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INTRODUCTION.

The reader of the Qurʾān cannot fail to see that there is a considerable amount of Jewish and Christian teachings embodied in it. The existence of these teachings led modern scholars to see that the founder of Islam was under Jewish, and/or Christian influence, and thus their efforts were to find how Muhammad came to know and incorporate these teachings in his Qurʾān. The results of these scholars were crystallised in the view that "Muhammad through his contact with the Jews and the Christians formulated his new religion eclectically.

In this thesis, our attempt is to study the Qurʾānic verses which were used by Muhammad in his polemics against the Jews and the Christians, to examine their sources, and to reflect on how and why Muhammad used them.

The method of our investigation is mainly built on the citation of these verses, the critical study of the Muslim commentaries on them, and the study of the Biblical and Apocryphal passages with which they are possibly connected.

The scheme of our research is based entirely on the prophetic claims of Muhammad, which are manifested in the Qurʾānic verses which claim that Muhammad's advent as a prophet was to confirm the previous revelations given to Moses and to Jesus, and that he like other prophets was called to make clear to the "people of the Book" the points on which they differed.
It is hoped that in this study we would be able to answer the following questions:

(a) Why Mohammed claimed Prophecy?
(b) How he used the Christian and Jewish teachings to support his claims?
(c) In which way does Islam differ from Judaism and Christianity?

Palmer\(^1\) in 1880 suggested a possible answer to the first question when he asked: "Why, if Mohammed preached nothing more than the central truth of Judaism and Christianity, did he not rather accept one or the other of these creeds, than found a new one?"

"To answer this question", he said, "we must regard Judaism and Christianity not as they are understood now, but as they existed in Arabia in Mohammed's time. Judaism was effete, Christianity corrupt. The Hebrew nation had fallen, and the pagan superstitions and Rabbinic inventions had obscured the primeval simplicity of the Hebrew faith and marred the grandeur of its law. The Christians were forgetful alike of the old revelation and of the new, and neglecting the teachings of their Master, were split up into numerous sects - Monotheists and Monophysites, Jacobites and Nestorians, and the like who had little in common but the name

---

\(^1\) The Koran, p.11.
of Christians, and the cordial hatred with which they regarded each other.

Jeffery\(^1\) suggests another view for the rise of Islam when he says: "In the sixth century Arabia was surrounded on all sides by nations of a higher civilization, the Empire of Byzantium, Persia, and Abyssinia possessed most of her fertile territory, and mighty religious influences, both Jewish and Christian, were at work in the Peninsula at the time when Mohammed was born. In his young manhood Mohammed was greatly impressed by this higher civilization and particularly by the religion of the great Empire of Noum, and there can be no serious doubt that his conception of his mission, as he first clearly outlined it for himself, was to provide for the Arabs the benefit of this religion and in some measure this civilization (see Bell, Origin, p.98,99). It was therefore natural that the Qor\(\text{\textsuperscript{\textast}}\) should contain a large number of religious and cultural terms borrowed from these surrounding communities. The religion, as he insists over and over again in the Qor\(\text{\textsuperscript{\textast}}\), is something new to the Arabs; it was not likely therefore, that native Arabic vocabulary would be adequate to express all its new ideas, so the obvious policy was to borrow and adapt the necessary technical terms. Many of these terms, as a matter of fact, were there ready to his hand, having already come into use in Arabia in pre-Islamic times.

\(^1\) A. Jeffery, P.V.O., p.38.
partly through Arab tribes who had accepted Christianity, partly through commerce with Jews, Christians, and Persians, and partly through earlier inquirers interested in those religions. In fact it is very probable that if we knew more about those elusive personalities - Umayya b. Abi Salt, Musaylama, and the Manifa, we should find that there was in Arabia at that time a little circle of seekers after monothelitism who were using a fairly definite vocabulary of religious terms of Jewish and Christian origin, and illustrating their preaching by a little group of stories partly of Judaeo-Christian, and partly Arabian origin. In the beginning Mohammed but followed in their footsteps, but he grasped the political arm and became a figure in the world, while of the others we can now discuss but the hazy outline, though they so largely prepared the way for him.

It is clear also that Mohammed set himself definitely to learn about things Jewish and Christian, (Hirschfeld, however, goes a little too far when he says, New Researches, p.13: "Before entering on his first ministry, Mohammed had undergone what I should like to call a course of Biblical training"), and thus undoubtedly himself imported new technical terms from these sources. It has been remarked not infrequently that the Prophet had a penchant for strange and mysterious words, and seemed to love to puzzle his audiences with these new terms, though frequently he himself had not grasped correctly their
meaning, as one sees in such cases as \( \text{الرّ} \) and

Sometimes he seems even to have invented words."

Our attempt, in this thesis, is not to prove or reject these

and various other theories, but to study the Qur'anic teachings

in the light of the Biblical studies which seem to be the

foundation stone of Islamic theology.

\[1 \text{ Compare infra pp. } \text{37} \]
CHAPTER ONE

MOHAMMED'S PROPHETIC CLAIM

The study of the Qur'an reveals three aspects of Mohammed's prophetic claims. The first is that he was sent as a warner, to the Pre-Islamic Arabs, who unlike other nations did not receive a prophet to call them to the worship of the True and the One God; the second, is that he was the prophet whose advent was foretold in the Scriptures of the Jews and the Christians; and the third is that his prophetic mission is the confirmation of the mission of the Patriarchs and the prophets in general and of that of Moses and Jesus in particular.¹

In this chapter we are going to study the reactions against these claims (a) by the Arabs and (b) by the Jews.

The Pre-Islamic Arabs Reactions Against Mohammed's Prophetic Claim.

The Qur'an, its commentaries, the biographers of Mohammed, and the Moslem historians give us a detailed account of the nature of this reaction; but as a detailed study of these reactions is beyond the scope of this thesis we shall confine ourselves to the theological nature of their reaction which

¹ See infra, pp. 37
could be classified under four aspects of one particular category which is the denial of the Divine authority of his revelations. They considered him as a dreamer, as a poet, as a man possessed by a devil, and as a sorcerer; moreover they accused him of receiving his instructions from a certain person whose language is not Arabic (possibly a Christian or a Jew); and furthermore they charged him that his Qur'ān is no more than the "Tales of the Ancients." All these considerations seem to be various aspects of the one and important cause which led them to reject his claims, and that is their conception of the NATURE OF THE PROPHET, which could be implied from the following Qur'ānic verses:

"Every warning that cometh to them from their Lord they hear only to mock— jesting in their hearts: and they who do this wrong say in secret discourse, "Is he more than a man like yourselves? will ye, then with your eyes open, accede to sorcery?"

Say: "My Lord knoweth what is spoken in the heavens and on the earth: he it is who heareth, knoweth."

"Nay" say they, "It is medley of dreams: nay, he hath forged it: nay, he is a poet, let him then come to us with a sign as the Prophets of old were sent."

---

1 Qur'ān, xxi.5; lxi.30; compare lxi.3.
2 ibid, xxi.5.
3 ibid, xxiii.25, 72; xliiv.13; compare lxi.52; lxi.29.
4 ibid, xliii.29; xlv.6; lixiv.2,3; lxxiv.24; lxi.11 ff.; xxxviii.3.
5 ibid, xvi.106.
6 ibid, lxvi.15; lxxiii.13; xxvii.70; xxv.5; xxiii.85;
   xvi.26; xlv.16; viii.31.
7 ibid, xxi.2-8.
8 Compare Qur. lxi.179, where the same demand is asked by the Jews. See infra pp. 111.
"Before their time, none of the cities which we have destroyed, believed: will these men, then, believe?
AND WE SENT NONE, PR EVIOUS TO THEE, BUT MEN TO WHOM WE HAD REVEALED OURSELVES. ASK YE THEN, THE PEOPLE WHO ARE WARNED BY SCRIPTURES IF YE KNOW IT NOT...
AND WE GAVE THEM NOT BODIES WHICH COULD DISPENSE WITH FOOD — AND THEY WERE NOT TO LIVE FOR EVER."

The Moslem commentators¹ tell us that the last of these verses was revealed as an answer to the query put to Mohammed by these pagan Arabs, and which is mentioned in the Qur'an in xxv.8,9:

"And they say, "What sort of apostle is this? He eateth food and he walketh the mart! Unless an angel be sent down and take part in his warnings!"

From these verses we can conclude that the reaction of the pagan Arabs against Mohammed's claims for Prophecy was based on the fact that they conceived the prophet to be super-human, of the angelic or demonic order. This conception is shown by Haldar,² and could be inferred from the Qur'anic verse xxxix.4 which reads:

"But they who have taken others beside Him as Lords, saying: 'We serve them only that they bring us nearer unto God!' — of a truth God will judge between them and the faithful, concerning that wherein they differed."

¹ Tabari Tafsir, on xxi.2-8; Zamakhshari, Kashaf, on loc. cit;
Baydawi, Anwar, on loc. cit.
² Association of Cult Prophets among the Ancient Semites, pp.180 ff. which says: "The Eastern and Northwestern Semites thought, as we have seen, that it was the God who spoke through/"
This conception of the superhuman nature of the Prophet called for the Qur'anic emphasis on the human nature of the prophet, as is shown in the following Qur'anic verses:

xiv.10-13:

"And of those who lived after them? None knoweth them but God. WHEN THEIR PROPHETS CAME TO THEM WITH PROOFS OF THEIR MISSION, THEY LAID THEIR HANDS ON THEIR MOUTHS AND SAID: "In sooth, we believe not your message; and in sooth, of that to which you bid us, we are in suspicious doubt."

"Their prophets said: 'Is there any doubt concerning God, maker of the Heavens and of the Earth, who calleth you that of your sins He may forgive, and respite you until an appointed time?'

"They said: 'YE ARE VERILY BUT MEN LIKE US: FAIN WOULD YE TURN US FROM OUR FATHER'S WORSHIP, BRING US THEREFORE A CLEAR AUTHORITY.'

"THEIR APOSTLES SAID TO THEM, "WE ARE INDEED BUT MEN LIKE YOU. BUT GOD BESTOWETH FAVOURS ON SUCH OF HIS SERVANTS AS HE PLEASETH, AND IT IS NOT IN OUR POWER TO BRING YOU AN AUTHORITY."

through his instrument in the cult, whether the oracle was imparted through 'technical methods of divination' or by ecstasies. We have also seen that this same idea most probably obtained with regard to Hubal's oracle in Mecca. Thus the fact that the God is thought to speak through the 'Priest' does not necessarily indicate ecstasy. But the most natural assumption would seem to be that the Arabs too believed that it was the God who spoke the ecstatic and that later WHEN THE PRE-ISLAMIC GODS WERE DEGRADED INTO DEMONS - A DEVELOPMENT WHICH HAD ALREADY BEGUN BEFORE ISLAM - THIS BELIEF WAS MODIFIED IN SUCH A WAY THAT THE KAHIN'S 'INSPIRATION' BEGAN TO BE REGARDED AS PROCEEDING FROM THE JINN. THIS CONCEPTION IS IMPLIED BY PROF. NYBERG WHEN HE SURMISES THAT AMR IBN LQAY'S RA'IA; ABU TUMAMA WAS REALLY A LOCAL GOD WHO LATER BECAME KHOZAMB'S GUARDIAN SPIRIT. WELHAUSEN ALSO ASSUMES WITH REFERENCE TO AGHANI, viii, p. 66, l.5 THAT SUCH WAS THE ORIGINAL CONCEPTION (AGHANI ix, p. 84; xi. 3 ff.) The KAHIN 'Awf ibn Rabi'a addressed the 'Asadites: "O my servants" and they reply: "At thy service, our Lord", which is the usual form of address to the God. In other words the KAHIN is regarded as speaking on behalf of or as identical with the God." For more illustration of this conception see the continuation of Haldar in ibid.
xviii.110:
"SAY: I AM ONLY A MAN LIKE YOU. IT IS ONLY
REVEALED TO ME THAT YOUR GOD IS ONE GOD: LET
HIM THEN WHO HOPETH TO MEET HIS LORD WORK A
RIGHTeous WORK: NOR LET HIM GIVE ANY OTHER
CREATURE SHARE IN THE WORSHIP OF HIS LORD."

xxi.3:
"And they who do this wrong say in secret
discourse, 'IS HE MORE THAN A MAN LIKE
YOURSELVES? WILL YE, THEN, WITH YOUR EYES
OPEN, ACCEDE TO SORCERY?"

"Then said the chiefs of the people who
believed not, 'THIS IS BUT A MAN LIKE YOUR-
SELVES: HE PAIN WOULD RAISE HIMSELF ABOVE
YOU: BUT HAD IT PLEASED GOD TO SEND, HE
WOULD HAVE SENT ANGELS: WE HEARD NOT OF THIS
WITH OUR SIRES OF OLD.'

xxvi.154. Speaking of the people to whom Salih
was sent.
"They said, 'Certainly thou art a person bewitched;
THOU ART ONLY A MAN LIKE US: PRODUCE NOW A SIGN
IF THOU ART A MAN OF TRUTH.'"

"When we sent two unto them and they charged them
both with imposture - therefore with a third we
strengthened them: and they said, "verily we
are the Sent unto You of God.
"They said, 'YE ARE ONLY MEN LIKE US: NOTHING
HATH THE GOD OF MERCY SENT DOWN; IN SOOTH YE
DO BUT LIE.'

xli.5.
"Say: 'I am only a man like you. It is revealed to
me that your God is one God. Act uprightly then
with Him, and implore his pardon. And woe to
those who join Gods with God."

lxiv.6.
"This, for that when their apostles came to them with
the clear tokens, they then said, "Shall men be our
guides?" And they believed not and turned their
backs. But God can dispense with them; and God is
Rich, Praiseworthy!"

1 Compare xxiii.34 ff. 2 Compare xxvi.158; xi.29.
3 Although Moslem commentators say that the whole of Sura lxiv. is
Medinian, yet Weil and Mir suppose it to be Meccan. (cf. Rodwell,
Koran, p.406, n.4).
vi.91. "And no just estimate do they form of God when they say: "NOTHING HATH GOD SENT DOWN TO MAN." SAY: WHO SENT DOWN THE BOOK WHICH MOSES BROUGHT; A LIGHT AND GUIDANCE TO MAN, WHICH YE SET DOWN ON PAPER, SHOWING PART, BUT CONCEALING MOST; THOUGH WE HAVE NOW BEEN TAUGHT THAT WHICH NEITHER YE NOR YOUR FATHER KNEW? SAY: GOD: "THEN LEAVE THEM IN THEIR PASTIME OF CAVILLINGS."

xvii.96-98
......; NOR WILL WE BELIEVE IN THY MOUNTING UP, TILL THOU SEND DOWN TO US A BOOK WHICH WE MAY READ: "SAY: PRAISE BE TO MY LORD! AM I MORE THAN A MAN. "AND WHAT HINDERETH MEN FROM BELIEVING, WHEN THE GUIDANCE HATH COME TO THEM, BUT THAT THEY SAY, "HATH GOD SENT A MERE MAN AS APOSTLE?". "SAY: DID ANGELS WALK THE EARTH AS ITS FAMILIARS, WE HAD SURELY SENT THEM AN ANGEL-APOSTLE OUT OF HEAVEN."

Mohammed's claims that his revelations are based on divine authority, require an explanation as to how he receives these revelations.

According to Tabari Tafsir on vi.91. There are two views explaining the occasion on which this verse was revealed, according to the first the people who denied the prophecy of the human being are the Jews, according to the other they are Pagan Arabs. According to Rodwell: Korân, p.351, n.4. "This verse and the following were probably Kedinian"; "at least" he says "it is difficult to conceive that Mohammed would have ventured thus to have written at Mecca. See Sprenger, Leben p.294 n." It should be noticed here that the Korân shows that even in its polemics against the Jews and the Christians, this conception of the superhuman nature of the prophet is contested; e.g. in iii.73, 74 we read:

"It besemeth not a man, that God should give him the scriptures and the Wisdom, and Prophecy, and that there he should say to man, "Become worshippers of me, as well as of God."; but rather, "Become learned in things pertaining to God; since ye know the scripture and have studied them."

"And God doth not command you to take to yourselves the Angels or the Prophets as lords. Would He enjoin unbelief on you after ye have become Muslims?"
In lIII.4 ff. we notice that Mohammed claims that his revelations were given to him by a certain being who is called "Terrible in Power" and whose manifestation in the highest point of the horizon suggests a divine or semi-divine nature. This manifestation of this being, and his descent, were to Mohammed the "GREATEST OF THE SIGNS OF HIS LORD", and that he was not speaking from mere impulse.

Moslem commentators identified this "being" with Gabriel,\(^1\)

\(^1\) The mention of the name Gabriel in the Qur'an occurs three times in the Medinan period. One is ii.91: "Say, whoso is the enemy of Gabriel - for he verily it is who by God's permission hath caused the Qur'an to descend on thy heart, in confirmation of previous revelations, and guidance, and good tidings to the faithful"; the second is ii.92: "Whoso is an enemy to God or his angels, or to Gabriel, or to Michael, shall have God as his enemy: for verily God is an enemy to the unbelievers." According to Tabari, Tafsir, on ii.91,2; these verses were said against the Jews who asked Mohammed to tell them who is his guardian angel, when he answered that it was Gabriel, the Jews said: "On this we depart from thee. Had there been any other guardian angel to you besides Gabriel we would have accepted you as prophet." Their reason was given to be that they considered Gabriel as their enemy. Another tradition relates the same explanation but instead of saying that they asked him about his guardian angel, it says they asked him concerning the Spirit and when he answered them saying: "The Spirit is Gabriel" they were reported to have said "he is our enemy." The cause of their enmity is given to be that Gabriel comes to them with hardship and bloodshed.

Although we have no direct reference in the Hebrew traditions to see the significance of these verses, yet there is an indication to show that the Jews considered Michael as superior in rank to Gabriel. (Cf. L.E. Gabriel Vol.V.p.541.) Moreover we find in (Enoch xx) that Michael was considered as the guardian angel of Israel and is called the high priest of the heaven, and is occupied in heaven, while Gabriel is the messenger of God, and the executor of His will on earth.
and went a step further by suggesting that this being is called the "Holy Spirit" and "The Faithful Spirit" in verses xvi.104 and xxvi.193 which read:

xvi.104:
"Say The Holy Spirit hath brought it down with truth from thy Lord that He may establish those who have believed and a guidance and glad tidings to the Moslems."

xxvi.193:
"The Faithful Spirit hath come down with it upon thy heart that thou mightest become a warner in the clear Arabic tongue."

This implies that the mode of revelation was conceived to be transmitted to Mohammed through an intermediary angelic being whom they called (at least in these cases) Gabriel. This conception could not be established. As we notice the study of the Qor'anic references to the (ROH) (Spirit) reveals that it was conceived differently in different verses. Sometimes it is used hypostatically (personified), while in others it is used as the divine gift of Prophecy (not personified). These different usages of the word Spirit led the Jews to ask him to specify what he means by the Spirit. His answer was "THE SPIRIT PROCEEDETH AT MY LORD'S COMMAND" and introduces us to an extremely important phase of Mohammed's conception of the relation between God and the prophet which will be discussed later on in this thesis.

1 See Appendix A. "The Qor'anic References to the Word 'ROH'.
2 The commentators are not in agreement as to whether the Jews asked Mohammed directly or induced Qaysaysh to ask him. See Tahari Tafsir, on xvii.87 who favours the former view.
3 See Qor'an xvii.87: AND THEY WILL ASK THEE OF THE SPIRIT. SAY: THE SPIRIT PROCEEDETH AT MY LORD'S COMMAND: BUT OF THE KNOWLEDGE HEREOF ONLY A LITTLE IS GIVEN TO YOU."
Mohammed's appeal to the Jews to accept him as a prophet is shown in the following Qur'anic verses:

11.38:¹
"O Children of Israel! remember my favour wherewith I showed favour upon you, and be true to your covenant with Me; I will be true to my covenant with you: Me therefore, revere Me; and believe in what I have sent down confirming your Scriptures, and be not the first to disbelieve it neither for a mean price barter my signs: Me therefore, fear Me."

In this verse the Qur'anic appeal to the Jews rests on two claims: (a) that the Qur'an is the confirmation of their scripture, and (b) to accept Mohammed as the prophet whose coming is foretold in their scripture.²

The second aspect of this appeal and its connection with the covenant made between God and the prophets is mentioned directly in iii.75 of the Qur'an in the following way:

"Moreover, when God entered into covenant with the Prophets, He said, 'This is the Book and the Wisdom which I give you; hereafter SHALL A PROPHET COME UNTO YOU TO CONFIRM THE SCRIPTURES ALREADY WITH YOU. YE SHALL SURELY BELIEVE ON HIM, AND YE SHALL SURELY AID HIM. ARE YE RESOLVED?' said He, 'AND DO YE ACCEPT MY COVENANT ON THESE TERMS?' THEY SAID 'WE ARE RESOLVED'; 'BE YE THEN THE WITNESSES', said He, 'AND I WILL BE A WITNESS AS WELL AS YOU.'"³

¹ Compare Ibn Hisham, Sira, p.178.
² This is the explanation given by Moslem commentators on this verse.
³ Compare ii.83 which reads:
"And/
It is difficult to say whether the origin of this verse ought to be traced to the Jewish or the Christian writings, since in both of these writings we find similar promises made. In the Acts of the Apostles vii.37 we read:

This is that Moses, which said unto the children of Israel, A prophet shall the Lord your God raise up unto you of your brethren, like unto me; him shall ye hear. This is he, that was in the church in the wilderness with the angel which spake to him in the mount Sinai, and with our fathers: who received the lively oracles to give unto us. To whom our fathers would not obey, but thrust him from them, and in their hearts turned back again into Egypt.

