhammad Abu Zahra, Sheikh (1966). Lectures on Christianity. Dar Al-Fikr Al-Arabi. p. 56.
83. Habib Saeed. Introduction to the Bible. p. 228.
84. Muhammad Abu Zahra, Sheikh. Lectures on Christianity. p. 41.
85. Introduction to the Bible. p. 210. See also: Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 197.
86. Ibid. P. 115.
87. Ibid. p. 223.
88. The Gospel and the Cross, pp. 14-12. See also: Ahmad Shalabi, Christianity. p. 205. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 198.
89. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 199. See also: Muhammad (peace be upon him) in the Torah, the Bible, and the Qur'an. p. 144
90. Dictionary of the Bible. p. 832
91. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 200

92. Introduction to the Bible. p. 243
93. Dictionary of the Bible. p. 833
94. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 201
95. Dictionary of the Bible. p. 823. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 291
96. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 202
97. Lectures on Christianity. p. 45
98. Dictionary of the Bible. p. 853
99. Paul's Epistle to the Colossians 4/10
100. Coptic History. Vol. 1. p. 74
101. Lectures on Christianity. p. 64
102. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 203
103. Introduction to the Study of the Bible p. 248-250.
104. Matthew: 11/12, 6/31. William Barclay, Commentary on the Gospel of Mark. Translated by Aziz Fahim (1977). Cairo: Christian Culture. p. 16.
105. Bucaille, Maurice (undated). The Holy Scriptures in the Light of Modern Knowledge. Cairo: Dar al-Maarif. p. 85/4.
106. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 203
107. Dictionary of the Holy Bible. P. 855.
108. Commentary on the Gospel of Mark. p. 44
109. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 205
110. Introduction to the Holy Bible. p. 253-255
111. Dictionary of the Holy Bible. p. 823
112. Introduction to the Holy Bible. p. 662
113. Lectures on Christianity. p. 50. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 207
114. From the Qur'an to the Bible. (in Urdu) p. 118
115. Committee on Religious Books. (1960). The Antiquity and Authenticity of the Four Gospels. (In Urdu) Pakistan-Punjab: Vol. 2, p. 131

116. Ibid., p. 140
117. Matthew 2:1, Mark 3:16-19, Luke 6:14-16, and Acts 1:13.
118. B. H. Streeter: The Four Gospels p. 43
119. Quoted by Streeter: Four Gospels p. 443.
120. From the Qur'an to the Bible. p. 124
121. Al-Masry, Sayyid Rashid Rida (undated). Introduction to the Gospel of Barnabas. Cairo edition.
122. Abu Zahra, Muhammad al-Sheikh. Lectures on Christianity. pp. 49-68. Dictionary of the Holy Bible. p. 122. Encyclopedia by Muhammad Farid Wajdi. vol. 1. 65. Izhar al-Haqq by Sheikh Rahmatullah al-Hindi, edited by Muhammad Ahmad Malkawi. vol. 1/11.
123. Al-Kutbi, Sheikh Ahmad Ali al-Malihi (1908). Answer to the Question of Some People of the Book. p. 6. Muhammad Izzat al-Tahtawi in his book, Bishār al-Risālah al-Muhammadiyah. See: Introduction to the Gospel of Barnabas.
124. This John is not the author of the well-known Gospel. The author of the Gospel called the Gospel of John is not certain. He is one of the Apostles, and he wrote it at the end of the first century AD. It contains the claim of the divinity of Christ, so its author must have been someone other than one of the Apostles.
125. Abu Zahra, Muhammad. Alsheikh. Lectures on Christianity. Glad Tidings of the Muhammadan Message. Muhammad Izzat al-Tahtawi. pp. 59-65
126. Hadith and Hadith Scholars, by Sheikh Dr. Muhammad Abu Zahra. pp. 185-190
127. Al-Bukhari. p.p. 62-76
128. Al-Isabah 4/198-199 from the Introduction to the Gospel of Barnabas by Magdi Muhammad al-Shahawi. Cairo: Al-Tawfiqiya Library, Al-Hussein Square.

129. Charles Junibert. (undated). Christianity, Its Origins and Development. Translated by Abdul Halim Mahmoud. Beirut: Al-Maktaba Al-Asriya. p. 68
130. Ibid. pp. 69-70
131. Al-Juwayni, Imam al-Haramayn. (1989). Healing the Thirst in Explaining What Occurred in the Torah and the Gospel of Change. Translated by: Al-Saqa and Ahmad Hijazi. Third Edition. p. 77. Christianity Between Truth and Distortion. p. 71
132. Christianity. p. 107
133. Muhammad Abd al-Rahman Awad (1986). Differences and Agreements between the Gospel of Barnabas and the Four Gospels. Cairo: Dar al-Bashir. p. 29
134. The Story of Civilization. Vol. 3. p. 24
135. Muhammad Rajab. Christianity: A Comparative Study. p. 98
136. Habib Sa'id (1977). The Dawn of Christianity. A History of Christianity Series. Cairo: Dar al-Jalil. p. 45
137. Art Logos. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, written by James Hasting between 1908-1927 vol.6. P.717
138. Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics, vol. 6. p. 718, Logos.
139. The Story of Civilization. Part 3. pp. 253-268. The Dawn of Christianity. pp. 41-44. John Luymer's History of the Church. p. 62
140. Is God One or Trinity? p. 88
141. Ahmed Shalabi. Christianity. p. 45
142. Habib Saeed. The Dawn of Christianity. p. 45
143. Is God One or Trinity? p. 45
144. Al-Tahtawi, Muhammad Izzat (1989). Christianity and Islam. Cairo: Maktaba al-Nour. p. 281
145. Christianity between Truth and Distortion. p. 87
146. H. G. Wells (1947). A Brief History of the World. Translated by Saeed Abdel Aziz Tawfiq. Beirut: Dar al-Fikr al-Arabi. p. 178

147. Al-Nadwi, Abu al-Hasan Ali al-Hasani (1965). What Has the World Lost with the Decline of Muslims? Beirut: Dar Al-Kitab Al-Arabi. Sixth edition. pp. 166-167
148. Al-Ghazali, Sheikh Muhammad. (1987). Defense of the Creed and Sharia. Beirut: Dar Al-Shorouq. First edition. P. 102.

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY

**More
Books!**

yes
I want morebooks!

Buy your books fast and straightforward online - at one of world's fastest growing online book stores! Environmentally sound due to Print-on-Demand technologies.

Buy your books online at
www.morebooks.shop

Kaufen Sie Ihre Bücher schnell und unkompliziert online – auf einer der am schnellsten wachsenden Buchhandelsplattformen weltweit! Dank Print-On-Demand umwelt- und ressourcenschonend produziert.

Bücher schneller online kaufen
www.morebooks.shop



info@omniscryptum.com
www.omniscryptum.com

OMNIScriptum



FOR AUTHOR USE ONLY