

MUHAMMAD IN THE BIBLE

Muhammad in the Bible is a small book written by Professor Abdu'l L-Ahad Dawud which aims to prove that the Bible predicted the coming of the prophet Muhammad and authorised his mission and his work meaning that the Bible proves Islam is of God. The author was a former Roman Catholic bishop who converted to Islam. To refute it would be to refute Islam for the Koran says that the gospels and the Old Testament predicted the coming of Muhammad (Sura 26).

The Foreword argues that when Moses prophesied that a prophet like him would come from the Hebrews and that if anybody wouldn't listen to him they would be cut off in Deuteronomy 18 that it was Muhammad he meant. The Foreword adds the extraordinary statements that Jesus never claimed to be the prophet and that his disciples thought he would be that prophet when he would return in the Second Coming. There is no evidence for any of that it the gospels oppose its statements. Also the Second Coming cannot be Jesus' chance to fulfil the prophecy because then Jesus will appear as judge and not as lawgiver. The gospels all say that Jesus was predicted by Moses and this is the only prophecy they could have had in mind. Also, Jesus did issue a law when he was alive and behaved like Moses and claimed to lead his people into the Promised Land of Heaven in imitation of Moses. Muslims regard Jesus as a true prophet therefore they would have to agree that if he fitted the mould he would have to be the prophet Moses meant for he was the first. It makes sense to take the prophecy as referring to the first suitable candidate for it is the only safe way. Muhammad was not a Hebrew but was allegedly descended from Ishmael who was the son of Abraham long before the nation of Israel even started but Moses says the prophet will come from among the people of Israel.

A prophecy from Deuteronomy 23:2 which simply says the Lord will shine from Paran is taken to refer to Muhammad who started his ministry in that region (page 3). But there is no evidence that the prophecy means anything like that. It could be referring to God inspiring lots of people at Paran or even appearing there. The prophecy about Paran in Habakkuk which says that the earth was full of the praise of God is cited as referring to Muhammad to. The word praise is taken to be a hint of his name for Muhammad means the praised one (page 4). But you can't read things into words that are just part of what is being expressed.

The book claims that God is not goodness itself like you have in Catholic theology (page 15). This shows that the God of Islam is not like the Catholic one at all despite the lies of Vatican II.

It charges that the correct version of John 1:1 is that the word existed in the beginning and the word was with God and the word was God's and blames the accepted version which says the word was God on a corruption (page 16). You can make old documents mean anything with that logic. There is no textual evidence of an alteration. And even if there were it might not be enough.

Haggai 2:7 is supposed to say that the Ahmed of all nations will come (page 22). But the prophecy is about God shaking the nations and filling up his temple with silver and gold but there was no universal earthquake or temple in Muhammed's time. The word he translates Ahmed is peace which is himda in the original but since the Arabic form of himda is Ahmed this is how he gets his fancy interpretation. This is so unfair because Haggai is just saying that peace will come that is all and they read mountains into this molehill.

The prophecy addressed to Judah that from it would come Shiloh is said to refer to Muhammad (page 51). Muhammad was not Shiloh who the Law says would receive the obedience of all people if Muhammad did not command anybody anything but only gave out the will of God as orthodox Islam says. Muhammad was born into a tribe of pagans, the Quraish tribe (page 8, Studies on Islam). He should have been a Jew if he was to have a chance of fulfilling the prophecy though he did claim to have been a descendant of Abraham. But that wasn't enough.

When it is admitted that nothing is known of what became of Ishmael what business have Muslims claiming to be his descendants and entitled to the promise made by God that Ishmael would father a nation? (page 30). Page 33 endeavours to argue that Isaac did not fulfil the promise to Abraham that there would be a great nation from his loins for Abraham was incestuously married to his sister. But the Law of Moses did not exist at that time so the incest though bad was not immoral or illegal then.

The prophecy of Jesus about another one like Jesus coming, the Spirit of Truth, which he made in the John gospel, is supposed to refer to Ahmad which is Muhammad (page 6). This is based on the grounds that Jesus said the comforter would be like Jesus and would come after he goes. The book says that Jesus could not have meant that he didn't have the Holy Spirit with him for it was. The Gospel of John says he passed him on before he left the world so he had him. The book thinks that Jesus referred to the coming of another man who was the Holy Spirit of Muhammad incarnate. In this view, Muhammad existed as a spirit being before he was born and it is this spirit that was meant. The book gives no evidence for

this pre-existence. How can it? The preexistence is not stated in the Koran but in the notorious forgery the Gospel of Barnabas (page 145) which not surprisingly the book makes no effort to defend for its errors are glaring. That is enough to refute the interpretation. Jesus did not specify in what way the spirit would be like him so it might not have been a man at all. Jesus' predictions about the Son of Man are taken to refer to Muhammad though most scholars believe that they are either Jesus predicting the coming of the real Messiah or just Jesus referring to himself in a roundabout way. This book is totally unscientific.

The book then argues that John's report that Jesus said he would send another paraclete refers to Muhammad because the word is periqlytos. This is based on the assumption that this word was lost from the original text (page 211). And the prophecy says he will live with them forever but Muhammad is dead. Page 218 boasts that Muhammad gave the world the full truth about God so he fulfilled this. But Muhammad did not for even Muslims often disagree on what his Koran taught and there are serious problems concerning how far what exists today is the original.

The book then denies that the Holy Spirit could have been meant because it is an impersonal gift from God for the New Testament says it is a gift and we are his temple meaning we already have it. But God is such a different kind of personal being from us that he could be described as an it. The real reason the book says this is because it wants to prove that the Spirit Jesus promised could not be the Holy Spirit. But no other spirit is clearly mentioned in the Bible. And the Bible teaches that the Spirit is a person.