3 (ed.) "And when a Book came to them from God confirming that which they had received already - although they had before prayed for victory over those who believed not - yet when that QOR'AN came to them, of which they had knowledge, they did not recognize it. The curse of God then is on the infidels." Rodwell, Koran p.376, n.3 tells us "Dr Sprenger (i.160) supplies the word "MESSIAS" and renders, "yet when he, the Messiah, came..." understanding the passage of Mohammed's claims to be the Messiah promised in Hag.ii.8(7) where the Hebrew root is identical with that of MOHAMMED, though in a different sense." Compare Is.xliv.9 in Hebrew.

Cf. Tabari. Annals, p.1209 tells us the tradition speaking of the meeting of Mohammed with the Khazrajites (who came to Mecca to seek Qeraysh's support in their wars against the Aws and the Jews) who were reported to have said, after he balled them to accept Islam: "Behold this is the promised prophet who is expected to come. Let us accept him before they do" (meaning the Jews); cf. also Ibn Hish. Sira, pp.370,373; see also Ibn Hish., Sira pp.178, and Hirschfeld, Essai (R.E.J.) viiiip.191; where they tell us that the Jews sent certain delegates to Mecca to see and examine Mohammed and to report whether he is the Messiah or not.

1 Cf. also Acts of the Apostles iii. 22, 26.
Deut.xviii.18 ff.: "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him. And it shall come to pass, that whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name I will require it of him. But the prophet, which shall speak a word presumptuously in my name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that he shall speak in the name of other Gods, that same prophet shall die."

Or possibly it has its source in the account given by the Rabbis in their commentaries on the covenant on Mount Sinai, which says:¹ (the address is to Moses)

"Thou seest only what is to happen in the near future, that Israel is to receive the TORAH on Mount Sinai, but I behold what cometh after, how the people will worship the steer, the figure of which they still see upon my chariot, even while my revelation will be made on Sinai. Thus they will excite my wrath; NEVERTHELESS, THOUGH I KNOW ALL THE PERVERSENESS OF THEIR HEARTS WHEREIN THEY WILL REBEL AGAINST ME IN THE DESERT, I WILL REDEEM THEM NOW FOR I ACCORD UNTO MAN THE TREATMENT OF MERITS FOR HIS PRESENT ACTIONS, NOT WHAT HE WILL DESERVE IN THE FUTURE."

On these bases Mohammed acclaimed himself to be the prophet whose coming was foretold in the Scriptures and whose mission was to guide the Jews who perverted their Scriptures. This claim is shown in the following Qorʾanic verses:

vii.156-159: "Who follow the Apostle, the unlettered² Prophet whom..."

² The word used is َأَلْبَيْنَوْ (unlettered). Bell Qurʾān ii.73 tells us that the word is of uncertain meaning. Tabari's authorities, Tafsīr ii.73 give the following meaning to the word: (a) illiterate, (b) a group of people who believe in neither the message of the prophet nor in the Sacred Writings. Although/
they find described with them in the Law and Evangel. What is right will he enjoin them, and forbid them what is wrong, and will allow them healthful viands, and prohibit the impure, and will ease them of their burden, and of the yokes which were upon them; and those who believe in him, and strengthen him, and help him, and follow the light which hath been sent down with him, - these are they with whom it shall be well.

Say to them: O men! verily I am unto you all the Apostle of God:"

In this last verse we see that Mohammed claims that his Prophecy is for all mankind, and not to one particular group of people. The revelation contained in this verse might have been occasioned by the Jewish contention that Mohammed was a prophet sent to the Arabs only. This might be shown from Tabari’s commentary on ii.71 which reads:

"And when they fall in with those who have believed they say, "We believe;" but when they are apart one with the other, they say, "Will ye acquaint them with what God hath revealed to"

Tabari prefers the first meaning, yet we find that the word is to be rendered differently, and here we go back to Tabari himself, who, in his commentary on ii.71 gives a tradition ascribed to Ibn ’Abbas which says that some of the Jews say to the believers "We believe in your prophet that he is SENT BY GOD BUT HE WAS ESPECIALLY SENT TO YOU." Tabari, Tafsir on vii.156, explains the word مُعْتَرَب as illiterate, but we are inclined to take it to mean the Gentile (cf. Horovitz J.P.N. p.190) after connecting it with ii.71 in the following manner:

The Jews believed that Mohammed is a true prophet sent by God to the Gentiles (i.e. the Arabs) and not to them. Cf. Qer.xxxiv.27
you, that they may dispute with you about it in the presence of your Lord?" Do ye not then understand their aim?"

According to a tradition ascribed to Ibn Abbas the Jews say to the believers: "We believe in your friend but he is a prophet for you especially."

The Reaction of the Jews to Mohammed's Claims for Prophecy.

The claim of Mohammed did not have an active effect on the Jews as a whole, although we find that some of the Jews accepted Islam and testified that Mohammed was the prophet whose coming was foretold in the Scriptures. 2

Their reaction against his claims for prophecy is perhaps manifested in the following verses of the Qur’ân:

iii.179:
"To those who say: 'Verily . . . God hath enjoined us that we are not to credit an apostle until he presents us a sacrifice which fire out of heaven shall devour."

and iv.152:
"The People of the Book will ask of thee to cause a Book to come down unto them out of Heaven."

1 Cf. Tab. Tafsir on ii.71.
2 Cf. iv.159,160: "But those of them who are firmly rooted in knowledge and the believers who believe in that which hath been sent down to thee, and in what hath been sent down before thee, and observe prayer, and pay the alms of obligation, and believe in God and the latter day - these! we will give them a great reward.

Tabari, Tafsir on xiii.43 tells us that Mohammed used these Jewish converts to Islam to testify his claims.
These two verses clear up for us an important aspect of the Jews towards Mohammed's claims for Prophecy. The former shows that the Jews of Medinah were relying on their Biblical tradition which is possibly connected with either

(a) I Kings xviii.17 ff. where we are told of the activities of the prophet Elijah and his contest with the prophets of Ba'alim, which resulted in Elijah's suggestion to Ahab to gather to him all Israel on Mount Carmel and to call the prophets of Ba'al, and the prophets of Asherah, where they would prepare two sacrifices, one to Ba'al and one to the Lord, and the accepted sacrifice, by being consumed by the Fire descending from heaven, would prove the truth of either the religious teachings of the prophets of Ba'al or those of Elijah. The prophets of Ba'al, we are told, were the first to prepare the sacrifice, but they failed and were mocked by Elijah. When Elijah prepared the offering and called on the Lord, his offering was accepted, and the Fire consumed it.

or (b) II. Chronicles vii.1, where we read:

"Now when Solomon had made an end of praying THE FIRE came down from heaven and consumed the burnt offering and the sacrifice, and the Glory of the Lord had filled the Lord's House."
It is highly probable that the Jews who asked Mohammed these things must have had these Biblical traditions in mind and thus we can see that they, like their predecessors, were on guard against the false prophets.¹

¹ The Old Testament is full of material concerning the false prophets: Perhaps the earliest account is that which is given in the Book of Deuteronomy. In Deut.xiii.2-6 (RV.1-5); (xviii. 20-22) the false prophet is designated there as "Prophet, or a dreamer of dreams". And in the same scriptural dicta the Talmud discovers provisions against the following classes of false prophets:

(a) one who presumes to speak in God's name what He has not commanded (xviii.20)

(b) one who pretends to have been charged with a message which in reality God has entrusted to another

(c) one who speaks in the name of other Gods (Deut.xiii.3, xviii.20).

The criteria by which a prophet is distinguished as false are in the view of rabbinical Jurisprudence, partly expressed and partly implied in the Deuteronomic dicta:

(a) one who has "spoken to turn you away from the Lord" (xiii. 6). There can never be another Moses with a different Law (Deut.R.viii.6. Comp.Bab.104a). Hence, whose professes to have received revelations changing the Law is a false prophet.

(b) when the things predicted "follow not, nor come to pass (Deut.xviii.22). This test is applicable only when the alleged revelation has reference to the near future, where his prediction concerns a distant period the Skeptic will say (Ezek.xii.27: "The vision that he seeth is for many days to come, and he prophesieth of the times that are afar off," But even there the prophecy concerns the immediate future this test if not always applicable.

(c) The Test of Miracles. (Deut.xiii.2), is the weakest of all tests since the prophet whose teachings are in strict accord with the Law of God needs no corroboration, while one who suggests the worship of strange Gods, even temporarily, or the permanent suppression of any precept embodied in that Law, is ipso facto a false prophet, and the performance of miracles cannot prove him to be a true one. (Deut.xiii.3 ff.). His suggestion when supported by a miracle is to be respected only, in order to accomplish some salutary purpose, he orders a temporary suspension
of a ritualistic law, as was the case with Elijah, who, to convince the misguided masses of the folly of Ba'al-worship invoked a miracle on the sacrifice he offered outside of the central sanctuary. (I Kings xviii.22-39).

(The preceding data is derived from S. Mandelssohn, False Prophets. (J.E. vol.x. pp.212-213.)

"cf. Jeremiah xxiii.16:
"Thus saith Yahweh of Hosts! hearken not to the words of the prophets who prophesy unto you, they are only puffing you up. It is an observation from their own hearts that they speak not one out of the Mouth of Yahweh."

"cf. Num.xii.6:
"And he (the Lord) said, Hear now my words: If there be a prophet among you, I the Lord will make myself known unto him in a vision; I will speak with him in a dream! My servant Moses is not so, he is faithful in all mine house: with him will I speak mouth to mouth, even manifestly, and not in dark speeches"

Jeremiah in his polemics against the false prophets did not say that their functions is wholly without authority. "As a matter of fact he himself reveals that their authority may be quite as valid. He makes this clear when he says, speaking in the name of Yahweh:

"xxiii.28:
"The Prophet that hath a dream
let him relate a dream;
But one that hath MY "WORD"
LET HIM SPEAK MY WORD FAITHFULLY."

In xxiii.30 he says:
"Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets (or ask[yahweh] who steal my 'words' from one another.

Jeremiah's Tests for True Prophecy.

(1) the character of its representatives
(2) the substance of their message
(3) the forms in which they gave it out on the word of Yahweh.

Another aspect of Mohammed's reaction to this demand is shown in ii.95,96 of the Qur'an:

"And when there came to them an apostle from God, affirming the previous revelations made to them, some of those to whom the Scripture had been given, threw the Book of God behind their backs as if they knew it not:

And they followed what the Satans taught in the reign of Solomon: Not that Solomon was unbelieving, but the Satans were unbelieving. Sorcery did they teach to men, and what had been revealed to the two angels, Haroot and Maroot, at Babel. Yet no man did these two teach until they had said: 'We are only a temptation, - Be not then an unbeliever.'

From these two did men learn how to cause division between man and wife; But uncles.

In these verses, we have the Qur'an defending the faith of Solomon on the one hand, and introducing another charge against the Jews on the other. The occasion of the defence of the

(a) Against the first all immoral prophets, adulterers, are eliminated. (xxiii.13.14); xxix.23; v.7 ff.; xxiii.7; xxiii.15.

To him the true mark of the True Prophet is shown in xxiii.22 'Turn back my people from their ways.'

(b) Only the prophet of disaster is truly sent by Yahweh. xxiii.29: "Is not my word like a fire, like a hammer that shatters the rock."

(c) False prophets have lying visions, and idle divination and deceit of the mind.

xiv.14: "They steal My Word from one another." xxiii.30. They take their tongues and bring forth an oracular utterance.

Jeremiah uses three qualifications of the true prophet in contrast to the false:

(a) He is one who HAS STOOD IN THE COUNCIL OF YAHWEH. xxiii.18,22.

(b) He HAS HEARD THE WORD OF YAHWEH. xxiii.18,21,28; xiv.14.

(c) He IS SENT BY YAHWEH. xxiii.21,32; xiv.14.
beliefs of Solomon might be connected with verses 111.179,180 in which the Jews asked Mohammed to prove his claims of Prophecy by causing fire to descend from heaven and consume his sacrifices.

In his answer to them, as we have seen, he charged them with unbelief. In these verses, he does not only charge them with unbelief but with a more serious accusation that they accused Solomon unjustly of being an unbeliever.

According to Tabari\(^1\) the Israelites at the time of Solomon used to hold the same views as the pre-Islamic Arabs in believing that the Jinn (the demons) used to steal the Divine secrets and tell them to the prophets or the priests. According to him, the Jews under the incitation of Satan accused Solomon of having his instructions in this manner. He narrates the following story to show the causes which led the Israelites to hold such a conception and thus to accuse Solomon of being an unbelievers. He tells us that when Solomon died, Satan appeared to the Israelites in a human form and told them that Solomon used to rule over the demons, the birds, the beasts, and the people through certain knowledge he got from certain books which he buried under his throne (these books according to Tabari were the records of the stolen Divine secrets which the Demons transmitted to the Israelites and which were condemned by Solomon, and his order was to collect all these books. When the books were collected he buried them

\(^{1}\) Tafsir, on 11.95.96.
under his throne). The Satan told them, further, if they uncover these books they will be able to have the same sovereignty as that of Solomon. The narrative goes on to say that they uncovered these books from under Solomon's throne and thus accused Solomon of sorcery. This commentary reflects only a partial knowledge of what seems to be the causes which led Mohammed to defend the faith of Solomon.

When the Jews asked Mohammed to prove his prophecy, Mohammed asked them: why did they not believe in their prophets in general and in Solomon in particular, who according to II. ch. vii. 1 ff. was accepted in the sight of the Lord and the fire descended from heaven and devoured his burnt offering and sacrifices. They not only misbelieved in Solomon but they called him a polytheist.

According to I Kings xi. 4-7:

"For it came to pass, when Solomon was old, that his wives turned away his heart after other Gods: and his heart was not perfect with the Lord his God, as was the heart of David his father. For Solomon went after Ashtoreth, the Goddess of Zidonians, and after Milcom, the Abomination of the Ammonites. And Solomon did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord and went not fully after the Lord, as did David his father. Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the Abomination of Moab, in the mount that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the Abomination of the children of Ammon. And so did he for all his strange wives which burnt incense and sacrificed unto their Gods."
Solomon was considered to be a polytheist. Muhammad's knowledge of the I Kings xi.4-7 passage is reflected in xxxviii.33 ff. of the Qur'an:

"We also made trial of Solomon, and placed a phantom on his throne: whereupon he returned to us in penitence. He said, O my Lord! pardon me, and give me a dominion that may not be met for any one besides me; for thou verily art the liberal giver."

Thus according to the Qur'an although Solomon fell into temptation and erred yet he did repent and followed God's ways. What seems to be important in the implication of this verse is what seems to be the Jewish claim that Solomon was ruling over the wide dominion of beasts, demons, and other things through magic.

Again here, the Qur'an stands to defend Solomon and to present the whole problem of sorcery as against Divine revelation.

From the Apocryphal literature Muhammad knew of the narrative of the Fallen Angels, the cause of which was the introduction of the doctrine of sin.

According to the Apocryphal book of the life of Adam and Eve, Satan was expelled from heaven because he disobeyed the order of Michael to worship the image of God the Lord. The Devil said in answer to Michael: "I have no (need) to

worship Adam; and since Michael kept urging me to worship, I said to him: "Why doest thou urge me? I will not worship an inferior and younger being (than I). I am his senior in the creation, before he was made was I already made. It is his duty to worship me."

This narrative is reproduced in the Qur'an in the following way: 1

"We created you; then fashioned you; then said We to the angels, 'Prostrate yourselves unto Adam' And they all bowed down in worship, save Iblis: He was not of those who prostrated themselves! To him said God: "What hath hindered thee from prostrating thyself in worship at my bidding?" He said, "Nobler am I than he: me hast thou created of fire - and of clay hast thou created him."

He said, "Get thee down hence: Paradise is no place for thy pride: Go forth then, verily one of the despised shalt thou be."

He said, "Respite me till the day when mankind shall be raised from the dead."

He said, "Verily one of the respited shalt thou be."

"He said, "Because then thou hast caused me to err, surely in the straight path will I lay wait for them: then will I surely come upon them from before and from behind and from their right hand and from their left, and thou shalt not find the greater part of them to be thankful."

He said, "Go forth from hence, a scorned, a banished one! Whoever of them shall follow thee, I will surely fill hell with you, one and all." And, O Adam! dwell thou and thy wife in Paradise, and eat ye whence ye will, but to this tree approach not, lest ye become of the unjust doers."

The Satan whispered them to show them their nakedness, which had been hidden from them both;

1 Cf. vii. 10 ff.
and he said: 'This tree your Lord hath not forbidden you, only lest ye should become angels, or become immortals.' And he swore to them both, 'Verily I am unto you one who counselleth aright.' So he beguiled them to their fall by deceits: and when they had tasted of the tree, their nakedness appeared to them, and they began to sew together upon themselves the leaves of the garden. And their Lord called to them, "Did I not forbid you this tree, and did I not say to you, 'Verily, Satan is your declared enemy'?".

Accordingly the narrative goes on to speak of the fall of man from heaven and the introduction of sin on earth. This fall of man initiated another fall, the fall of the angels. Al-Mugaddasi narrates this fall in the following way. God said that He is about to assign a vice-regent on earth: "Do you want to make in it some one to lead corruption and initiate bloodshed while we are praising and sanctifying thee?" God told them "Verily, I know what ye know not." Al-Mugaddasi goes on to narrate that when Adam fell and his generation led corruption and did the evil, the angels said to God:

"30 Lord, are these the people whom you appointed upon earth?" God ordered them to choose three of their chiefs to descend on earth to teach Adam's generation how to be righteous. They did, but while they were on earth a woman came to them and they were attracted by her beauty and they drank wine, and killed the soul, and did that which was not right. They taught this woman the formula through which they used to ascend to

---

2 Qor. ii. 28 ff.
heaven and by the use of this formula she ascended to heaven and she was transformed into a star and ever since she was known as Venus."

According to Wensinck, only two angels were chosen to descend to earth, these were, according to him, Harūth and Marūt whom he identifies with Azael and Shannāzār who according to the Book of Enoch, chapter vi, had voluntarily sinned and who "taught men to make swords, and knives, and shields, and breast-plates, and made known to them the metals (of the earth) and the art of working them, and bracelets, and ornaments, and the use of antimony, and the beautifying of the eyelids and all kinds of costly stones, and all colouring tinctures." The story of the Fall of Angels is told in a different manner in the Book of Jubilees, where it is stated that the purpose of the fall of angels was carried by the will of God who sent the watchers to the earth to "instruct the children of men to do judgement and uprightness." The stay of the three watchers (angels) on earth exposed them to sin and thus they were attracted by the women on earth and lusted with them. This sin of the Fallen Angels had its reaction on the angels in heaven. This reaction is expressed in Enoch ix, where we read that Michael, Uriel, Raphael and Gabriel looked down from

1 Harūt and Marūt (B.I. vol.II, p.272 b).
2 According to the Greek version of the Book of Enoch (see Charles' edition, note 2 p.19) the children of men made (them) for themselves and theirs and transgressed and led astray the holy ones.
3 iv.15 and v.1 ff.
heaven and saw much blood being shed upon the earth. They said:

"The Lord of Ages, Lord of Lords, God of Gods, King of Kings (and God of Ages), the Throne of Thy Glory (standeth) unto all generations of the ages, and Thy name holy and glorious and blessed unto all ages! Thou hast made all things, and power over all things hast Thou: and all things are naked and open in Thy sight, and all things Thou seest, and nothing can hide itself from Thee. Thou seest what Azazel hath done, who hath taught all unrighteousness on earth and revealed the eternal secrets which were (preserved) in heaven, which men were striving to learn. And Serjaza, to whom Thou hast given authority to bear rule over his associates, and they have gone to the daughters of men upon the earth and have slept with women, and have defiled themselves, and revealed to them all kinds of sins. And the women have borne giants, and the whole earth has thereby been filled with blood and unrighteousness."

In answer to this appeal, God ordered Raphael to bind Azazel, and to cast him into the darkness.

The connection between these Apocryphal narratives and the belief (or the lack of it) of Solomon is shown from the tradition which ascribes to Solomon the authorship of certain words "treating of all the sciences and particularly of magic. The legend of Solomon and Asmodeus¹ was current as early as the time of Josephus, who states ("Ant." viii.2 5) that God enabled Solomon to acquire skill to expel demons and that he left collections of incantations and directions as to the

¹ The legend is narrated in 'Emek ha-Melek' (pp.14d - 15a) republished by Jellinek and reproduced by Max Seligsohn (Solomon) (J.E. vol.xi. pp.443)
use of exorcisms (Comp. Origen, 'Epistola and Mattheam' xxvi.63).\(^1\)

Moreover, it is said: "To Solomon was revealed the book of secrets ['Sefer ha-Razim'] by means of which he ruled over demons and everything in the world."\(^2\)

Thus we can conclude that in his treatment of the defence of the faith of Solomon Moḥammed was criticising two aspects of the Jewish traditions:

(a) that Solomon taught sorcery and magic

(b) that Solomon was an unbeliever.

Another aspect of Moḥammed's appeal to the Jews to accept him as a prophet is shown from what seems to be his claim as the follower of the Abrahamic religion. This could be implied from the commentaries on iii.22.23, reading:

"Hast thou not marked those who have been given a portion of the Scriptures, when they are summoned to the Book of God that it may settle their differences? Then did a part of them turn back, and were averse. This - because they said 'The fire shall by no means touch us, but for certain days.' And their own devices have deceived them in their religion."

All the authorities of Tabari\(^3\) agree that the people concerned in this verse were the Jews; but they differed on the occasion of its revelation. Two of the traditions given on the authority of Ibn (Abbas say that when Moḥammed entered a Jewish Biblical school to call them to believe

\(^1\) Max Seligsohn, ibid. p.446\(^a\) & b.
\(^2\) Max Seligsohn, ibid. p.447\(^a\).
\(^3\) Tafsir, on iii.22.
in his mission, some of them asked him to specify his religion. His answer was that he is the follower of the religion of Abraham, they said that Abraham was a Jew. The tradition continues to say that Mohammed referred them to their scriptures but they refused. Other traditionalists say that the occasion for the revelation of this verse was that Mohammed referred them to their own scriptures to show them that his name and advent is foretold in them. It is highly probable that it is more correct to ascribe the occasion of its revelation to the former traditions (the ones which connect it with the religion of Abraham), as it clarifies more the whole attitude of Mohammed and his mission to the Jews and the Christians.

When Mohammed started his mission, he was very much inspired by the Abrahamite narratives of which he came to know. In Abraham he saw the founder of the true religion and thus he was the leader of the prophets who succeeded him and introduced his religion to their people.

Ibn Abbas' explanation of iii.123 seems to explain further verses ii.134 and iii.58 ff.

ii.134 reads:

1 Qor. iii.57 ff.; ii.129; ii.134.
2 Narratives like those which represented Abraham contesting the worship of idols. These narratives are reproduced in the Qur'\’an. cf. Qor. xix.42 ff; vi. 74 ff; xliii.25; xxvi. ; xxxvii.81 xxxviii.45; and those which represent Abraham seeking the true God and rejecting the belief in the Astral deities. Reproduced in the Qur'\’an vi.74 ff.
"Will ye say, 'Verily Abraham and Ishmael and Isaac and Jacob and the Tribes were Jews or Christians'? "Say" Who knoweth best ye or God? And who is more in fault than he who concealeth the witness which he hath from God? But God is not regardless of what ye do!"

iii.58 ff. read:
About that in which ye have knowledge; but why dispute ye about that of which ye have no knowledge? And God hath knowledge, but ye know nothing. Abraham was neither Jew nor Christian; but he was sound in faith, a Muslim; and not of those who add Gods to God. Verily they among men who are nearest to Abraham are surely those who follow him and this prophet Mohammed, and they who believe on him: But it is God who is near to the faithful.

The word 'nearest' in this verse and the word 'offspring' in ii.118 give the clue and possibly the source for these arguments. According to the Biblical teachings, both in the writings of St. Paul and the Old and New Testaments the Jews and the Christians claim their descent from Abraham.

In II.Chron.xx.7 we read:
"Art not Thou our God, who didst drive out the inhabitants of this land before thy people Israel and gavest it to the seed of Abraham thy FRIEND FOR EVER."

In the Epistle to the Galatians iii. 13 ff. we read:

1 For the "Hanif" see Appendix C.
2 "When the Lord made trial of Abraham by commands which he fulfilled, He said, 'I am about to make thee an Imam to mankind:' he said, 'of my offspring also:' 'My covenant', said God, 'embraceth not the evil-doers.'"
"Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the Law, being made a curse for us, for it is written: Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.

That the blessing of Abraham might come on the Gentiles through Jesus Christ, that we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith.

Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not and to seeds, as of many, but as of one and to thy seed which is Christ."

Again in the Epistle to the Galatians iii.8 & 9 we have:

"And the Scripture forseeing that God would justify the Gentiles on grounds of faith, announced the Gospel to Abraham beforehand saying, in thee shall all the nations be blessed."

From these verses it is clear that the Jews and the Christians were in controversy over (a) claims of descent from Abraham and (b) the question of the observance of the Law. Mohammed found in these controversies not only the importance of Abraham in the history of Monotheism, but he also found the answer to the Jews and the Christians who said: "Become ye Jews or Christians so that ye may be guided." His first claim to the pagan Arabs was thus supported and his mission that all the Prophetic missions were confirmation of the religion of Abraham was strengthened.

---

1 Compare the Epistle of St. James ii.23:

"And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, Abraham believed God, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness and he was called the friend of God."
Mohammed noticed also that the dispute between the Jews and the Christians was about whether righteousness can be obtained through 'faith' or by observing 'the Law'. These controversies are recorded in the following passages:

(a) The Epistle of St. James ii.20 ff:
"But wilt thou know, O vain man, that faith apart from works is barren? Was not Abraham our father justified by work, in that he offered up Isaac his son upon the altar. Thou seest that faith wrought with his works, and by works was faith made perfect and the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, And now Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God."

(b) in Romans iv. 1 ff. we read:
"What shall we say then that Abraham our father, as pertaining to the flesh, hath found? For if Abraham were justified by works, he hath whereof to glory, but not before God. For what saith the Scripture? Abraham believed God, and it was counted unto him for righteousness. Now to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

(c) in Romans iv.16-25:
"Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by Grace, to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed; not to that which is of the law, but to that also which is of the faith of Abraham; who is the father of us all, (as it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations,) before him whom he believed, even God, who quickeneth the dead and calleth things which he not as though they were."  

---

1 Referred to in iii.57.
(d) in Matt. iii. 9:
"And think not to say within yourselves, we have Abraham to our father: for I say unto you, that God is able of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."

(e) Justin Martyr (Tryph. LXV) tells us that they "supposed that the everlasting kingdom will be assuredly given to those who are of the seed of Abraham according to the flesh, although they be sinners and unbelieving and disobedient towards God."

The attitude of Mohammed towards this controversy was not only negative, in the sense that he rejected the claims that the Jews and the Christians were the partakers of the religion of Abraham and through him they were blessed, but was also positive in the sense that anyone would be blessed by the promise made to Abraham, if he is righteous and faithful and so we have in 11.118 that the blessing through Abraham was not to be claimed through descent from Abraham but through his faith:

"When his Lord made trial of Abraham by commands which he fulfilled, He said 'I am about to make thee an Imam to mankind'. He said 'of my offspring also'. 'My covenant', said God, 'embraceth not the evil-doers.'"

---

Again in 11.120 we read:
"And when Abraham said, 'Lord! I make this land secure, and supply its people with fruits, such of them as believe in God and the last day.' He said, 'And whoso believeth not, little therefore will I bestow on him; then will I drive him to the torment of the Fire! and ill the passage!'"

Although these verses are not connected with Mohammed's apologetic in 11.134 and iii.57, yet they reveal the conception, and perhaps the different line of thought which Mohammed formulated:

(a) that Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but the founder of Monotheism.

(b) that redemption does not come only through claim of descent but through righteousness.

We also notice from what has preceded that at this stage the conception of the Qur'an about the religion of Abraham was neither an innovation of Mohammed after his break with the Jews, as Wensinck claims. The religion of Abraham for Mohammed was, then, the introduction of Monotheism and the complete break with the ancient pagan beliefs and myths.

CHAPTER TWO

THE JEWS AND THE CHRISTIANS ARE CHARGED WITH
INTERPOLATING THEIR SCRIPTURES.

When the Jews rejected Mohammed's claim for prophecy on the
grounds which we have discussed,¹ he did not only show them that
they were an unbelieving race, and that they had rejected and
slain the prophets who previously came to them with the wisdom
and the truth;² but he charged them with interpolating their
scriptures. This accusation, according to Buhl,³ "was really
the only way of escape for Mohammed out of a dangerous situation,
when he came into closer contact with the Jews in Medina. He
had from the beginning appealed to the evidence of the 'people
of the Scripture', i.e. the Jews and the Christians, as he was
firmly convinced that the contents of the Old and New Testament
coincided with what he preached on the basis of his revelations.
But his ideas of incidents and laws in the Old Testament con-
tained such misunderstandings that they naturally provoked
criticism and ridicule from the Jews and thus he was put in a
false position. If his expositions were contradictory to the
old revealed scriptures, his claims to have received them by

¹ See supra pp. 16.
² See supra pp. 100.
³ (Tahrif) (E.I.iv. p. 618b).
divine revelation at stake. But as his consciousness of his prophetic inspiration was unassailable, there was only one thing for him to do, namely to declare that the Jews had maliciously corrupted their sacred books while he himself had given their true content. It was a bold assertion but was made easier for him by the fact that these scriptures were sealed books to his followers, while they believed firmly in the truth of his words. In this connection Mohammed uses the expression ḤARRAFA (Sura ii.70, iv.48; v.16,45), more rarely the synonym LAWA (iii.72; iv.48), or BADDALA the meaning of which is narrower "to exchange", "to put in the place of something" (ii.56, vii.16). How he pictured this alteration to himself is not clear from his words and perhaps he had no very definite idea of it: he was more concerned with the fact itself than with how it was done."

This theory of Buhl does not convey correctly the Qur'anic conception of interpolation, and Mohammed's attitude towards the Jews and the Christians. It starts with the assumption that Mohammed invented this accusation, which is not completely true. In the previous chapter, we observed that Mohammed appealed to the Jews and the Christians to accept him as the prophet whose coming was foretold in their scripture.¹ The grounds on which Mohammed appealed to them were shown to be connected with

¹ See supra pp. 14-18
the covenant which was made between God and the prophets. When the Jews rejected Mohammed he charged them with being, like their ancestors, an unbelieving race and thus lodged the following polemics against them (Qur'an iv.154):

"So, for that they have broken their covenant and have rejected the signs of God and put the prophets to death unjustly, saying the while, "Our hearts are uncircumcised"—nay, but God hath sealed for their unbelief, so that but few believe."  

1 See Qur'an iii.75. According to Rodwell, Koran, p.432, n.1. These prophets are those who assembled on Mount Sinai. Compare the Jewish legend, that all the prophets, even those who were not yet born, were present on Mount Sinai when God gave the law to Moses. See Shemot Rabba, Parashah.28, according to which not only the prophets but the Rabbis of every generation were present at the giving of the law.  

Compare also the covenant between God and the Israelites indicated by ii.75 of the Qur'an which reads:

"And when we entered into covenant with the children of Israel, we said, 'Worship none but God, and be good to your parents and kindred, and to orphans, and to the poor, and speak with men what is right, and observe prayer, and pay the stated alms.' Then turned ye away, except a few of you, and ye withdrew afar off."

2 Mohammed was not the first to utter these polemics against the Jews, as we can see that the same words were used in the Old and the New Testaments; e. g. the accusation that they slew the prophets is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, vii.52: "which of the prophets have not your fathers persecuted and they have slain"; the phrase "our hearts are uncircumcised" is found in Acts vii.51: "Ye stiffnecked and uncircumcised in heart and ears, ye always resist the Holy Spirit"; again in Ex.xxxiii.3: "For I will not go up in the midst of thee; for thou art a stiffnecked people"; Deut.x.16: "Circumcise therefore the foreskin of your heart, and be no more stiffnecked"; Jer.ix.25: "and all the house of Israel are uncircumcised in the heart."; Jer.vii.25: "Since the day that your fathers came forth out of the land of Egypt unto this day, I have sent unto you all my servants the prophets... 26. Yet they hearkened not unto me, nor inclined their ear but made their NECK STIFF, they did worse than their fathers. And thou shalt speak all these words unto them; but they will not
The charge of breaking their covenant is added to the charge of interpolating their scriptures in v. 16 of the Qorʾān which reads:

"So for their breaking their covenant we have cursed them, and have hardened their hearts. THEY SHIFT THE WORDS OF SCRIPTURE FROM THEIR PLACES (YIQARIFONA AL-KALIMA 'AN MAVADI' IH) and forgotten part of what they were taught."

The Qorʾān in ii. 55, and vii. 161-62 give us a specimen of the Jewish interpolation of the Divine word or the Divine Commandments:

"And when it was said to them 'Dwell in this city and eat therefrom what ye will, and say 'HITTATUN' and enter the gate with prostrations, then will we pardon your offences - we will give increase to the doers of Good.'

Then the evil-doers among them CHANGED THAT WORD INTO ANOTHER THAN THAT WHICH HAD BEEN TOLD THEM: THEREFORE SENT WE FORTH WRATH OUT OF HEAVEN UPON THEM FOR THEIR EVIL DOINGS."

The meaning, and the significance of the word HITTAH is not clear. Horovitz\(^2\) tells us: "Neither the explanation of Hirschfeld\(^3\), nor that of Leszynski\(^4\) is satisfactory, and the word continues to remain obscure."

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{hearken unto thee}; thou shalt also call unto them; but they will not answer thee"; cf. Jer. xxv. 4; xxvi. 5; xxx. 19; xxxv. 15.
\item Compare Numbers xxvii. 14. "For ye rebelled against my commandment in the desert of Zin, in the strife of the congregation."
\itemCompare Isa. lxiii. 10. "But they rebelled, and grieved his holy Spirit."
\end{itemize}

1 Compare Qorʾān v. 46. "They shift the words of the law from their places and say, 'If this be brought to you, then beware of it."
2 J.P.N. p. 198.
3 New Researches, p. 107, who with Geiger followed Sacy, and connected it with the Hebrew word ֶלַחְנַה, who suggests that it is a derivation from ֶלַחְנָה.
If the word HITTAH is connected with forgiveness, and the verse is a reference to the narrative of the entry of the Jew to the Holy Land; then it is very likely that Mohammed was using the word in connection with God's promise to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob mentioned in Exodus xxxiii.1-3:

"And the Lord spake unto Moses, Depart, go up hence, thou and the people which thou hast brought up out of the land of Egypt, unto the land of which I sware unto Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob, saying, Unto thy seed will I give it: And I will send an angel before thee; and I will drive out the Canaanite, the Amorite, and the Hittite, and the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite: unto a land flowing with milk and honey: for I will not go up in the midst of thee; for thou art a stiffnecked people: lest I consume thee in the way."

and to the act of forgiveness which the Lord was gracious to bestow on the Israelites which is referred to in Ex.xxxiv.6,7:

"And the Lord passed by before him, and proclaimed, the Lord, the Lord, a God full of compassion and Gracious, slow to anger, and plenteous in mercy and truth: KEEPING MERCY FOR THOUSANDS, FORGIVING INIQUITY AND TRANSGRESSION AND SIN ".

In the light of these possible connections between the Qur'anic verse ii.55 and Ex.xxxiii.1-3, xxxiv.6,7. we can explain the word HITTAH in the following way:

When the Jews rejected Mohammed's appeal for accepting him as a prophet he charged them with being unbelievers, and ungrateful to God who bestowed on them many gracious acts. As an example of these acts, Mohammed mentioned to them the story of the Exodus¹ and reminded them of the many sins they had committed

¹ ii.46.
in the desert\textsuperscript{1}. Then God forgave them and allowed them to enter the Holy Land, and asked them to repent. This act of Penitence which was required according to ii.56 of the Qur\textsuperscript{an} is their saying \textit{\textarcdegree}\textsuperscript{2}\textdegree\textsuperscript{a}, which as suggested above has its Hebrew equivalent \textit{\textarcdegree}\textsuperscript{b}\textsuperscript{b} and as the Arabic word \textit{\textarcdegree}\textsuperscript{c}\textsuperscript{c} means (sinned) and if added to the personal pronoun implies a confession, then we suggest that Mohammed, in this verse, wanted the Jews to remember that they have sinned and not to sin again by refusing him. This suggestion, and the connection of the word \textit{\textarcdegree}\textsuperscript{d}\textsuperscript{d} with the conception of interpolation suggest another connection with another two verses of the Qur\textsuperscript{an}:

(a) ii.74:
"And they say, 'The fire of Hell will certainly not touch us, but for computed days: Say: Have ye received such a promise from God? Then God will not break his promise: or, Speak ye of God that which ye know not.'"

and (b) v.21:
"Moreover the Jews and the Christians say, 'Sons are we of God and His beloved.' Say: why then doth He chastise you for your sins? Nay ye are but a part of the men whom He hath created! He pardoneth whom He pleaseth, and chastiseth whom He pleaseth, and with God is the sovereignty of the Heavens and of the Earth, and all that is between them, and unto Him do all things return."

---

\textsuperscript{1} Of these he mentions their worship of the Golden Calf. ii.48, 52,86; iv.152; vii.146; xx.90,93.

Compare also Qur\textsuperscript{an}, v.24 ff. "Enter, O my people! the holy Land which God hath destined for you. And turn not back, lest ye be overthrown to your ruin." They said, "O Moses. Lo! There\textsuperscript{h}in are men of might. And verily, we can by no means enter it till they be gone, but if they go forth from it then verily will we enter in.... THEY SAID O MOSES! BY NO MEANS CAN WE ENTER WHILE THEY REMAIN THEREIN, GO THOU AND THE LORD AND FIGHT, LO HERE WILL WE SIT US DOWN."

\textsuperscript{2} Cf. Qur\textsuperscript{an}, iii.23.
According to Moslem commentators ii.74 was said in reply to the Jews who said that the punishment of God will be incurred by them only for certain days whose number is equivalent to the number of days in which they sinned in the desert; similarly they said that (v.21) was said to Mohammed by both Jews and Christians in reply to his threats that if they do not believe in his mission they will face at the day of Judgement the Divine Punishment.

It is very likely that (v.21) refers to St John's mention of the argument between the Jews and Christ concerning the forgiveness of the sins and the claims of the Jews that they are the Sons of God:

**St. John, viii.31 ff.**

"Then said Jesus to those Jews which believed on him, if ye continue in my word, then are ye my disciples indeed; And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. They answered him, we be Abraham's seed, 1 and were never in bondage to any man: how sayest thou, ye shall be made free? Jesus answered them, verily, verily, I say unto you, WHOSOEVER COMMITTETH SIN IS THE SERVANT OF SIN. And the servant abideth not in the house for ever: BUT THE SON ABIDETH EVER. If the SON therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed. I know that ye are Abraham's seed, but ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you. I speak that which I have seen with my Father: and ye do that which ye have seen with your father. THEY/"

---

1 See supra pp. 34-35 for the Qur'anic discussion about Abraham in general, and its answer to the Jewish and Christian claims of being the seed of Abraham in particular (supra p. 36).
THEY ANSWERED AND SAID UNTO HIM, ABRAHAM IS OUR FATHER. JESUS SAITH UNTO THEM, IF YE WERE ABRAHAM'S CHILDREN, YE WOULD DO THE WORKS OF ABRAHAM.

BUT NOW YE SEEK TO KILL ME, A MAN THAT HATH TOLD YOU THE TRUTH, WHICH I HAVE HEARD OF GOD: THIS DID NOT ABRAHAM.

YE DO THE DEEDS OF YOUR FATHER.

THEN SAID THEY TO HIM, WE BE NOT BORN OF FORNICATION, WE HAVE ONE FATHER EVEN GOD.

JESUS SAID UNTO THEM, IF GOD WERE YOUR FATHER, YE WOULD LOVE ME: FOR I PROCEED FORTH AND CAME FROM GOD; NEITHER CAME I OF MYSELF, BUT HE SENT ME."

Concerning the word הָאָרַח, the word means Sins and was used to convey a demand of an act of confession of sins. The Jews, although forgiven yet they sinned again and furthermore they said that they are the Sons of God and that God will not punish them because they are His sons and His beloved.

Another aspect of the charge of interpolation is shown in the Qur'ān in 11.70 ff. where we read:

"Desire ye then that the Jews should believe you? Yet a part of them had already heard the word of God, and then, after they had understood it, perverted it, and knew that they did so......

...... WOE THEREFORE TO THOSE WHO WITH THEIR OWN HANDS TRANSCRIBE THE BOOK, AND THEN SAY, "THIS IS FROM GOD" THAT THEY MAY SELL IT FOR SOME MEAN PRICE! WOE THEN TO THEM FOR THAT WHICH THEIR HANDS HAVE WRITTEN! AND, WOE TO THEM FOR WHAT THEY HAVE EARNED!"