Page 148 argues that since the Bible uses words that are similar to the meaning of Muhammad that he must be prophesied. So if my name is Jesus or Joshua as we have it among ourselves today then the Bible is about me! Page 149 argues that the name of Muhammad was first given to the prophet and that the people he grew up with would not have known of the roots of the name in the Bible so he must have been the one prophesied. But how does the author know that the little-known people the prophet grew up among knew or came into contact with? There have been several Muhammads who have claimed revelation from God. It is well-known that Islam among the ordinary people is in the grip of fortune-tellers who give revelations from Allah. There are plenty who have different names but which have the same meaning. The name of Muhammad is not enough. The man's message has to be provably infallible.

Page 129 states that if three Persian kings came to acknowledge baby Jesus as king as the gospel of Matthew alleges then why did Persia persecute Christianity? This is bad logic for first of all the gospels never say that Jesus was visited by kings or if they came from Persia and Persia might have persecuted Christianity thinking it was not true to King Jesus. This appalling perversion of logic that we are not meant to see through and which looks sensible if you don't think is employed in the apologetics of every religion on earth. It is sickening. There have always been prophets who called themselves Muhammad or were named that.

Page 133 and thereabouts uses arguments against the authenticity of the New Testament gospels that have been employed by liberal Christian scholars. For example, it is complained that the gospels were written in Greek – the implication being that this was to prevent the Jews and Romans from learning much about them for they were lies and corruptions of the original teaching of Jesus. I would argue that for all we know the gospels might have originally been written in Aramaic and loosely translated into Greek for there is no proof whatsoever that what we have now is the word of God for it could be a translation of the word of God which is an entirely different thing.

Page 136 tells a lie about the Catholic Church. It says that all sins grave or not have to be confessed to a priest and that is why there is no peace in the Catholic Church. Our apologist knows fine well that you have only to confess grave sins in that faith. In page 137 we meet some admirable candour, he admits that the more holy he got as a Catholic the more he secretly hated non-believers. Another lie on page 188 accuses the Catholic Church of claiming to turn the water of baptism into the blood of Jesus to wash away sins. The aim is to debunk the Catholic faith so that readers will become Muslims and that is dishonest for it is not enough to refute a faith for that reason for you have to prove your own is valid as well.

Page 153 sees contradictions in the Gospels that do not exist. For example, Andrew being a disciple of John the Baptist who brings Simon to Jesus and abandons John for Jesus which is recounted in John is supposed to be contradicted by Matthew 4:18-19. But Matthew only says that Jesus asked these men to follow him. That's all so there is no contradiction.

John the Baptist prophesied about a prophet who he had come to pave the way for. This silly book argues that this prophet was Muhammad (page 156) though it is evident that the gospels think it was Jesus. The book argues that John said the prophet would come after and he and Jesus lived at the one time so it was Muhammad. But John meant that Jesus would come as prophet for he was not a prophet as in role yet. The book then argues that if Jesus had been the prophet, John would have followed him. But John could have betrayed Jesus for he did lose his faith in him according to the gospels. And one did not have to run after Jesus all day long like the apostles to be a follower. The book then says that if Jesus had been the prophet, John would not have baptised him but this ignores the gospels in which John protests and only gives in because Jesus really wanted to be baptised and they say elsewhere that John was open-minded about Jesus' real status. John could have been talking about Joseph Smith as well as Muhammad if he did not mean Jesus because we know so little about John

and his teachings – some precursor.

The gospels say the prophet was Jesus and if it was anybody it was him.

Conclusion

Muhammad was not predicted in the Bible

BOOKS CONSULTED

An Introduction to Asian Religions, E G Parrinder, SPCK, London, 1957

Answering Islam, The Crescent in Light of the Cross, Norman L Geisler and Abdul Saleeb, Baker Books, Grand Rapids, 2002

Concise Guide to Today's Religions, Josh Mc Dowell and Don Stewart, Scripture Press, Bucks, 1988

God Is Not Great, The Case Against Religion, Christopher Hitchens, Atlantic Books, London, 2007

In Defence of the Faith, Dave Hunt, Harvest House, Eugene, Oregon, 1996

Islam, Christianity's Greatest Challenge, Misc. International Publications, Lubbock, Texas, undated

Muhammad: A Western Attempt to Understand Islam, Karen Armstrong, Victor Gollancz Ltd, London, 1991

Muhammad in the Bible, Prof 'Abdu 'L-Ahad Dawud, Bina, Singapore, 1978

Studies on Islam, Jack Budd, Red Sea Mission Team, Northants, 1994

The Case Against God, Gerald Priestland, Collins, Fount Paperbacks, London, 1984

The Collection of the Qur'an, John Burton, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1977

The Curate's Diary, October 2001, No 199, Arklow, Co Wicklow

The Light Shineth in Darkness, Udo Schaefer, George Ronald, Oxford, 1979

The Varieties of Religious Experience, William James, Fount, Glasgow, 1960

The Wordsworth Dictionary of Beliefs and Religions, Wordsworth Editions Ltd, London, 1995

The World's Religions, Lion, Herts, 1982

Understanding Islam, Frithjof Schuon, Mandala Books, Unwin Books, London, 1981

What Everyone Should Know About Islam and Muslims, Suzanne Haneef, Kazi Publications, Illinois, 1982

Who is This Allah? GJO Moshaym, Dorchester House Publications, Bucks, 1994

Why I am not a Muslim, Ibn Warraq, Prometheus Books, New York, 1995

Why I Became a Christian, Sultan Muhammed Paul, Gospel Literature Service, Bombay, 1981