Although there might be an implication that the perversion of the sacred book refers to the Qur'ān (i.e. the Jews pervert the wording of the Qur'ān), yet the mention of the words "they may

1 Cf. Qur. iii.72.
sell it for some mean price" and "woe, therefore, to those who
with their own hands transcribe the Book, and say 'This is
from God'" gives us a direct reference to Jeremiah's polemic
against the false prophets¹ which reads:

"Therefore, behold, I am against the prophets, saith the Lord, THAT STEAL MY WORDS EVERY ONE FROM HIS NEIGHBOUR. BEHOLD I AM AGAINST THE PROPHETS, SAITH THE LORD, THAT USE THEIR TONGUES, AND SAY, HE SAITH."

The important charge which the Qur'an makes against the
Jews and the Christians in connection with this accusation of
interpolation is that they have changed the original revela-
tions. This change is not a textual one but a misrepresenta-
tion and an insertion of new ideas which resulted in
sectarianism, disputes, and differences among the Jews and
Christians on the one hand, and the Christians among them-
selves on the other.

This aspect of the charge is shown in the following verse:

xi.112:
"And of old gave we Moses the Book, afterwards they fell into variance about it, and if a decree of respite had not gone forth from thy Lord there had surely been a decision between them, and verily they are still in suspicious doubt about it."

The occasion for the revelation of this verse was, according to
Tabari,² to console Mohammed so that he would not be discouraged
by the unfavourable attitude of the pre-Islamic Arabs. God,

¹ Jer.xxiii.30 ff.; compare Micah iii.5 ff.; and cf. A.R. Johnson,
The Cultic Prophet in Ancient Israel, p.44, and 30. Compare
Cor.iii.72; iv.48, where the words "pervert the Scriptures with their tongues."
² Tafsir, on xi.112.
tells him that he was not the only prophet whose mission was rejected and as an illustration He gives the response of the Israelites to Moses' mission. This interpretation of this verse does not convey the whole significance of what this verse implies. The words: "afterwards they fell into variance about it" seem to refer to the different Jewish sects who differed in their views on certain theological conceptions. The reference to the difference between the "People of the Book" is directly mentioned in ii.209 which reads:

"Mankind was but one people (one religion) and God sent the prophets to announce glad tidings and to warn, and He sent with them the Book with the Truth, that it might decide the dispute of men, and none disputed but those to whom the Book had been given, after the clear tokens had reached them through mutual jealousy. And God guided those who believed unto the Truth, whereas, by His permission they had disagreed, and God guideth whom He pleaseth into the straight path."

The mission of Mohammed thus was to clear up to them their disputes and differences. This mission is said in xvi.66 in the following way:

"And we have sent down the Book to thee only that thou mightest clear up to them the subject of their wrangling, and as a guidance and a mercy to those who believe."

1 See infra pp.77, 78
Although the reference of the pronouns "them" and "their" is not specified, yet the Qur'an goes a step further when it says in xliii.63-65:

"And when Jesus came with manifest proofs, he said: 'Now I come to you with wisdom and to clear up for you a part of those things about which ye are at variance, fear ye God, therefore, and obey me:
Verily God is my Lord and your Lord; Wherefore worship ye Him: This is a right way.
But the different parties fell into dispute among themselves; but woe to those who thus transgressed, because of the punishment of an afflictive day."

It is clear that in this verse the Qur'an is exposing its theory of the causes through which the prophets are sent. As we have seen that due to the difference of the Israelites God sent Jesus to "clear to them their differences", and to guide them to the right path, but those who came after him fell into variance concerning him2 (i.e. Jesus).

---

1 Zamakhshari, Kashaf., on xvi.66 tells us that the reference here is to the pagan Arabs who disputed and differed among themselves about the resurrection of the dead. It is to be noticed also that the Jews have differed among themselves concerning the same doctrine. The Sadducees denied the resurrection (cf. E.R. Adler, Ages of the World (Jewish) (E.R.E. vol. I. p. 204 b) who says: The Rabbis throughout their literature rebuked the Skepticism of the Sadducees who denied this dogma (Bab. xi. 1: He hath no portion in the world to come who denies that the resurrection of the dead is in the Torah.)

2 Cf. Qur.xix.38: "And the sects have fallen to variance among themselves about Jesus.
And woe, because of the witnessing place of great day, to those who believe not."

Cf. ii.254 ff.: "Some of the Apostles we have endowed more highly than others: to some God hath spoken and He hath raised others of them to loftiest grade; and to Jesus the Son of Mary we gave manifest proofs of His mission, and/
According to Muslim commentators, it was the Jews who differed about Jesus. Tabari\(^1\) tells us that after Jesus was raised to heaven, the Jews, elected four men of their Jurists (Rabbis?) (דכין) to give their opinions about Jesus. When the first was asked, he said that Jesus was God, He descended on earth to create what He wants and to put life in what He wants; after He did that He ascended again to heaven. Some of the Jews followed this opinion and were called the Jacobites. The second said that Jesus was the Son of God, those who followed his opinion were called the Nestorians. The third said that Jesus and His mother were Gods. The fourth said that He was neither God nor the Son of God but an apostle of God.

One can notice the historical misrepresentation of this commentary. On the one hand the Jacobites and the Nestorians were established a long time after the Resurrection of Jesus, and, on the other hand, the establishment of these sects did not originate in Jewish circles. These verses, although they speak

\[\text{AND WE STRENGTHENED HIM WITH THE HOLY SPIRIT.} \]
\[\text{AND IF GOD HAD PLEASED, THEY WHO CAME AFTER THEM WOULD NOT HAVE WRANGLING, AFTER THE CLEAR PROOFS HAD REACHED THEM, BUT INTO DISPUTE THEY FELL.} \]
\[\text{SOME OF THEM BELIEVED AND SOME WERE UNBELIEVERS, YET IF GOD HAD PLEASED THEY WOULD NOT HAVE THUS WRANGLED; BUT GOD DOETH WHAT HE WILL.} \]

\(^1\) Cf. Tab., Tafsir, ii.254 ff.
about the Christian heresiologies, yet they are connected with one development of the idea of the Intermediaries between God and man, and how this conception of Intermediaries developed in the Jewish thought.

The whole question of interpolation rests on the differences of the Jews and the Christians concerning Jesus, and the differences between the Christians among themselves concerning the Nature of Christ, (i.e. the HUMAN AND THE DIVINE).
CHAPTER THREE

THE POLEMICS OF THE QOR'AN AGAINST THE CONCEPTION OF

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

The polemics of the Qor'AN against the conception of the Fatherhood of God manifests itself in three ways. There are certain verses which condemn the conception in general; there is a verse or two which criticizes the conception as conceived by the Jews; and there are many verses criticizing the conception of the Divine Sonship of Christ.

We have grounds to believe that the three aspects of the polemics are connected with the Biblical teachings, and that, although the Moslem commentators assign certain verses to be directed against the pagan Arabs, yet they are connected in one way or another with the general development of the Semitic religions from Polytheism to Henotheism, to Monotheism.

In this chapter we are going to study the Qor'anic verses which reflect this development in its various stages.

The Polemics against the Conception of the Fatherhood of God in General.

In 11.110,111 of the Qor'An it is said: "They say: 'God hath begotten a son! Glory be to Him!"
Nay rather His, whatever is in the Heavens and the Earth! And when He decreeth a thing, He only saith to it 'Be' and it 'Is'."
So also in x.69 we read:

"They say: 'God hath begotten issue!' No!
Glory be to Him, He is the self-sufficient.
All that is in the Heavens and all that
is in earth is His!
Have ye warranty for that assertion? Speak
ye of God that which ye know not?"

In xviii.3 the following is said:

"And they say: 'the Merciful' hath begotten
offspring! How have ye asserted a monstrous
thing! Almost might the heavens be rent
thereat, and the earth cleave asunder, and
the mountains fall down in fragments that
they ascribe a son to the Merciful when it
beemeth not the Merciful to beget a son."

The Polemics against the Conception that God is the Father of

In xxii.26 we read:

"Yet they say, 'The Lord of Mercy hath begotten issue
(the Angels).' Glory be to Him! Nay, they are but
his honoured servants; They speak not till He hath
spoken, and they do His bidding, He knoweth what is
before them and what is behing them; and no plea shall
they offer save for him with whom He is pleased, and
they tremble for fear of Him; And him among them who
saith, "I am a God beside Him," - that then will We
recompense with hell: in such sort will We recompense
the offenders."

In xxxvii.149 ff. the Qur'an alludes to the belief that
the pagan Arabs ascribed daughters to God:

"Inquire then of the Meccans whether Thy Lord
hath the daughters and they, the sons?
Have we created angels females? And were
they witnesses?
Is it not truly a falsehood of their own
when they say:
'God hath begotten'? and they verily are
the liars.
Hath He preferred daughters to sons?
What reason have ye for thus judging?
will ye not then receive this warning?
Have ye a clear authority?
Bring/
Bring forth your Book if ye speak truth.  
AND THEY MAKE HIM TO BE A KIN WITH THE JINN;  
BUT THE JINN KNOW THAT THE IDOLATERS SHALL  
BE BROUGHT UP BEFORE GOD."

The mention of the daughters and the female angels led  
the Moslem commentators to say that the pre-Islamic Arabs  
believed that Al-Lat, Al-(Uzza and Manat to be the female  
angels.¹ This explanation leads us to consider the  
Qor'anic verses which speak of the relationship between  
God, the angels, and the demons. The Qor'an in vi.100  
tells us of this relationship in the following way:

"Yet have they assigned the Jinn to God as  
His associates, though he created them, and  
in their ignorance have they falsely ascribed  
to him SONS AND DAUGHTERS. GLORY BE TO HIM!  
AND HIGH LET HIM BE EXALTED ABOVE THAT  
WHICH THEY ATTRIBUTE TO HIM."

Again in vi.137 we have:

"Moreover, they set apart a portion of the  
fruits and cattle which he hath produced,  
and say,  
'This is for God! - so fancy they - 'And  
this for those whom we associate with him.'  
But that which is for these associated Gods  
of theirs cometh not to God; yet that which  
is for God cometh to the associated Gods.  
An evil judgement do they form!"²

¹ According to Tabari's authorities (Tafsir, on xxxvii.158) we  
have the following explanations:
(a) According to Ibn 'Abbas, the kinship is said to be that  
of a brotherhood between God and Iblis (Satan).
(b) According to Mojahid, the unbelievers of Qoraysh believed  
that the angels are the daughters of God and this offspring  
was the result of the marriage between God and the female Jinn.
(c) Qatadah says that these polemics are against the Jews  
who said that God married the Jinn and this marriage  
resulted in the birth of the Angels.

² Compare Deut.xxxi.17; Ps.cvi.37.
The conception of the association of the Demons, and Angels, with God, and the practice of their worship is condemned in the Qur'ân in the following verses:

**xxxiv.39-40.**
"God will gather the people and the angels, and will ask the angels: 'Did these worship you?' They shall say, 'Glory be to Thee! Thou art our friend, not these! NAY THEY WORSHIPPED THE JINN: IT WAS IN THEM THAT MOST OF THEM BELIEVED.'"

**xxi.16 ff.**
"Also We created not the heaven and the earth, and what is in between for sport: Had it been our wish to find a pastime, We had surely found it in ourselves if to do so had been our will. Nay, we will cast the truth over falsehood, and it shall smite it, and lo, it vanisheth! But woe to you for what ye utter of God. AND ALL BEINGS IN THE HEAVENS AND ON THE EARTH ARE HIS: AND THEY WHO ARE IN HIS PRESENCE DISDAIN NOT HIS SERVICE, NEITHER ARE THEY WEARIED. THEY PRAISE HIM NIGHT AND DAY: THEY ARE WORN OUT WITH WEARINESS."

The Qur'ânic mention of the kinship between God and the Demons, in xxxvii.158, on the one hand, and the mention of God gathering the people and the angels at the Day of Judgement and asking the Angels whether they were worshipped by the people, on the other, bring us to what seems to be the occasion for the revelation of these verses.

In the Apocalypse of Isaiah xxiv.21,22 we read:

"And it shall come to pass in that day, that the Lord shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high, and the kings of the earth upon the earth. AND/"
AND THEY SHALL BE GATHERED TOGETHER, AS PRISONERS ARE GATHERED IN THE PIT, AND SHALL BE SHUT UP IN THE PRISON, AND AFTER MANY DAYS SHALL THEY BE VISITED."

and in Ps. lxxxii we read:

"God standeth in the congregation of the mighty, He judgeth among the gods. How long will ye judge unjustly, and accept the persons of the wicked? Selah. Defend the poor and fatherless: Do justice to the afflicted and needy Deliver the poor and needy: rid them out of the land of the wicked. They know not, neither will they understand; they walk on in darkness, all the foundations of the earth are out of course. I have said, YE ARE GODS; AND ALL OF YOU ARE CHILDREN OF THE MOST HIGH. BUT YE SHALL DIE LIKE MEN, AND FALL LIKE ONE OF THE PRINCES. ARISE, O GOD, JUDGE THE EARTH; FOR THOU SHALT INHERIT ALL NATIONS."

In these Biblical passages, and in Gen. vi.1-4:

"And it came to pass, when men began to multiply on the face of the earth, and the daughters were born unto them, THAT THE SONS OF GOD (OR GODS) SAW THE DAUGHTERS OF MEN THAT THEY WERE FAIR, AND THEY TOOK WIVES OF ALL WHICH THEY CHOSE."

we have the possible references to the Qor'anic polemics against the conception of the kinship between God and the Angels and the Demons on the one hand, and the polemics against the worship of the Angels on the other.

1 Compare Daniel iv.14 (R.iv.17).
What is the Meaning and the Significance of the "Sons of God" in the O.T. Writings?

The mention of the Sons of God (or Gods) in Gen. vi. 1-4, and Ps. lxxxii. occasioned a great difficulty to modern commentators. G.E. Wright tells us: "there has been a wide divergence of opinion in the interpretation of this Psalm. The traditional view, of which St. John x. 34 is the earliest witness, regards the Elohim here as human Israelite judges whom God is sentencing for their failure to provide justice. Such an understanding of the word and the Psalm is, however, entirely too forced with little to commend it. The same can be said of a suggestion of Duhn that the Elohim are the Hasmonaean kings, and Buttenwieser's belief that they are the deified kings of the Hellenistic age. We must take more seriously a third view, which as far as I am aware, Ibn Ezra was the first to suggest. In this case the Elohim are the patron angels of the nations, who appear in the Book of Daniel and extra-canonical literature. Yet it is a question as to whether the patron angels of late theology would have been condemned to death as are the Elohim of this Psalm.

In any event this third view differs but slightly from a fourth interpretation, expounded by such scholars as Gunkel

1 The Old Testament against its Environment, p. 31.
and Wellhausen. In this case the psalm is taken literally. God calls the gods of the nations to a heavenly assize, named here 'Adat-El. He, as the head of the assembly and its judge, indicts them for their failure to provide justice for the poor and needy. The words used for the members of this divine assembly are:

- Mal'akim (angels)
- Qedoshim (Holy Ones)
- Bene' Elohim or Bene' Elim (Sons of God or Divine beings)
- Abadim (Servants)
- Mesharetim (Ministers).

"In the light of the evidence" Wright later says: "the literal interpretation of Psalm lxxxii must, it seems to me, be accepted as the only possible one. The problem which immediately arises, however, is in regard to the composition of the heavenly council. There appears to be considerable evidence that during the seventh and the sixth centuries, at least, a large amount of syncretism occurred, so that within the framework of the council a number of pagan elements appear. In any event, we know that in this period and later the host of heaven, meaning the sun, moon, and stars, appear as members of the assembly."

The Biblical story of the Sons of God marrying the daughters of men indicates the possibility of its connection with the cult.

---

1 ibid. p.34.
of the 'Fallen Angels' which is explained in the Book of Enoch,\(^1\) and the Book of Jubilees,\(^2\) and is reflected in the Qur'an.\(^3\)

According to the Book of Jubilees, the Fall of the Angels was carried by the Divine Will of God, who sent the watchers to the earth to "instruct the children of men to do judgement and uprightness." The stay of these watchers (angels) on earth exposed them to sin and thus they were attracted by the women on earth and lusted with them.

The Book of Enoch,\(^4\) tells us of the name AZAZEL\(^5\) as the leader of these Fallen Angels.

In Lev. xvi.8-10 it is said that at the Day of Atonement "Aaron shall cast lots upon the two goats: one lot for the Lord, and the other lot for the scapegoat (Azazel)."\(^6\) "The meaning of Azazel and his identity is disputed, but the inference from this ritual makes it certain", says Benzinger and Cheyne, that both Yawheh and Azazel must be personal beings.

They, however, think that it is more natural to connect the belief in question with the demonology and angelology which developed so largely in the post-exilic age (Enoch vi.7; viii.1; ix.6; x.4) and thus Azazel would become a prominent member of the class of SEMIM, or DEMONS OF THE FIELD AND THE DESERT, to whom sacrifices were offered in post-exilic times (Lev.xvii.7) and to their service priests were appointed (II.Chr.xi.15).

---

\(^1\) vi.2 ff.; cf. K. Kohler, Angels (J. E. vol. I. p. 592a).
\(^2\) iv.15 and vi.1 seq. See supra, pp.
\(^4\) Enoch vi.7.
The Polemics against the Jews saying (UZAYR IS A SON OF GOD.

In the Qur'ān in ix.30.31 we read:

"Moreover, the Jews say "Ezra (Uzayr) is a Son of God", and the Christians say "The Messiah is a Son of God". Such the sayings in their mouth! They resemble the saying of the unbelievers of old! God do battle with (curse) them! How are they misguided!"

There are various theories identifying (Uzayr of this verse with the Ezra of the Old Testament. These theories are based mainly on the Jewish traditions which speak of Ezra as the publisher of the Holy Scriptures, the director of the complete resettlement of the Jews in Palestine after the Babylonian captivity, and he who was translated into heaven. ¹

This theory of identifying (Uzayr with Ezra is given also by Walker² in a different way. He tells us that this charge: "if it was not originated in Mohammed's own mind, is obviously a slanderous accusation against the Jews, made by their enemies, perhaps the Samaritans, who hated Ezra most bitterly because he changed the sacred law and its script. Indeed Gaster has pointed out (in his article on the Samaritans in the Encyclopedia of Islam) that Mohammed seems to have made several borrowings from the Samaritans, which have hitherto been unrecognised. May not this be another

---

¹ See Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, vol.IV.pp.354-359; vol.IV.pp.431,432,n.5; p.441,n.33; and 445.n.50.
² Bible characters in the Qur'ān.
instance? In the eyes of the Samaritans Ezra had acted presumptuously. He had changed the Old Divine Script - still used and read by the remnant of the Samaritan community - for the Aramaic script. He had acted as if he were God Himself, or the Son of God. The Samaritans accused the Jews of following Ezra and accepting his new edition of the sacred text. They not only accused the Jews of altering the sacred script, but also of interfering with the text. Gaster sees in this the origin of Mohammed's conception of the TAHRIF, or the doctrine of the corruption of the Holy Scripture by the people of the Book.

The identification of 'Uzayr with Ezra on the basis of publishing the law of Israel, is not strong enough to lead Mohammed, or the Samaritans, to call him the "Son of God". If it is based on the account of his being translated to heaven, the text of this account\(^1\) makes it impossible to render such an accusation, as we see in it a definite distinction between Ezra and the Son of God. The passage reads:

"For thou shalt be taken up from (among) men, and henceforth thou shalt remain with my son\(^2\) and with such as are like thee, until the times be ended."

This tradition of Ezra calls for his identification with the Qurʾanic Idris rather than with 'Uzayr as this

\(^{1}\) The Ezra-Apocalypse, edited by G.H. Box (London 1912), p.309.

\(^{2}\) Cf. ibid, p.309 n. where different readings are given.
possibility seems to rest on the following:

a. The name of Ezra was otherwise Esdras.

b. The account that Ezra was translated to heaven might be connected with the Qor'anic verses (xix.57,58) which read:

"And mention, in the Book, IDRIS, that he was a faithful prophet and we elevated him to a supreme place."¹

Thus if Idris is equivalent to the Biblical Ezra, then who of the Biblical characters could be identified with (Uzayr? Lidzbarski² favours the possibility of a Jewish sect in Arabia venerating Ezra to such a degree as to deify him, thus casting shame on their orthodox brethren.³ This sect, Lidzbarski suggests, is probably the SETHIANS.⁴

This theory of Lidzbarski is not elaborated, and thus we might find certain connections between this theory and that of Casanova⁵ which sees in (Uzayr a textual emendation, and reads, instead of (عزر), the name عزر, and identifies this (Uzayr with AZAEL or AZAZEL who, according to the Jewish Hagada, is the leader of the "Sons of God" in Gen.vi.2,4.

---

¹ Moslem commentators identified IDRIS with Enoch, cf. Jeffery, Foreign Vocabulary of the Qur'ân, s.v., p.51.
² De propheticis, Qua Dicuntur, Legendis Arabicis, (Leipzig 1893), p.35,n.3.
⁴ According to Ginzberg, The Legends of the Jews, vol.v,p.149, n.52. This sect glorified Seth (The Son of Adam) and identified him with the Messiah; cf. Josephus (Antiquities, 1,2,3).
⁵ Idris et (Uzayr, Journal Asiatique, CCIV, 1924, p.360.
J. Finkel\(^1\) produces another theory by altering the diacritic points, and reading the word (AZIZ instead of (Uzayr. \(\approx\) for \(\approx\). The meaning of (AZIZ is King or Potentate. With this amended text, Finkel connects this Qur\’anic verse with Psalm ii.7, which reads:

"The Lord said unto me, Thou art my Son; this day have I begotten Thee."

Majid Bey\(^2\) claims that (Uzayr represents Osiris. This assumption is carried through a comparative study of the Ancient Egyptian Gods with those of Ancient Arabia.

In spite of these various theories, Horovitz\(^3\) considers that there is no reason to doubt the equation (Uzayr = Ezra, though he himself in his treatment of the subject\(^4\) suggests in conclusion that "it is very probable that Muhammad received his information from a Jewish or Judeo-Christian sect who revered Ezra in a manner similar to that in which certain sects revered Melchisedek (see Epiph. Haeris, v.1-9).\(^5\)

Of these theories, that of Casanova seems to be the most probable, not only because it connects (Uzayr with a direct Old Testament reference which mentions the Sons of God, but because it supports the views we have suggested in the previous chapter.

It is highly probable that the passage of Gen.vi.1-4 started the Qur\’anic theological polemics against the Jews.

---

4. ibid.
It seems that when Mohammed heard either the reading of these verses or the stories connected with them, he objected or questioned their usage. When he was told about the stories of the Fallen Angels, and their connection with the Flood narrative, the Fall of Adam, and the ritual of the Day of Atonement, he seemed to have rejected these views as pagan and started his polemics against the angelology and demonology of the Jews.

So far we have studied the Qor'anic polemics against the conception of the Fatherhood of God as it is viewed from the point of view of associating God to the other Gods. But the Qor'an introduces us to another aspect of this polemic, namely the Jewish conception of the relationship between God and the Israelites.

The Polemics against the Jews saying that they are the Sons of God.

In our study of the word HITTAH we noticed that the Jews were reported to have said that God will not punish them except for a computed time, this because they said that they were the sons and the beloved of God.¹

¹ v.21. "Moreover the Jews and Christians say, "Sons are we of God and His beloved." Say: "Why then doth He chastise you for your sins? Nay! Ye are but a part of the men whom He hath created! He pardoneth whom He pleaseth, and chastiseth whom He pleaseth, and with God is the sovereignty of the Heavens and of the Earth and of all that is between them, and unto Him do all things return."
The conception that the Israelites are the Sons of God is reflected in some passage in the Old Testament and could be derived from the proper names.¹

"Its earliest occurrence, apart from proper names, is in Exod.iv.22 (J.E.):"

"And thou (Moses) shalt say unto Pharaoh, thus saith the Lord, ISRAEL IS MY SON, MY FIRSTBORN; AND I HAVE SAID UNTO THEE, LET MY SON GO, THAT HE MAY SERVE ME; AND THOU HAST REFUSED TO LET HIM GO: BEHOLD, I WILL SLAY THY SON, THY FIRST BORN."

Hos.i.10:
"Yet the number of the children of Israel shall be as the sand of the sea, which cannot be measured nor numbered; and it shall come to pass that, in the place where it was said unto them, ye are not my people, it SHALL BE SAID UNTO THEM, YE ARE THE SONS OF THE LIVING GOD."

Hos.xi.1:
"When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my SON OUT OF EGYPT."

Isa.1.2:
"Hear, 0 heavens, and give ear, 0 earth, for the Lord hath spoken: I HAVE NOURISHED AND BROUGHT UP CHILDREN, AND THEY HAVE REBELLED AGAINST ME.²

Jer.iii.4:
"Wilt thou not from this time cry unto me, 0 MY FATHER, THOU ART THE GUIDE OF MY YOUTH?"³

---

² Compare Isa.xxx.19.
³ Compare Jer.iii.14-19. "Return, 0 backsliding children, saith the Lord, for I am a husband unto you; and I will take you one of a city, and two of a family, and I will bring you to Zion."

cf. Jer.iv.22; xxxi.9 (based on Ex.iv.22); xxxi.20; Deut.xxxii.6; 19; Isa.xliii.6; xlviii; lxiii.16; lxiv.8.
The conception of the Fatherhood of God is accompanied with the conception of God's LOVE and thus we notice that in this Qur'anic verse the claim of the Jews and the Christians was not only that they were the Sons of God but, it is said, that they are the Beloved of God.

In the Qur'an (iii.29) we read:

"Say: If ye love God, then follow me: God will love you, and will forgive your sins: for God is forgiving, Merciful. Say: Obey God and the Apostle, but if ye turn away, then verily God loveth not the unbelievers."

This verse and v.21 do not only connect the Israelite conception of their being the Sons of God with their conception of the Love of God for them; but they also lead us to study the Old Testament writings about the loving relationship between God and the Israelites.

According to G.E. Wright,\(^1\) the earliest reference to God's love for His people is that of Hosea where in iii.1 he says:

"And the Lord said unto me, Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend and an adulteress, even as the Lord LOVETH THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL, THOUGH THEY TURN UNTO OTHER GODS AND LOVE CAKES OF RAISINS."\(^2\)

---

1 ibid. p.407.

2 The mention of the cakes of raisins reflects the cult of offering cakes to Astarte, the Queen of Heaven; see Jer. vii.18, xliiv.19. "Here", according to S.L. Brown, The Book of Hosea, p.28, "they are one of the 'Dionysiaic features', of the worship of the Baals who were thought to be the givers of grapes."
Again in Hosea ix.15:
"All their wickedness is in Gilgal; for there I hated them: because of the wickedness of their doings I will drive them out of mine house.
I will LOVE THEM NO MORE; all their princes are revolters."

In Hosea xi.1-4:
"When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my Son out of Egypt.
As they called them, so they went from them:
They sacrificed unto the Baalim, and burned incense to graven images.
Yet I taught Ephraim to go; I took them on my arms; but they knew not that I healed them.
I drew them with cords of a man, with BANDS OF LOVE...."

In Deuteronomy iv.37 we read:
"And because he loved thy fathers, therefore he chose their seed after them, and brought thee out with his presence, with his great power, out of Egypt."

In Deuteronomy vii.8 we read:
"But because the Lord loveth you, and because he would keep the oath which he sware unto your fathers, hath the Lord brought you out with a mighty hand, and redeemed you out of the house of bondage, from the hand of Pharaoh king of Egypt."

In Deuteronomy xxiii.5:
"Nevertheless the Lord thy God would not hearken unto Balaam, but the Lord thy God turned the curse into a blessing unto thee, because the Lord thy God LOVED THEE."

1 Compare xiv.4: "I will heal their backsliding, I will love them freely: for mine anger is turned away from him."

2 Cf. Deuteronomy vii.13; x.15; Jeremiah xxxi.3; Isaiah xliii.4; lxiii.9; Malachi 1.2; Zephaniah iii.17.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE JEWISH TRADITIONS CONCERNING THE INTERMEDIARIES BETWEEN GOD AND MAN.

In the first chapter we noticed that the pre-Islamic Arabs rejected Muhammad's claims for prophecy on the grounds that he was not a supernatural being. In the previous chapter we studied the Qur'anic polemics against the conception of the Fatherhood of God; in this study we noticed that Mohammed was primarily criticizing the conception of the kinship between God, the Demons, and the Angels. We noticed also that the Jews degraded the Gods of the nations in such a way as to make them subject to the supremacy of Yahweh.

In this chapter we are going to study the various stages through which Yahweh revealed Himself to His people. In the first stage we notice that Yahweh manifests Himself in person. His appearance in a corporeal form is shown in Gen.iii.8 ff. and in Gen.xviii.1 ff.1

1 E. Kautzsch, Religion of Israel (Hasting's Dict. of the Bible) extra volume, p.638 n. tells us: "In Gen.xviii.1 ff. there are now, indeed, as has been shown by Kraetschmar (ZATW,1897, p.81 ff.) two recensions of the same narrative combined. According to the earlier of these Yahweh Himself appears, accompanied by two angels; according to the later (the 'plural source'), three angels are sent by Yahweh, who Himself abides in heaven (cf. esp.ix.24.)."
In this stage, the appearance of Yahweh to his people in a corporal form is connected with the Jewish conception of the "Angel of Yahweh" who according to Kautzsch\(^1\) was: "a form of appearance of Yahweh Himself," "a temporary descent of the latter to visibility", distinguishable from Himself only in so far as it does not represent the full and complete majesty of His being. The circumstance, which has been felt to be very strange, that the expression 'Angel of Yahweh' is not infrequently suddenly exchanged for the simple 'Yahweh', is very simply explained. The designation 'Angel of Yahweh' is necessary wherever he comes (particularly in conversation) into direct contact with men, whereas the simple 'Yahweh' is sufficient when God is to be thought of as if by Himself, separate from men or at least unseen by them. Although in some passages this condition of things is obscured by touches of the redactor's hand, there are others where it is readily recognizable. So in Judges v.23 'Curse Meroz, said the Angel of Yahweh [addressing Israel.] because they came not to the help

---

1 Kautzsch, ibid. tells us: "The E source of the Pentateuch remains even here true to its principle of avoiding the name 'Yahweh' and says (but in quite the same sense) MAL'AKH 'ELOHIM (Gen.xxi.7) or MAL'AKH HĂ-'ELOHIM 'Angel of God' (Gen.xxxi.11; Ex.xiv.19).

2 ibid.
of ('the invisibly present) Yahweh.' In like manner, in Gen. xvi.7 ff. the God who speaks to Hagar is always called MAL'AKH YAHWEH, whereas, according to verse 11, Yahweh Himself has heard her affliction, this being a function for which He did not require a personal meeting with her. In any case, it is quite in the spirit of the narrator when in verse 13 Hagar discovers in Him who has spoken with her Yahweh Himself.

Again, in Gen.xxi.17 ff. (the Elohistic parallel to the Jahwistic narrative of Chapter xvi) it is God that hears the voice of the lad, but the angel of God that calls to Hagar out of heaven, etc. And in verse 19 it is God that opens her eyes, so that she sees the well of water, this required no personal, mechanical operation. On the contrary, it might be accomplished by an act of the Divine will working from afar, and this is plainly the meaning of the narrator. But it is to be observed how here in E a marked spiritualizing of the ancient THEOLOGUMENON has already taken place. In J the angel of Yahweh evidently meets Hagar at the well personally and in human form; in E, on the other hand, he calls to her 'from heaven'. The thought of a human body pertaining to Yahweh is thus, if not exactly dropped, forced into the background. The same is true in Gen.xxii.11 (where Mal'akh Yahweh, occurring in what is otherwise an interrupted Elohistic narrative, can by only a variant for Mal'akh ) Elohim, due to a redactor, or occasioned
Perhaps by the redactional addition in verse 15, which also speaks of the angel of Yahweh.

It is intelligible how, as the conception of God grew more profound, the above described pale manifestation, although only temporary and not exhausting the complete being of Yahweh, must have given offense to the religious sense. But this offense was not summarily removed by transforming the Mal'akh Yahweh into a created angel; on the contrary, men still held fast to a representation of Yahweh Himself. Under this head fall certain passages in which it is sometimes hard to say whether we are still to think of Mal'akh Yahweh in the form described above, or simply of a created angel. So in Ex. xxiii. 20 f.: "Truly I will send my angel before thee, to keep thee by the way and to bring thee unto the place which I have prepared. Take ye heed of him, and hearken unto his voice; but be not rebellious against him, for he will not forgive your transgression; FOR MY NAME IS IN HIM!"

This last expression means nothing else than 'for he is a representation of my being' and is not to be weakened, with Ewald and others, as if it meant only that the angel represents God as the ambassador does the king, and has power to speak in His name; on the contrary he is himself Divine."

1 Kautzsch, gives the following illustrations of this conception. Gen.xxxi.11(R) the angel of God calls to Jacob 'in a dream'; Gen.xxxii.30[31]: Gen.xvi. and xxii. "the remarkable interchange of 'Yahweh' or 'God' and 'angel of Yahweh'; in Judges vi.11 ff. we have according to verse 14 a personal manifestation of Yahweh. This is called Mal'akh Yahweh everywhere except in verses 14,16 and 23; but even in verse 14 and 16 the LXX read Mal'akh Yahweh; in Judges xiii the angel of Yahweh, whom the parent of Samson took at first for a man of God, is intended to be an appearance of Yahweh Himself, as is shown not only by verse 18, but quite expressly by verse 22 ff. Hos.xii.4 ff.

2 Cf. Ex.xxxii.34 and xxxiii.2; and compare II Sam.xiv.17,20; xix.28 where David is compared to the angel of God; I Sam.xxix.9 has 'like an angel of God'; and in a later period Zec.i.11ff.; xii.1,5 ff. where there is no doubt as to the creaturely character of this 'angel of Yahweh'. In the considerably later passage, Zec.xi.8 the 'angel of Yahweh' stands in parallelism with 'Yah'; but the latter term is here manifestly not simply equivalent to Yahweh, but stands for a supremundane, Divine being; so that ever here 'the angel of Yahweh' is kept quite distinct from Yahweh Himself.

(All the discussion and illustrations here are taken from Kautzsch, Religion of Israel (H.D.B. Extra Vol.pp.637b-639a).
Other aspects of bridging the gulf between Yahweh and His people are shown in the following manner:

(a) The Face of Yahweh which substitutes His presence. ¹
(b) The Glory of Yahweh. (I\$am.iv.22; compare Ex.xxxiii.18 and Deut.v.21 (23); I Kings viii.11; II Chron.vii.1. Compare Is.vi.3; Num.xiv.21 f.; Hab.ii.14.

This tendency of avoiding any reference to the anthropomorphic character of Yahweh, and the establishment of His Transcendentalism is shown also in the efforts of the writers of the Targum where they used the word MEMRA to substitute the anthropomorphic representations of Yahweh in the Old Testament; e.g. Onkelos renders Gen.xx.3 in the following way: "A WORD (MEMRA) from before Yahweh."² Num.xxxiii.3 and 4, Onkelos renders: "perhaps an oracle from before Yahweh (MEMAR MIN QosAM YAH\$EH). Similar caution is evident, however, where God says that He will meet with the Israelites at the Tabernacle on stated occasions. (Ex.xxxv.22 ff.) Onkelos: "I will cause MY WORD (MEMRI, oracle) to meet thee there..."

Ex.xxiv.42,43 Onkelos: "I will cause my oracle (MEMRI) to meet with you there to speak with thee there, and I will cause my oracle to meet with the Israelites, and it (the Tabernacle) shall be sanctified by my Glory."

Ex.xix.17: "Moses brought the people out of the camp to meet God": Onkelos: "towards the oracle (MEMRA) of God."

¹ Ex.xxx.14; compare Deut.iv.37; Is.lxiii.9; Ps.xxii.10(9).
² All the passages quoted as illustrations are taken from G.F. Moore, The Intermediaries in Jewish Theology (H.T.R.vol.xv.p.49 ff.)
³ Gen.xx.3 "But God came to Abimelech in a dream of the night". Gen.xxxi.24; Num.xxii.9 (with no mention of a dream).
When God speaks to Himself.

Where the Hebrew is literally 'God said in his heart (mind)
Onkelos renders 'Said in (or, by) his word (MEMREH); cf. Gen.
vi.21, cf.vi.6.

Gen.vi.6. "God repented that He had made man."
Onkelos "Yahweh turned in his word (MEMREH) that
He had made man."

Similarly verse 7; so also I Sam.xv.11 and 35; Zech.viii.14.
Targum: "My word (thought, MEMRI) did not turn."

Passages in which it is said that God will fight for the Israelites.

These passages are paraphrased in the following way:

e.g. Deut.iii.22 "For the Lord your God, He it is that
fighteth for you."

Onkelos "For Yahweh, your God, His WORD (MEMREH)
fights for you." cf.Deut.i.30.

Passages where God says :"He will be with ...

e.g. Ex.iii.12 "God says to Moses 'I will be with thee'."

Onkelos "My word (MEMRI) will be in thy support." 1

Passages for the Hand of God.

e.g. Ex.xxxiii.22 "And it shall come to pass, while
my Glory passeth by, that I will put thee
in a cleft of the rock AND WILL COVER THEE
WITH MY HAND UNTIL I HAVE PASSED BY."

Onkelos "I will extend protection by my word over thee."

---

1 Cf. Gen.xxi.20, 21, 22; xxvi.28; xxviii.20; xxxi.5, 42;
xxxix.21, 23.
Passages in which God speaks of the Covenant.

e.g. Gen. ix. 12: "This is the sign of the Covenant which I make between Me and you."

Onkelos: "I establish my Covenant between my word and thee."

The Metatron.

The Jewish Cabala on the other hand conceives the intermediary between God and man in the person of the METATRON, who was, for them, "an angel of the highest order, or a mysterious being of higher than the angelic rank, who was in a peculiar sense a mediator and intercessor with God."

"The oldest occurrence of the word is in Sifré on Deut. xxxii.49, that is, in a Palestinian work, the final redaction of which falls early in the third century, but which in this part is a Midrash of the School of Ishmael (three quarter of a century earlier). Moses is bidden to ascend Mount Nebo ... and see the Land of Canaan. On this R. Eliezar comments: "With his finger He (God) was a METATRON TO MOSES."

"The Metatron was explained by R. Moses ben Nahman and Eshtori Farhi, as 'one who shows the way'. Another occurrence in a Palestinian Midrash is in Bereshith Rabbah 5.4 (on Gen. i.9). R. Levi said, some interpreters interpret with Ben Azzai and Ben Zoma that THE VOICE OF GOD WAS MADE A METATRON OVER THE WATERS,

1 Cf. verses 13, 15, 16, 17; xvii.7.
2 G.F. Moore, ibid, p.62.
ACCORDING TO THE WORDS 'THE VOICE OF THE LORD WAS OVER THE
WATERS' (Ps. xxix. 3).

According to the interpreters holding this view God was a
METATRON TO THE ISRAELITES, leading them in the Desert. This
interpretation is based on Ex. xiii. 21: 'The Lord goeth before
them by day, leveling down for them the highest and leveling up
the depressions (cf. Is. xl. 3 ff.).

"In the same sense, and with the same scripture reference,
we find in a later Midrash on Ex. xxiii. 20: "Behold, I send an
angel" etc.

"God said to Israel, when you were worthy of it, I myself
was made a messenger (SHALIH) for you, as if I did for you in
the desert, as it is said, 'the Lord went before them by day ...'
but now that ye are not worthy, I turn you over to a messenger
(Shalih), as it is said, 'Behold, I send an angel."

In the Babylonian Talmud, Metatron is an angel (Sanhedrin
38 b). R. Nahman (ben Isaac) narrates a controversy between
R. Idi and a heretic. The heretic quoted Ex. xxiv. 1: "And to
"Go as he said, ascend unto the Lord" etc. "Why not ascend unto
me", the Rabbi replied it means Metatron, whose name is like the
name of his master, as the Scripture says: "For My Name is in
him."

According to Rappaport,¹ Metatron was conceived by some Jews
as the chief Angel of the Divine presence, who was charged by God
to create the world.

¹ Myth and Legend in Ancient Israel, vol. iv, p.43.
After the early narratives of the O.T.,

In a later stage of the development of the conception of the relation between God and man in Jewish theology, we notice God's activity in man was manifested in the function of the "Spirit of Yahweh". In one stage of this development we notice that the "Spirit of Yahweh" is bestowed upon the Judges to equip them for the task of their appointment as rulers.¹

In the other, the Spirit of Yahweh is conceived as the Prophetic Gift, or the "oracular power and extraordinary behaviour of the early prophets";² in a third aspect of this development, the Spirit of Yahweh was conceived as the power falling upon the prophet, "taking possession of him in such a manner as to let him feel that he is in the grip (literally 'the Hand')³ of God, and capable of being 'carried away' in an experience which is unmistakably ecstatic.⁴ On the other hand, an experience of this kind is by no means the only or necessary consequence of being subject to possession by the Spirit of Yahweh. It may issue, rather, in those temperate qualities which characterize the ideal servant of Yahweh and specifically His vice-regent upon earth, of whom the prophet says (Isa.xi.2):⁵

---

¹ Cf. Judges iii.10; xi.29; vi.34; xiii.25; xiv.6,19; xv.14; compare I Sam.xi.6; xvi.13,14; I Chron.xii.18.
² Cf. Aubrey R. Johnson, The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel, p.30; cf. Num.xi.17,24-30(E); xxiv.2(J); I Sam.x.5-13; xix.18-24; Cf. II Sam.xxii.1.2.
³ Cf. Ezekiel iii.14, viii.3; xxxvii.1.
⁴ Cf. Ezek. iii.12,14, viii.3, xi.1,24; xxxvii.1; xliii.5.
⁵ Cf. xliii.1 ff.; Zech.iv.6.
"There shall rest upon him the Spirit of Yahweh,  
A Spirit of Wisdom and discernment,  
A Spirit of Counsel and might,  
A Spirit of knowledge and the fear of Yahweh."  "1

A further development of this conception is shown in the effect of the Spirit of Yahweh on the prophet equipping him with the word of God as it is shown in Isa. xlviii.16:

"Come ye near unto me, Hear ye this, I have not spoken in secret, from the beginning, from the time that it was, there am I AND NOW THE LORD GOD HATH SENT ME."  "2

1 A. Johnson, loc. cit., p.36.
2 It is to be noticed that there are two readings of this verse. The Revised version renders it as above, but the Authorised version of 1611 reads it this way:

"AND NOW THE LORD GOD, AND HIS SPIRIT, HATH SENT ME."

It is also important to notice that Isaiah, in his account of his call (Ch.vi.) "The prophet" sees the enthroned Yahweh with the Seraphim as His attendants. Their antiphony emphasizes the 'holiness' of Yahweh, which includes His unapproachableness. Isaiah cries out in dismay, for what he has seen is a sentence of death for a man of 'unclean lips'. One of the Seraphim cauterizes his lips with a hot stone from the altar, and declares that his iniquity is taken away and his sin is expiated (Ix.vi.7). Thereupon Isaiah hears the voice of Yahweh (from behind the smoke-veil) saying in His heavenly council: "WHOM SHALL I SEND AND WHO WILL GO FOR US?" which elicits Isaiah's offer of service: "Here am I, send me." (The quotation is taken from H.Wheeler Robinson, "The Council of Yahweh" (J.T.S., vol. XLV-XLVI (1944,1945), p.150). Compare Jeremiah xxiii.18 "WHO HATH STOOD IN THE COUNCIL (SODH) OF YAHWEH, THAT HE SHOULD PERCEIVE? AND HEAR HIS WORD,", which is spoken to distinguish between the true and the false prophet. (See supra, pp. ). Compare also I Kings xxii.19-22 where 'the Spirit' is designated as one of the members of the Heavenly Council. Compare also Ex.xxxiv.28, where we read: "And he was there with the Lord forty days and forty nights; he did neither eat bread, nor drink water. And he wrote upon the Tables the Word of the Ten Commandments."
G.H. Dix\textsuperscript{1} tells us: "The conception of the Spirit-endowed Messiah had its origin in the belief that the Spirit of the Lord came upon the early rulers of Israel to equip them for their task of rulership. Thus the Judges were Spirit-endowed, and their successors, the Kings, were similarly spoken of. Even after Davidic monarchs had proved themselves failures there were yet prophets and Psalmists who believed that the covenant given to David through Nathan was inviolable, and that some one of David's house, fully endowed with the Spirit, should be Israel's deliverer from its foes. We can trace the course of this belief through the books of the Old Testament from Jeremiah (xxx.9), Ezekiel (xxxvii.26), Psalm cxxii.17, and Zechariah (iv.6), into the Psalms of Solomon, and so to the Pharisees of our Lord's day. The belief persists that this new 'David' shall yet come to inaugurate the Messianic kingdom through the Spirit with which he is endowed........"

"Now in none of these passages is there a single mention of angels as the intermediaries between God and the world, and in this respect they resemble the priestly document of the Hexateuch, which likewise avoids all mention of angels. The writers of this school PREFERRED TO THINK OF GOD AS HIS OWN AGENT, AND APPARENTLY OBJECTED TO THE IDEA OF ANY OTHER AGENCY THAN HIS SPIRIT, INVISIBLE, INCORPOREAL, AND KNOWN ONLY BY THE

\textsuperscript{1} The Enochic Pentateuch (J.T.S. vol.xxvii (Oct.1925)), p.34.
EFFECTS PRODUCED BY HIS INDWELLING. POSSIBLY THEY WERE AFRAID OF MAKING ANGELOLOGY A RIVAL TO THEIR MONOTHEISTIC BELIEFS, ESPECIALLY IN THE LATER PHASES OF JUDAISM WHEN MUCH WAS MADE OF THE HEAVENLY HIERARCHY. They therefore developed the doctrine of the Spirit, as against the doctrine of the Angel of the Lord; and later still the doctrine of the Sevenfold activity of the Spirit, as against the doctrine of the seven archangels. This sevenfold Spirit is the endowment of the Messiah in Isa.xi.1,2.3

"In contrast with the theme of the Spirit-endowed Messiah, there was a parallel development in another school of thought of the theme of the Messianic Angel of the Lord. This Angel was the visible manifestation of God to men. Without now considering the origin of this idea, it may be noticed that David was compared with him (I Sam.xxix.9; II Sam.xiv.17,20. Cf. Zech.xii.8); and when the descendants of David proved failures, certain prophets bade people expect the coming of the Angel Himself in the Messianic office, e.g. (Isa.vii.14, ix.6, and Mal.iii.1,2.)."1

1 Dix, ibid. p.35.
Christian evidence showing the differences of opinion among the
Jews concerning the conception of the Angels and the Spirit.

The existence of the difference concerning the intermediary
beings is reflected in the book of the Acts of the Apostles where
in xxiii.6 ff. we read:

"But when Paul perceived that the one part were
Sadducees, and the other Pharisees, he cried out
in the council, Brethren, I am a Pharisee, a son
of Pharisees: touching the hope and resurrection
of the dead I am called in question.
And when he had so said, there arose a dissension
between the Pharisees and Sadducees; and the
assembly was divided.
For the Sadducees say that there is no resurrection,
neither angel, nor spirit: but the Pharisees
confess both."

Again in the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians we find it
clearly stated that Paul was warning the Jews of Colossae against
causâ exponent to anyone who attempted to deviate from "their worship of the
Angels." In Colossians ii.18 we read:

"Let no man rob you of your prize by a
voluntary humility and worshipping of the
angels, dwelling in the things which he
hath seen, vainly puffed up by his
fleshly mind...."

The worship of the Angels mentioned in these verses brings
us to consider the Jewish traditions which speak of this kind
of worship.

1 See supra pp.
In the Jewish Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphic writings we find this tendency reflected in the following way.\(^1\)

In the *Ascension of Isaiah* (c.ix.35)\(^2\)

'I saw the Lord and the second angel, and they were standing. And the second whom I saw was on the left of my Lord. And I asked: "Who is this?", and he said unto me: "WORSHIP HIM, FOR HE IS THE ANGEL OF THE HOPY SPIRIT, WHO SPEAKETH IN THEE AND THE REST OF THE RIGHTEOUS."

Williams, commenting on this, says: "But the whole chapter is evidently Christian, and the term 'angel' here refers to the third person in the blessed Trinity."

In Co.vii.19 we read:

'He who sat on the throne in the second heaven was more glorious than all (the rest). And there was great glory in the second heaven, and the praise also was not like the praise of those who were in the first heaven. AND I FELL ON MY FACE TO WORSHIP HIM, BUT THE ANGEL WHO CONDUCTED ME DID NOT PERMIT ME BUT SAID UNTO ME: "WORSHIP NEITHER THRONE NOR ANGEL WHICH BELONGS TO THE SIX HEAVENS - FOR FOR THIS CAUSE I WAS SENT TO CONDUCT THEE - UNTIL I TELL THEE IN THE SEVENTH HEAVEN. FOR ABOVE ALL THE HEAVENS AND THEIR ANGELS HAS THY THRONE BEEN PLACED, AND THY GARMENTS AND THY CROWN WHICH THOU SHALT SEE."'

"It will be observed that while in the former of these passages worship is to be paid to the third person of the Trinity, in the second, worship of other angels is forbidden."

"This doubtless" says Williams\(^3\) "points to Christians being exposed to some danger on this score."

\(^1\) All the quotations cited in this section are derived from A.Lukyn Williams' article, *The Cult of the Angels at Colossae* (J.T.S. vol.X (1908-4909), pp.413-438.
\(^2\) ibid p.422, the date of this book is given to be the end of the second century A.D.
\(^3\) ibid p.422.
The worship of Angels by the Jews is also mentioned in The Apology of Aristides (par. 14 (Syriac recension only))¹, which says:

"In the methods of their actions (i.e. those of the Jews) THEIR SERVICE IS TO ANGELS AND NOT TO GOD, IN THAT THEY OBSERVE SABBATHS AND NEW MOONS AND THE PASSOVER AND THE GREAT FAST, AND THE FAST, AND CIRCUMCISION, AND CLEANSNESS OF MEATS."²

CELSUS, (as quoted by Origen (c. Cels.i.26)), says:

"THEY WORSHIP ANGELS, AND ARE ADDICTED TO SORCERY, IN WHICH MOSES WAS THEIR INSTRUCTOR."

"Similarly further on (c. Cels.v.6) Origen quotes Celsus as saying:

"The first point relating to the Jews which is fitted to excite wonder, is that they should WORSHIP THE HEAVEN AND THE ANGELS WHO DWELL THEREIN, AND YET PASS BY AND NEGLECT ITS MOST VENERABLE AND POWERFUL PARTS, AS THE SUN AND MOON, AND THE OTHER HEAVENLY BODIES, BOTH FIXED STARS AND PLANETS, AS IF IT WERE POSSIBLE THAT "THE WHOLE" COULD BE GOD, AND YET ITS PARTS NOT DIVINE, OR [AS IF IT WERE REASONABLE] TO TREAT WITH THE GREATEST RESPECT THOSE WHO ARE SAID TO APPEAR TO SUCH AS ARE IN DARKNESS SOMEWHERE, BLINDED BY SOME CROOKED SORCERY, OR DREAMING DREAMS THROUGH THE INFLUENCE OF SHADOWY SPECIES, WHILE THOSE WHO PROPHESE SO CLEARLY AND STRIKINGLY TO ALL MEN, BY MEANS OF WHOM RAIN, AND HEAT, AND CLOUDS, AND THUNDER (to which THEY OFFER WORSHIP), AND LIGHTNINGS, AND FRUITS, AND ALL KINDS OF PRODUCTIVENESS, ARE BROUGHT ABOUT - BY MEANS OF WHOM GOD IS REVEALED TO THEM - THE MOST PROMINENT HERALDS AMONG THOSE BEINGS THAT ARE ABOVE - THOSE THAT ARE TRULY HEAVENLY ANGELS - ARE TO BE REGARDED AS OF NO ACCOUNT."³

¹ Ed. J. Armitage Robinson, Texts and Studies (1891), cited by Williams, ibid p.426.
² The nature of this passage seems to be polemical and one should take it with care.
³ "Upon this Origen remarks truly enough that in making these statements, Celsus appears to have 'fallen into confusion, and to have penned them from false ideas of things which he did not understand', but in any case one or two of his statements should be noticed. Celsus expressly says that the Jews do not worship
Jerome also refers to Col. ii. 18, 19 (Ep. ad Algasiun par. 10, Migne xxii. 1032), saying:

"BUT GOD TURNED, AND GAVE THEM UP TO SERVE THE HOST OF HEAVEN." Acts vii. 42. But the Host of Heaven means not only sun and moon and glowing stars, but also the whole multitude of the angels and their troop.... God gave them up to serve the host of heaven, which is here called by the Apostle the worship of Angels."

So again (in Matt. v. 34 seq.) he says:

'The Jews in swearing by Angels and the city of Jerusalem and the Temple and the Elements, were worshipping creatures and carnal objects with the honour and obeisance due to God.'

The Jewish tradition, according to the following passages, warns against any tendency to the worship of the Angels; e.g. 1


"R. Judan said in his own name, in human relations a man has a patron. If a time of trouble comes to him he does not come in suddenly to him, but he goes and stands at his patron's door, and calls to his slave or to one of his household, and the latter says, Such and such a man is standing at the door of the court-
yard. Perhaps he lets him in, and perhaps he lets him go! BUT THE HOLY ONE, BLESSED BY HIM! IS NOT SO. IF TROUBLE COMES ON A MAN HE MUST NOT CRY EITHER TO MICHAEL OR TO GABRIEL BUT HE MUST CRY TO ME, AND I ANSWER HIM AT ONCE. THAT IS WHAT IS WRITTEN: EVERY ONE THAT CALLETH ON THE NAME OF THE LORD SHALL BE DELIVERED."

the heavenly bodies, in this CONTRADICTING THE PREACHING OF PETER as quoted above (cf. Williams, ibid p. 426), and he also connects their worship of angels in some fashion with the practice of sorcery." (Both the quotation and the comments are cited by Williams, ibid p. 428. For the connection of the worship of angels with sorcery see supra pp. 424, 425 where we discussed the Qor'anic polemics against the Jewish belief in sorcery. Cf. also Williams, ibid pp. 424, 425 where he quotes from The Testament of Solomon.

1 Again all the passages we are quoting are cited by Williams, ibid.
The Targum of Jerusalem on Ex.xx.23 (20) reads:

"My people, the children of Israel! Ye shall not make, to worship, the likeness of the sun and the moon and of the stars and of the planets and of the ANGELS who serve before Me; idols of silver and gold ye shall not make you."

In these passages we notice that the Jewish tradition forbids the worship of angels. Then how are we to account for St. Paul's statement in Col.ii.18; and later for Justin Martyr's statement:

"But both Him (so. THE FATHER) and the Son who came forth from Him and taught us these things, and THE HOST OF THE OTHER GOOD ANGELS WHO FOLLOW AND ARE MADE LIKE TO HIM, AND THE PROPHETIC SPIRIT WE WORSHIP AND ADORE, KNOWING THEM IN PERSON AND TRUTH, AND DECLARING WITHOUT GRUDGING TO EVERY ONE WHO WISHES TO LEARN AS WE HAVE BEEN TAUGHT."

The answer to this question seems to be linked with the development of the doctrine of the Intermediaries in the Jewish theology in general and with the conception of the Nature of the Messiah in particular. As we have noticed that the Jews had two schools of thought concerning these doctrines; then it is probable that Paul was referring to these two schools of thought and supporting the one which conceived the Messiah as the Angel of the Lord.

---

1 First Apology, Chap. vi, cited by A.Roberts, The Translation of the Works of Justin Martyr. (First Apology, Chapter vi.).
2 Compare Jacob Bryant, Observations on Controverted Passages in Justin Martyr. (London 1793).
The Qor\dj;anic Conception of Intermediaries.

In the first chapter we noticed that the Jews (directly or indirectly)\(^1\) asked Mohammed about the Spirit.\(^2\) His answer was:

"The Spirit proceedeth at my Lord's Command.

The meaning of the word \(\text{\textit{Amr}}\) (which is rendered here as 'command') occasioned certain difficulties among modern scholars.\(^3\) Some, like Horovitz,\(^4\) traced it back to the Jewish ME\dj;MA (which is equivalent to the Hebrew "Dibber" and "Dibb\dj;ur"), while others, like Grimme\(^6\) and Rudolph,\(^7\) explained the word to mean the LOGOS.

In the light of our previous study of the conception of Intermediaries in Jewish theology, we attempt to study the significance of the word \(\text{\textit{Amr}}\) and its relation to the Spirit, and the Word of God.

The Qor\dj;anic usage of the word \(\text{\textit{Amr}}\) means in the following verse, the Command of God:

1) In vii.75: The people of the prophet Saleh "rebelled against the Command of God."

2) In ii.44: The people of Thamood also "rebelled against the Lord's command."

---

\(^{1}\) See supra pp. 12 ff-
\(^{2}\) Qur.xvii.88.
\(^{3}\) Cf. J. Horovitz, Jewish Proper Names, p.188.
\(^{4}\) Cf. ibid.; and Mohammed's Himmelfahrt (Der Islam, IX (1919)p.178).
\(^{5}\) See supra pp.
\(^{6}\) Das Leben, ii.51.
\(^{7}\) Die Abhängigkeit des Korans von Judentum u., Christentum, p.41.
3) xi.45: We read that there is no escape from the decree of God.

4) lxv.8: It is said that the cities that turned aside from the Command of the Lord and His apostle were chastised.

This Command of the Lord is also shown to be used in connection with the angels; and thus we have:

1) xiii.12: It is said that the angels are appointed as guardians by the Command of the Lord.

2) xviii.48: Satan disobays the Command of the Lord and does not prostrate to Adam.

3) xix.64: It is said that the angels said: "We come not down from Heaven but by the Lord's Command."1

4) xvi.2: The angels with the Spirit are caused by the Lord's Command to descend on whosoever God pleases.

5) xl.15: "Of exalted grade, of the throne possessed, He sendeth forth the Spirit at His own behest, on whomsoever of His servants He pleaseth, that He may warn of the day of meeting."

6) xlii.52: "And thus have we sent the Spirit to thee with a revelation, by our own Command. Thou knowest not ere this, what "the Book" was, or what the faith. But we have ordained it for a light: by it will we guide whom we please of our servants."

In the first four verses the word ْاَمْر tends to mean the revelation, in the others, the angels are appointed and commanded by God to descend on the prophets. This divine command differs but little from the word of God which is used in the following verses:

---

1 Rodwell, Koran, p.116,n.1 tells us "This verse is to be understood as an answer on the part of Gabriel to Mohammed's complaints of long intervals between the revelations."
1) x.20: "Men were of one religion only: then they fell to variance and had not a decree (of respite) previously gone forth from thy Lord their difference had surely been decided between them."

2) x.96: "Verily they against whom the Decree of thy Lord is pronounced, shall not believe."

3) xi.120: "Moreover, had thy Lord pleased, He had assuredly made mankind of one religion: but those only to whom thy Lord hath granted His Mercy will cease to differ. And unto this HATH HE CREATED THEM, FOR THE WORD OF THY LORD SHALL BE FULFILLED."²

4) xxxix.19: "But good tidings are there for those who shun the worship of Taghout and turn to God. Cheer them with good tidings THOSE MY SERVANTS WHO HEARKEN TO MY WORD AND FOLLOW ITS EXCELLENCE. THESE ARE THEY WHOM GOD HATH GUIDED AND THESE ARE MEN OF INSIGHT."

5) xlviii.26 (Late Medinan): "When the unbelievers had fostered rage in their hearts the rage of ignorance (of unbelief) - GOD THEREFORE SENT DOWN HIS PEACE on his apostle and on the faithful and fixed firmly in them the word of piety, for they were most worthy and deserving of it, and God hath knowledge of all things."

---

1 Cf. Cor.xi.112; xlili.13; xx.129.
2 Cf. vii.133 "... AND THE GOOD WORD OF THY LORD WAS FULFILLED ON THE CHILDREN OF ISRAEL BECAUSE THEY HAD BORNE PATIENCE: AND WE DESTROYED THE WORKS AND THE STRUCTURES OF PHARAOH AND HIS PEOPLE."
3 The usage of the word SAXINAH, in this verse and in ii.249; xlviii.4; xlviii.18; ix.26; and ix.40, show that Mohammed was acquainted with the Jewish conception of the Intermediaries and is using it, at least in xlviii.26, to prove his prophethood.
The connection of this Command of God, and the Word of God, with the prophets is shown in the following verses:

1) iii.34: "God announceth John (Yahya) to thee who shall be a verifier of the Word from God, and a great one, chaste, and a prophet of the number of the just."

2) iii.40: "Remember when the Angel said, "O Mary! verify God announceth to thee the Word from Him: his name shall be Messiah Jesus the son of Mary, illustrious in this world and in the next, and one of those who have near access to God."

3) xxxvii.171: "And our word came of old to our servants the sent ones."

4) x.82: "And by his words will God verify the truth, though the impious be averse to it."

5) xiii.23: "Will they say he hath forged a lie of God? But if God pleased, He could seal up thy very heart. But God will bring untruth to nought and will make good the truth by His word."

6) iv.169,170: O people of the Book! overstep not bounds in your religion; and of God, speak only the truth. The Messiah, Jesus, Son of Mary, is only an apostle of God, and HIS WORD which He conveyed into Mary, and a spirit proceeding from Himself. Believe therefore in God and His apostles, and say not, "A triad" (there is a Trinity) - forbear - it will be better for you. God is only one God! Far be it from His glory that He should have a son! His, whatever is in the heavens, and whatever is in the earth! And God is a sufficient guardian. The Messiah by no means disdaineth to be a servant of God, nor do the angels who are nigh unto Him."

---

1 This is said in connection with the narrative of the contest between Moses and the Magicians in front of Pharaoh.
In these passages we notice two important aspects of the usage of the "WORD"; in the first (iii.34), third (xxxvii.171), fourth (ix.82) and fifth (xlii.23) the "WORD" is used in the sense previously used as the Revealed Word (i.e. the contents of the Scriptures); in the second (iii.40) and the sixth (iv.169) it is identified with Jesus.

According to Moslem commentators, 1 Jesus was called the Word of God because he was created by the creative Word of God. They connected this verse with xix.36, which reads:

"It besemeth not God to beget a son. Glory be to Him, WHEN HE DECREEH A THING HE ONLY SAITH TO IT BE AND IT IS."

In the light of this connection they explained the occasion of its revelation as an explanation of the miraculous birth of Jesus. Their explanation was: As Adam was born without a father and a mother so Jesus was born from a mother without a father by the Divine Creative Power.

The resemblance between the creation of Adam and that of Christ is also shown by the fact that the Qur'an uses the word "Spirit" in both cases.

In xxi.91 of the Qur'an we read of the breathing of the Spirit of God in Mary:

"And her who kept her maidenhood (Mary) and into whom WE BREATHED OF OUR SPIRIT, AND MADE HER AND HER SON A SIGN TO ALL CREATURES." 2

---

1 Cf. Tabari, Tafsir, on iv.169, and Zamakhshari, Kashaf on loc. cit.
2 Cf. lxvi.12.
In xv.29 we read of the breathing of the Spirit of God in Adam:

"And when I shall have fashioned him and breathed of my Spirit into him, then fall ye down to him in worship."

The similarity between Adam and Christ explained to us what the Qur'an, at least in this stage, means by the Spirit. According to the Biblical narratives Adam, before his fall, was created in the image of God and was endowed with the Divine Spirit. But according to those Biblical narratives this Divine Spirit "SHALL NOT ALWAYS STRIVE WITH MAN, FOR THAT HE ALSO IS FLESH."

This Spirit of God in Adam did not qualify him to acquire the Divine Nature.

This argument of the similarity between Adam and Christ does not originate with Mohammed. It is based on the account given in I Corinthians xv.45 "where it is said that the identification of the "Second Adam" with the Messiah was commonly made by the Rabbis in Paul's time, from whom he had doubtless learned it."  

I Cor.xv.45 reads: "So also it is written, THE FIRST MAN ADAM BECAME A LIVING SOUL. THE LAST ADAM BECAME A LIFE-GIVING SPIRIT."

in xv.47 we read: "THE FIRST MAN IS OF THE EARTH, EARTHLY: THE SECOND MAN IS OF HEAVEN.

48. AS IS THE EARTHLY, SUCH ARE THEY ALSO THAT ARE EARTHLY: AND AS IS THE HEAVENLY, SUCH ARE THEY ALSO THAT ARE HEAVENLY."

---

1 Cf.xxxviii.72.  
2 Gen.i.26,27.  
3 Gen.vi.3.  
4 Gen.vi.3; compare Romans v.12-21; I Corinthians xv.20-22.  
In this light we can then understand the Qor'anic conception of the relation between man and God.

The "WORD OF GOD" is transmitted to man through the prophets. The prophet receives this WORD in four different ways:

(a) through Revelation.
(b) through God's speech from behind the veil.
(c) through a messenger; and
(d) through sending the Spirit.

These four modes are explicitly spoken of in the following verses:

"IT IS NOT FOR A MAN THAT GOD SHOULD SPEAK WITH HIM BUT BY REVELATION, OR FROM BEHIND A VEIL, OR HE SENDETH A MESSENGER TO REVEAL BY HIS PERMISSION WHAT HE WILL: VERILY HE IS EXALTED WISER! AND THUS WE SENT THE SPIRIT TO THEE WITH A REVELATION, BY OUR COMMAND. THOU KNOWEST NOT, ERE THIS, WHAT 'THE BOOK' WAS OR WHAT THE FAITH. BUT WE HAVE ORDAINED IT FOR A LIGHT: BY IT WILL WE GUIDE WHOM WE PLEASE OF OUR SERVANTS. AND THOU VERILY SHALT SURELY GUIDE INTO THE RIGHT WAY."

The 'WORD' received through Revelation.

Unfortunately it is not very clear from the Qor'an whether the 'WAHY' (Revelation) is the generic name for all the particular aspects through which God conveys His Word to His people, or whether it is a distinct way of this communication between God and man. The question shall remain open although this verse indicates that it is a special mode.²

¹ Qor. xlii.50-53.
² There is a possibility of connecting this particular mode of communication with the Divine being through a mystical way in
The WORD received through the Speech of God from behind a Veil.

This verse should be read in connection with ii.112, which reads:

"And they who have no knowledge say: 'Why doth not God speak to us, or thou come to us with a sign? So spake those who were before them the like of their words: their hearts are alike: Clear now have we made the signs (verses) for those who have firm faith.

The Qur'an also condemns the Jews of Moses' time for they asked their prophet to cause them to see God plainly.1

which man is said to see the Light of God. This possibility rests on the Qur'anic parable given in xxiv.35, Which reads:

"God is the light of the heavens and of earth. His light is like a niche in which is a lamp - The lamp is encased in glass - the glass, as it were, a glistening star. From a blessed Tree is it lighted, the olive should well-nigh shine out, even though fire touched it 'not! It is light upon light, and God setteth forth parables to men, and God knoweth everything." In xxiv.40 we read: "... He to whom God shall not give light, no light at all hath he." In v.18: "... Now hath a light and a clear Book come to you from God, by which God will guide him who followeth after His good pleasure, to the path of peace, and bring them out of darkness to the LIGHT OF HIS WILL." In v.48: "Verily, we have sent down the Law, wherein are guidance and light. By it did the prophets who professed Islam judge the Jews." In v.50: "And in the footsteps of the prophets caused we Jesus the Son of Mary to follow, confirming the law which was before him: and we gave him the Evangel with its guidance and light." xxxix.23 "Shall he then whose breast God hath opened to Islam, and he resting on light from his Lord ...?" lixi.8: "Fain would they put out the light of God with their mouths! but, though the infidels abhor it, God will perfect His light." 1 See Qur.ii.52; iv.152.
In iv.162 we notice that the Qoran indicates that God spoke to Moses:

"Of some Apostles We have told thee before, of others We have not told thee. DISCOURSING DID GOD DISCOURSE WITH MOSES."

But this discourse was not face to face as we can see that in vi.139, the Qoran tells us of Moses requesting to see God. This request and God's answer are recorded in the following way:

"And after Moses came at our set time and his Lord had spoken with him, he said: 'O LORD SHOW THYSELF TO ME, THAT I MAY LOOK UPON THEE.'
HE SAID: 'THOU CANST BY NO MEANS SEE ME. BUT LOOK TOWARDS THE MOUNT, AND IF IT ABIDE FIRM IN ITS PLACE, THEN SHALT THOU SEE ME. AND WHEN HE MANIFESTED HIMSELF TO THE MOUNTAIN, HE TURNED IT INTO DUST! AND MOSES FELL IN A SWOON!'."

The impossibility of seeing God, and speaking to Him directly, is the Qoranic conception of the Absolute Transcendentalism of the God. His speaking to Moses is said in vii.141 in the following way:

"HE (God) said, 'O MOSES! VERILY THEE ABOVE ALL MEN HAVE I CHOSEN BY COMMISSION, AND BY MY SPEAKING WITH THEE. TAKE THEREFORE WHAT I HAVE BROUGHT THEE, AND BE ONE OF THOSE WHO RENDER THANKS."

The 'WORD' received through a Messenger.

The messenger is none but a member of the angelic beings. In the night of Power it is said (Qor.xcvii.4) that the angels and the Spirit descend, by permission of their Lord, for every
As the tendency was to elevate the angelic beings to the rank of devotion.\(^1\) The Qur'an stresses the point that the angels or messengers are but servants of the Lord and that their descent with the revelation is completely under the Divine Command (\(^{1}\)Amr).\(^2\)

**God's Relationship between God and the Prophets through the Spirit.**

The Muslim commentators explain the Spirit in this verse as Gabriel; but this explanation does not seem to fit in with the general meaning of the verse as a whole. We noticed that the Qur'an in this verse classifies the mode of revelation into four categories. If we are going to take the Spirit in this verse to mean Gabriel then we shall be confronted with a great difficulty in explaining the identification of Jesus with the Spirit.\(^3\)

The explanation of the Spirit and the different modes of revelations to different apostles is suggested in the following Qur'anic verse:

11.254: "Some of the apostles We have endowed more highly than others: to some God hath spoken, and He hath raised others of them to the loftiest grade, and to Jesus the Son of Mary We gave manifold proofs of His mission, and We strengthened him with the Holy Spirit. And if God had pleased, they who came after them would not have wrangled, after the clear proofs had reached them. But into disputes they fell: some of them believed, and some were unbelievers; yet if God had pleased, they would not have thus wrangled: but God doth what He will."

---

1 See supra pp. 7f
2 See supra pp. 84; and Appendix A, pp. 113, 114
3 See supra pp. 86
The mention of the differences of the people of the Book and the exposition of the different modes of revelation to different prophets and apostles, can only be interpreted in one way; that Mohammed is referring to the conflicting schools of thought concerning the Nature of the Messiah.

1) In iv.170.
"THE MESSIAH BY NO MEANS DISDAINETH TO BE A SERVANT OF GOD, NOR DO THE ANGELS WHO ARE NIGH UNTO HIM."

and
2) v.79:
"The Messiah, Son of Mary, is but an Apostle; Other Apostles have flourished before him; AND HIS MOTHER WAS A JUST PERSON: THEY BOTH ATE FOOD. BEHOLD HOW WE MAKE CLEAR TO THEM THE SIGNS! THEN BEHOLD HOW THEY TURN ASIDE!"

In this last cited verse we notice that the same theme of the belief in the supernatural prophets (the one who does not eat nor drink nor walk the marts)\(^1\) is still dominating. In this case, this belief is not conceived by the pseudo-Islamic Arabs, but by Christians whose views on the Nature of Christ produced a long series of controversial views and heretical movements in the Christian Church.

This verse speaks about Jesus and His mother eating food as might be explained in the light of this long series of controversies concerning the Nature of Christ, and as an example we quote the Polemics of Ignatius against the Docetists'\(^2\) "CHRIST",

\(^1\) Compare xx1.5-8.
"JESUS he says, "WAS TRULY BORN AND ATE AND DRANK, WAS TRULY PERSECUTED UNDER PONTIUS PILATE ..... WAS TRULY RAISED FROM THE DEAD."¹ The opposite view is represented in Text 11.10 where we read that Michael is reported to have said:

₁ THE FIRST DAYS I APPEAR UNTO YOU, BUT I DID NOT DRINK BUT I DID SEE A VISION.²

² Compare the Gospel according to St. John iv.31-37.
CHAPTER FIVE

THE POLEMICS OF THE QOR’ĀN AGAINST THE DIVINE NATURE OF CHRIST.

In the previous chapter we noticed that the Qor’ānic conception of the relation between God and man stressed the idea of the absolute transcendentalism of God. The transcendental God, accordingly, revealed His will and His knowledge via his prophets who were conceived as human beings. In this conception the Qor’ān avoided the early Jewish conception of the direct manifestations of Yahweh in the human form, and the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation.

Although the Qor’ān calls Jesus the "Messiah Son of Mary" yet the conception of the Messiah as the Saviour and Redeemer is not mentioned (neither in its Jewish nor in its Christian form). What the Qor’ān says about the Messiah is mainly concentrated on his prophetic function. The Messiah is one of the prophets whom God sent. Jesus came as a prophet to the Israelites who differed among themselves.¹

The Qor’ānic "Christology" (if we might use the term) is reflected in various aspects, but all these aspects seem to emphasise the complete humanity of Christ. In the following

¹ See supra, pp. 47
verse, the Jews are condemned for being unbelievers and for not accepting the mission of Jesus:

iv.152: "The prophet of the Book will ask of thee to cause a Book to come down unto them out of heaven. But a greater thing than this did they ask of Moses! For they said 'Show us God plainly! and for this their wickedness did a storm out of Heaven lay hold on them. Then took they the calf as the object of their worship, after that our clear tokens had come to them; but we forgave them this, and conferred on Moses undoubted power. And We uplifted the mountain over them when we made a covenant with them, and We said to them, 'Enter the gate adoring': and We said to them, 'Break not the Sabbath', and We received from them a strict covenant. So for that they have broken their covenant and rejected the signs of God and put the prophets to death unjustly, saying the while, 'Our hearts are uncircumcised, nay, but God hath sealed them up for their unbelief, so that but few believe, and for their unbelief - and for their having spoken against Mary a grievous calumny and for their saying, 'Verily we have slain the Messiah, Jesus the Son of Mary, an Apostle of God' ... yet they slew Him not, and they crucified Him not, but they had only His likeness, and verily they who differed about Him were in doubt concerning Him. No sure knowledge had they about Him, but followed only an opinion, and they did not really slay Him, but God took Him up to Himself: and God is mighty wise."

In this verse, the Qoran, besides re-echoing the speech of St. Stephen (recorded in Act, Chap.vii), the Polemics of the Old Testament prophets (e.g. Jeremiah vii.25; xxv.4; xxvi.5; xxix.19; xxxv.15) and the Biblical passages (e.g. II.Kings xvii.13ff.; xxi. 10 ff.), charges the Jews with slandering Mary; and boasting that they had killed Jesus.

---

The Jewish Slander against Mary.

In saying the Jews "have spoken against Mary a grievous calumny" the Qur'ān seems to refer to certain expressions in the Jewish tradition such as Jesus alleged to be a "Memzer" (of spurious birth). R. Shim'on ben ¹ Azai said, "I have found a roll of pedigrees in Jerusalem, and therein is written a certain person SPURIUS EST EX ADULTERA (NATUS); to confirm the words." Herford's commentary says: "This passage is from the Mishna and therefore belongs to the older stratum of the Talmud. R. Shim'on ben ¹ Azai was the contemporary and friend of AQIBA, about the end of the first and beginning of the second century. They were both disciples of R. Jehoshua ben Hananiah (b. Taan. 26a), of whom frequent mention will be made in these pages. R. Jehoshua, in his early life, had been a singer in the temple (b. Erach.11b), and his teacher, R. Johanan ben Zaccai, was old enough to have seen and remembered Jesus. The Rabbis mentioned here were amongst the leading men of their time, and on that account must have been much concerned with the question arising out of the growth of Christianity. R. Jehoshua is expressly mentioned as having been one of the chief defenders of Israel against the Minim; and, whatever may be the precise significance of that term, it will be shown subsequently that it includes Christians, though it may possibly include others also. R. Agiba also is said to have been a particularly zealous opponent

1 Cf. R.T. Herford, Christianity in Talmud and Midrash, p.43.
2 ibid.
of the Christians.... When, therefore, Shim'on ben Ḥazai reported that he had found a book of pedigrees in which it was stated that "a certain person" (PELONI) was of SPURIOUS BIRTH, it is certainly probable that the reference is to Jesus. Unless some well-known man were intended, there would be no point in referring to him, and unless there had been some strong reason for avoiding his name, the name would have been given in order to strengthen the argument founded upon the case. For it is said that Shim'on ben Ḥazai made his statement "in order to confirm the words of R. Jehoshua"; and R. Jehoshua had laid it down that a bastard is one who is condemned to a judicial death, i.e. one born of a union which was prohibited under penalty of such a death. Now Jesus undoubtedly had been condemned (although not on account of his birth) to a judicial death, as the Talmud recognises and Shim'on ben Ḥazai brings the evidence of the book which he had discovered, to show that in the case of a notorious person the penalty of a judicial death had followed upon unlawful birth."

Another statement is given by Harford:

ben Sanh. 106a - R. Johanan said (concerning Balaam), "In the beginning a prophet, in the end a deceiver."
Rab. Papa said, "This is that which they say, SHE WAS THE DESCENDENT OF PRINCES AND RULERS, SHE PLAYED THE HARLOT WITH CARPENTERS."

Harford commenting says: "It will be shown subsequently

1 ibid, pp.47,48. The statement is taken from b. Sanh. 106a.
2 ibid, p.48.
that Jesus is often referred to in the Talmud under the figure of Balaam, and the words just translated occur in the middle of a long passage about Balaam. No name is mentioned to indicate what woman is meant. But the context suggests that the mother of Jesus is intended; and the suggestion is borne out by the statement that the woman mated with a carpenter. The passage, as it stands, is of a later date....

Again in the polemics with the Minim, Herford records the following:

PESIQTa Rab. xxi, p.100b: "R. Hija bar Abba said, if the Son of the harlot shall say to thee, 'These are two Gods' say unto him, 'I am He of the sea; I am He of Sinai'... (another explanation), R. Hija bar Abba said, If the son of a harlot shall say to thee, 'These are two Gods' say unto him (Deut.v.4) Face to face the Lord spake (singular, not plural) with you."

Herford commenting says: "In the present passage the doctrine of two gods is ascribed to the "son of the harlot". This phrase can refer to none other than Jesus, the story of whose birth was thus coarsely represented in the Rabbinical tradition (see Herford, Christianity in Talmud, p.41 ff.)."

The Qor\'anic Denial of the Crucifixion of Christ.

It should be emphasised that the nature of the denial of the crucifixion of Christ in this verse is polemical and that these polemics were motivated by the Jewish reaction against
Mohammed's claim for prophecy. The significance of the verse was to show the Jews that Mohammed was not the only Prophet who was rejected by them, and that their history shows that they not only used to reject the prophets but they used to kill them as well.

This charge of the Jews slaying the prophets is also made by St. Stephen in the book of the Acts of the Apostles (vii.52):

"WHICH OF THE PROPHETS HAVE NOT YOUR FATHERS PERSECUTED? AND THEY HAVE SLAIN THEM WHICH SHewed BEFORE OF THE COMING OF THE JUST ONE; OF WHOM YE HAVE BEEN NOW THE BETRACERS AND MURDERERS."

1 Cf. Cor.ii.81: "So oft then as an apostle came to you with that which your souls desired not, did ye swell with pride, and treat a portion as impostors, and SLAY OTHERS?".

& ii.85: "... Why then have ye of old slain God's prophets, if ye are indeed believers?"

"In the O.T. we read but few martyrdoms of the prophets: besides the slaughter of the prophets of the Lord by Jezebel, there are the murders of Zechariah, the high priest (II.Chron.xxiv.20-2) and of Urijah in (Jer.xxvi.23). But again current literature was not limited to the Books of the O.T. There were many traditions as to the fates of the prophets; and the persecuting and slaying of the righteous was recognized as a feature of the history of Israel. This accusation was driven home by the Lord Himself, quoting 'The wisdom of God' which was perhaps some contemporary 'wisdom book' (cf. Luke.xii.49: "Therefore also said the wisdom of God, I WILL SEND THEM PROPHETS AND APOSTLES, AND SOME OF THEM THEY SHALL SLAY AND PERSECUTE."); I Thes.ii.15: "WHO BOTH KILLED THE LORD JESUS, AND THEIR OWN PROPHETS, AND HAVE PERSECUTED US, AND THEY PLEASE NOT GOD, AND ARE CONTRARY TO ALL MEN."; and Heb.xi.37: "They were stoned, they were sawn asunder, were tempted, were SLAIN WITH THE SWORD; THEY WANDERED ABOUT IN SHEEPS'KIN and goatskin, being destitute, afflicted, tormented."

(Both the references and the quotation are taken from the Westminster Commentary on the Book of the Acts.).
Some scholars saw in the Qur'anic denial of the Crucifixion a borrowing from the teachings of Basilides who "denied that Christ himself suffered, but asserted that Simon of Cyrene was crucified in his place." But this could not be taken as an indication to show that Mohammed believed in the unreality of the Body of Christ and thus was under the Docetic influence, as we have seen, that the Qur'anic teachings were built on the conception of the complete humanity of the Prophet. If Mohammed was not under the Basilidian influence then what was the purpose of his denying the Crucifixion? The answer to this question should be sought in the light of the occasion on which the denial was made. This occasion shows that this denial was made as an answer to the Jews who said we killed Christ. Thus Mohammed refuted their argument by relying on Basilides' teachings which say that they did not kill him.

The words (seemed to them) are explained by Muslim commentators in the following way. When Jesus was condemned and was about to be crucified, God made another man to have the same appearance as Jesus and thus this man who received the likeness of Jesus was crucified in his place.

2 "The story that Basilides taught about the Crucifixion of Simon of Cyrene is generally rejected, though Pfleiderer (Urchristianum ii.384) considers that the statement in the fourth gospel that Jesus went out bearing the Cross for himself (John xix.17) was intended to repudiate the synoptic statement that Simon of Cyrene helped Jesus to carry His Cross, and was elicited by the turn given to the story by Basilides." The quotation is taken from A.S. Peake, E.R.E. vol.ii.p.425 b.)
However fanciful this story seems it is to be noticed that the Qur'ān made use of it probably for two purposes: (a) to show that God's power is over that of the Jews, and (b) to rebut, and probably minimise, their saying to him, if you do not stop we would slay you as we slew Jesus.¹

The mission of Jesus is expressed in the Qur'ān in the following way:

xliv.59-63:

"Jesus is no more than a servant whom we favoured, and proposed as an instance of divine power to the children of Israel, and if we pleased we could from yourselves bring forth angels to succeed you on earth: and ye shall be a sign of the last hour; doubt not then of it, and follow me: this is the right way, and let not Satan turn you aside from it, for he is your manifest foe. And when Jesus came with manifest proofs, he said:

'Now am I come to you with wisdom, and a part of those things about which ye are at variance I will clear up to you. Fear ye God therefore, and obey me. Verily God is my Lord and your Lord, wherefore, worship ye him: this is the right way, but the different parties fell into dispute among themselves, but woe to those who thus transgressed, because of the punishment of an afflictive day!' "²

¹ It is narrated (cf. Baladhuri, Futuh, p.17; Diar-Bakri, Tarikh al-Khams, vol.1.p.459 ff., Wakidi Faghazi, Ibn Hish. Sira, p.545, Tabari, Anals, p.136) that Mohammed after his victory over Quraysh in Badr, called on the Jews of Banu Qaynuga in their market and asked them to accept Islam lest they should have the same fate as Quraysh in Badr. The report says that they refused and told him not to be deceived by his victory over Quraysh who were not skilled in war; if he fought them he should find in them good fighters. The Qur. refers to this incident in iii.10 ff. Although we do not have any direct mention of the Jews saying we kill you as we killed Jesus, yet as the verse falls in Sura iii (whose contents are mainly reference to Christians and Christian teachings) there is a possibility of finding certain provocations which might have led them to say this.

² According to Moslem commentators, the exposition of the Qur'ānic teaching concerning Jesus in this verse is occasioned by the
In these verses we find that Jesus was sent as a prophet to the Israelites to clear up to them part of what they differed on. The mission of Jesus to clear the difference among the Jews did not clear up to the people the Divine Will, as, according to this verse, and others, the coming of Jesus occasioned other differences among the Christians who not only disputed about the Nature of Christ but also fell in enmity and hatred among themselves as it is said in v.17:

"And of those who say, 'Verily we are Christians,' have we accepted the covenant. But they too have forgotten a part of that which they were warned; wherefore WE HAVE STIRRED UP ENMITY AND HATRED AMONG THEM THAT SHALL LAST TILL THE DAY OF THE RESURRECTION, and in the end will God tell them of their deeds."

The difference in opinion among the Christians concerning the divinity and the humanity of Christ led Mohammed to assign himself as the sent prophet to clear to them their difference as it is said in v.18,19:

"O people of the Scriptures! now is out Apostle come to you to CLEAR UP TO YOU MUCH THAT YE CONCEALED, OF THOSE SCRIPTURES, AND TO PASS OVER MUCH. NOW HATH A LIGHT AND A CLEAR BOOK COME TO YOU FROM GOD BY WHICH GOD WILL GUIDE HIM WHO FOLLOWETH AFTER HIS GOOD PLEASURE, TO PATHS OF PEACE, AND BRING THEM OUT OF THE DARKNESS TO THE LIGHT BY HIS WILL; AND GUIDE THEM TO THE RIGHT PATH.

INFIDELS/

question put to Mohammed by Qoraysh who said (cf. Qor.xliii.57: "And when the Son of Mary was set forth as an instance of Divine power, Lo! thy people cried out for joy thereat: And they said, "Are our Gods or is He the better?"

1 See supra pp.47 Tabari, Tafsir, on xliii.63, does not specify the nature of the differences between the Jews but says generally "Because the differences between the Jewfish sects were numerous." 2 e.g. xix.5 ff. "This is Jesus, the Son of Mary; This is a
INFIDELS ASSUREDLY ARE THEY WHO SAY, "VERILY GOD IS THE MESSIAH SON OF MARY!
SAY: WHO THEN COULD HAVE ANY POWER OVER GOD, IF HE CHOSE TO DESTROY THE MESSIAH SON OF MARY, AND HIS MOTHER, AND ALL WHO ARE ON THE EARTH TOGETHER."

To show that Christ did not confess to be Divine the Qor'AN in v.116 put into his mouth the following words:

"And when God shall say: - "O Jesus! Son of Mary!
HAST THOU SAID UNTO MANKIND - 'TAKE ME AND MY MOTHER AS TWO GODS, BESIDE GOD!" HE SHALL SAY - 'GLORY BE UNTO THEE! IT IS NOT FOR ME TO SAY THAT WHICH I KNOW TO BE NOT THE TRUTH: HAD I SAID THAT, THEN VERILY THOU WOULDST HAVE KNOWN IT: THOU KNOWEST WHAT IS IN ME, BUT I KNOW NOT WHAT IS IN THEE; VERILY THOU KNOWEST THINGS UNSEEN!
I SPAKE NOT TO THEM AUGHT BUT THAT WHICH THOU DIDST
BID ME - 'WORSHIP GOD, MY LORD AND YOUR LORD!' AND I WAS THEIR WITNESS WHILE I STAYED AMONG THEM; BUT SINCE
THOU HAST TAKEN ME TO THYSELF, THOU HAST THYSELF WATCHED THEM, AND THOU ART WITNESS OF ALL THINGS."

In ii.73 ff. the Qor'AN negates the divination of the prophet in the following way:

"IT BESEEMETH NOT A MAN, THAT GOD SHOULD GIVE HIM THE SCRIPTURES AND THE WISDOM, AND PROPHECY, AND THAT THEN HE SHOULD SAY TO MEN, "BECOME WORSHIPPERS OF ME AS WELL AS OF GOD," BUT RATHER, "BECOME LEARNED IN THINGS PERTAINING TO GOD, SINCE YE KNOW THE SCRIPTURES AND HAVE STUDIED THEM. - AND GOD DOETH NOT COMMAND YOU TO TAKE TO YOURSELVES THE ANGELS OR THE PROPHETS AS LORDS. WOULD HE ENJOIN BELIEF ON YOU AFTER YE HAVE BECOME MOSLEMS."

Statement of the truth concerning which they doubt. It becometh not God to beget a son. Glory be to Him! when He decreeth a thing, He only saith to it Be, and it is. AND VERILY, GOD IS MY LORD AND YOUR LORD, ADORE HIM THEN. THIS IS A RIGHT WAY. BUT THE SECTS HAVE FAILED TO VARIANCE AMONG THEMSELVES ABOUT JESUS: AND WOE BECAUSE OF THE WITNESSING-PLACE OF A GREAT DAY, TO THOSE WHO BELIEVE NOT!"

3 See Appendix B.

1 Compare ix.31 of the Qor'AN: "They take their teachers, and their ronks, and the Messiah Son of Mary, for Lords besides God, though/
The Qur'\text{\'}an thus states its conception about Jesus in v.76-79:

"They misbelieve who say 'Verily God is the Messiah the Son of Mary' but the Messiah said: 'O children of Israel I worship God, my Lord and your Lord; verily he who associates aught with God, God hath forbidden him Paradise, and his resort the Fire; and the unjust shall have none to help them. They misbelieve who say, 'Verily God is the Third of Three,' for there is no God but one, and if they do not desist from what they say, there shall touch those who misbelieve amongst them grievous woe. Will they not turn again toward God and ask pardon of Him? For God is forgiving and merciful.'

THE MESSIAH, THE SON OF MARY, IS ONLY A PROPHET! PROPHETS BEFORE HIM HAVE PASSED AWAY, AND HIS MOTHER WAS A CONFESSOR, THEY USED BOTH TO EAT FOOD. SEE NOW HOW WE EXPLAIN TO THEM THE SIGNS, YET SEE HOW THEY TURN ASIDE."

The mention of the words 'they used to EAT FOOD', in this verse, and the mention of the prohibition of the worship of angels and the prophets in the previous cited verse (v.19), and the statement: "The Messiah by no means disdaineth to be a servant of God, nor do the angels who are nigh unto Him" (in iv.170), and the exposition of the Qur'\text{\'}anic "Christology" in the following verse(iv.69):

"O YE PEOPLE OF THE BOOK! OVERSTEP NOT BOUNDS IN YOUR RELIGION, AND OF GOD SPEAK ONLY THE TRUTH. THE MESSIAH JESUS, SON OF MARY, IS ONLY AN APOSTLE OF GOD AND HIS WORD, WHICH HE CONVEYED INTO MARY AND A SPIRIT FROM HIM."

BELIEVE/ though bidden to worship one God only. There is no God but He! Glory be to Him beyond what they associate with Him."

and compare the Gospel according to St. Matthew (xxiii.7,8):

"But be not ye called Rabbi: FOR ONE IS YOUR TEACHER, AND ALL YE ARE BRETHREN: FOR ONE IS YOUR FATHER, WHICH IS IN HEAVEN.
NEITHER BE YE CALLED MASTERS: FOR ONE IS YOUR MASTER, EVEN THE CHRIST."

1 Compare the Gospel according to St. Matthew,i.20:
"FOR THAT WHICH IS CONCEIVED IN HER IS THE HOLY SPIRIT."
leads us to put forth the view that Mohammed in forming his "Christology" was in line with the Jewish conception of the "Spirit-ENDOWED MESSIHY" which we have discussed in Chapter Four.

The question arising is: Where did Mohammed get these teachings from? Is it directly from the Jews? or from the Christians?

In answer to these questions we feel that we are not competent enough to add much on the spilt ink of modern scholarship, but we can cite two or three quotations from the views of some Christian writers such as St. John of Damascus who was living within a life-time of the prophet's decease, and who said:

"The false ..... prophet "Mohammed ..... after consulting with a certain ARIAN MONK FOUNDED HIS OWN SECT."

"FOR THE WORD OF GOD SAYS (HOBREHTD) HAVING ENTERED INTO MARY, BECOT JESUS." 2

"The Damascene's statements were afterward amplified by authors of lesser authority and reputation such as Bartholomew of Edessa and Euthymius Zigabenus.

1 For the meaning of the "WORD OF GOD" and "A SPIRIT FROM HIM" see supra pp.
The former was reported to have said:

"From the Arians ... he (Moḥammad) learned that the Word and the Holy Spirit were creatures, from the Nestorians that a man, that is to say, a human person, should be adored."\(^1\)

The latter was also reported to have said:

"Moḥammad ..... on a trip to Palestine, learned from the Arians that the Word and the Spirit are creatures.

"Besides the affirmation of St. John of Damascus that Moḥammad's mentor was an Arian, we have the words of his disciple, Theodore Abu Qurrah, d.820 A.D., who is reported to have said:

"The Agarenes ..... bend their efforts to one point, the denying of the divinity of the Word of God ..... for their false prophet, since he follows the error of Arius, passed on to them this teaching, so opposed to piety and religion."\(^2\)

Furthermore, O'Shaughnessy\(^3\) tells us:

"As early as the fourth century certain Arians, mentioned in a letter of the patriarch of Alexandria, were reputed to have proposed a doctrine on the divine Word that is almost identical with the apparent teaching of the Qur'ān."\(^4\)

\(^1\) Again the quotation is from T. O'Shaughnessy, ibid. cf. Bartholomaei Edesseni, Concutatio Muhammedis (P.G.104, col.1450).

\(^2\) T. O'Shaughnessy, ibid. Reference to the quotation: Theodori Abuqurah, Opuscula, 25 (P.G. 97, col.1558).

\(^3\) Loc. cit.

O'Shaughnessy\textsuperscript{1} tells us that if Mohammed used the Arian teachings, "the Nestorian doctrine must have been even more present to him, if we are to judge by its wide diffusion through Arabia." On this basis this writer tells us: "One Nestorian doctrine among others that appears to have been incorporated into the Islamic 'revelation' is a misinterpreted presentation of "the new Adam" of Saint Paul (Romans v.12-19 and I Cor.xv.21-22)."

"The Nestorians were reported to have said that and the \textsuperscript{2}Qur'an incorporated it in its teachings."

\textsuperscript{1} Loc. cit. p.35.
\textsuperscript{2} T. O'Shaughnessy, Loc. cit. p.36.37, who quotes the following apologetic of Joannis Cassiani, \textit{De Incarnatione Christi}, Lib.7, capt.6. (P.L. 50, col.214): "You (O Nestorius)" writes John Cassian "assert the Lord Jesus to have been alike in all things and equal to Adam; Adam indeed (conceived) without seed and Jesus too without seed, the first only a man." Cf. the answer of Bartholomaei Edesseni, in \textit{Confutatio Agarenii} (P.G.104, col. 1398), which reads: "O fool, if to Christ we are to compare Adam because he too was made without seed, it would follow by your reasoning that the first ass, dog and serpent, also formed without seed, could be put on a par with them both."
CHAPTER SIX.

THE QOR\ANIC POLEMICS AGAINST THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF THE TRINITY.¹

The Qor\an speaks of the three Gods in the following two verses:

1. iv.169, which reads:
"O people of the Book! overstep not bounds in your religion; and of God, speak only the Truth. The Messiah, Jesus, Son of Mary, is only an apostle of God, and his word which He conveyed into Mary, and a Spirit proceeding from Himself. Believe therefore in God and his apostles, AND SAY NOT, 'A TRIAD' (there is a Trinity) - Forbear - it will be better for you. God is only one God! Far be it from His Glory that He should have a son! His whatever is in the Heavens and whatever is in the Earth! And God is a sufficient Guardian."

2. v.77, which reads:
"They surely are infidels who say, 'God is a third of three': for there is no God but one God: and if they refrain not from what they say, a grievous chastisement shall assuredly befall such of them as believe not."

Unfortunately in both of these verses we do not have any clue as to the identification of the third person of the Trinity; but from v.79 of the Qor\an we might find a suggestion which might connect the third person with Mary. Furthermore this suggestion is also shown in vi.16 where we read:

¹ Much of the study of this topic has been anticipated in former chapters.
"And when God shall say - "O Jesus, Son of Mary! hast thou said unto mankind - 'Take me and my mother as two Gods, beside God?'  He shall say - 'Glory be unto Thee! It is not for me to say that which I know to be not the truth; had I said that, then verily thou wouldest have known it: thou knowest what is in me, but I know not what is in thee; verily thou knowest things unseen!"

This Qor'anic suggestion is not based on any recognised conception of the Trinity in the Christian Church. It reference can either by the invention of Mohammed or that some heresy might have had such a conception. In Appendix B\textsuperscript{1} we see that in Arabia, Thrace and Scythia, there were certain women who were adoring the Virgin as a goddess and offering to her a certain kind of cake. They were the Collyridians. Furthermore, we noticed\textsuperscript{2} that the phrase THEOTOKOS (the Mother of God) caused certain controversies in Church history, and it brings to memory the address of Anastasius, the Presbyter of Antioch, which included:

"Let no one call Mary THEOTOKOS, she was but a human being. It is impossible for God to be born of a human being."

---

1 See infra, pp. 121, 122.
2 See infra, pp. 122.
APPENDIX A.

THE QOR')ANIC REFERENCES TO THE WORD ROUH.

The word RÜH occurs twenty times in the Qor'an. Of these fourteen are assigned to the Meccan period, five to the Medinian period, and one is disputed.

In xvii.4 ff.
"Therein (the night of Power )
descend the angels and the Spirit by permission of their Lord for every matter."

lxxviii.38
"On the day whereon the Spirit and the Angels shall stand ranged in order they shall not utter a word, save he whom the God of Mercy permits, and who shall say that which is right."

1 According to Tabari's authorities, Tafsir on loc. cit. the Spirit is Gabriel; Zamakhshari, Kashaf on loc. cit. gives the same explanation, but adds another account to the effect that the Spirits are "creatures among the angels who are not seen by the angels save on that particular night."

2 According to Bell, this is Meccan but perhaps suffered later editions. Tabari's authorities give the following explanation of the word RÜH.
(a) Ibn Mas'ûd said that it is an angel in the fourth heaven. He is the greatest of all who are in the heavens. He is greater than the mountains, and the angels. He praises God 12,000 praises and out of each praise God creates an angel. On the Day of Judgement, these angels come in one row.
(b) Ibn 'Abbas said that the Ruh is the grandest of all the angels.
(c) Dahâk and Shabî said that he is Gabriel.
(d) Mujahid said that the Ruh is a creature in the form of human beings who eat and drink, in another tradition, also ascribed to Mujahid, it is said that they are like human beings but not of the angels.
(e)/
lxx.l-5. 
"An inquirer inquired concerning the punishment that shall alight on the infidels: none can hinder God from inflicting it, the master of those ascents¹ by which the angels and the spirit ascend to Him in a day, whose length is fifty thousand years."

---

(e) Abo Khalid said they resemble humans, yet they do not belong to the human race.
(f) Qatadah said that they are the Sons of Adam (human beings) and he was reported to have said that this was what Ibn 'Abbas used to conceal.
(g) Ibn 'Abbas said that they are the souls of human beings.
(h) Ibn Zayd on the authority of Ibn Wahb said that the Ruh is the Qur'an, and he supported this explanation with xlI.51.

Zamakhshari, Kashaf on lxxvii.38 says that it (or they) is the grandest, the noblest, and the most near to God of all the Creatures.

Baydawi, Anwai-., on lxxvii.38 said that the Ruh is an angel who is in charge of the Souls or its Species, or Gabriel, or Creatures greater than angels.

¹ The Arabic word is جمایه، अनुभव. Bell (Cor·lan vol.a, p.604) renders it: "master of the stairs" and says: "the idea is obscure; there may be a reminiscence of Jacob's ladder (Gen. xxviii.12 f.)."
xxvi.193,4.
"The faithful Spirit hath come down with it upon thy heart that thou mightest become a warner - in the clear Arabic tongue. And truly it is foretold in the Scriptures of them of yore. Shall it not be a sign to them that the learned among the Children of Israel recognised it."

xiv.29.
"And when I shall have fashioned him (Adam) and breathed of my spirit into him, then fall ye down to him in worship."  

1 The commentators tell us that there is a variant reading of the readers of Hijaz, and Basra gave the readings to mean that "the faithful Spirit came down with it. The Kufa readers doubled the letter (z) to give it the strength that God caused the faithful Spirit to descend with it. The commentators also identified "The RUH AMIN" of this verse with Gabriel. Compare also xvi.104: "Say: the Holy Spirit hath brought it down with truth from thy Lord, that He may establish those who have believed, and as a guidance and glad tidings to the Muslims." The verse following this gives an indication of the occasion of the revelation of this verse. xvi.105 says:
"We verily also know that they say, "Surely a person teacheth him." But the tongue of him at whom they hint is foreign, while this Qor'an is in the plain Arabic." Compare lxxxi.19-21; liii.5; xxvi.193.

2 The 'Breathing' of God's spirit in Adam is also mentioned in xxxviii.72 (compare xxxvi.80). In these two verses we have the narrative of the creation of Adam and the dialogue which took place between God and Satan (then an angel according to the Moslem tradition). In this dialogue in these early revelations one can feel that the motive of the revelation is a comparison between the Angels and the First Man. The Qor'ān wants to set the preference of the First Man, who by the possession of the Spirit of God became superior to the Angels (men conceived as demons by the Arabs). A development of the motive of the narrative of the creation of Adam is seen in ii.28 ff.:-
"And/
"And when thy Lord said to the angels, 'Verily I am about to place one in my stead on earth,' they said: 'Wilt thou place there one who will eat corruptly therein and shed blood? But we celebrate thy praise and extol thy holiness.' God said, 'Verily, I know what ye know not.' And he taught Adam the names of all things, and then set them before the angels, and said: 'Tell me the names of these, if ye are endowed with wisdom.'

The mention of 'blood shedding' and the angels' fear of the corruption on earth, remind one of the narrative of the Fallen Angels in the Book of Jubilees (iv.15 & v.1); also in Enoch ix where we read that Michael, Uriel, Raphael and Gabriel looked down from heaven and saw much blood being shed upon the earth. They said:

"The Lord of Ages: Lord of Lords, God of Gods, King of Kings (and God of Ages), the Throne of thy Glory (standeth) unto all generations of the ages, and thy name holy and glorious and blessed unto all ages! Thou hast made all things, and Power over all things hast thou; and all things are naked and open in thy sight, and all things thou seest, and nothing can hide itself from thee. Thou seest what Azazel (the chief of the fallen angels) hath done, who hath taught all unrighteousness on earth and revealed the eternal secrets which were preserved in heaven, which men were striving to learn. And Semjaza, to whom thou hast given authority to bear rule over his associates, and they have gone to the daughters of men upon the earth, and have slept with women, and have defiled themselves, and revealed to them all kinds of sins. And the women have borne giants, and the whole earth has thereby been filled with blood and unrighteousness."

This account should be an explanation of Gen. vi.1-6. This account seems to be the source of this Quranic verse and a tradition ascribed to Ibn Mas'ud supports it. It says (see Tabari, Tafkir, on ii.28) that the first inhabitants of the earth were the demons (the Jinn). They were the cause of corruption, they shed blood in it, and massacred
xxi.91.
"And her who kept her maidenhood (Mary), and into whom We breathed of our Spirit, and made her and her son a sign to all creatures."

xix.16,17.
"And make mention in the Book, of Mary, when she went apart from her family to a place eastward, And took a veil to shroud herself from them: and we sent our spirit to her, and he appeared before her like a perfect man."

xvi.2.
"By his own behest He causeth the angels to descend with the Spirit on whom He pleaseth among his servants bidding them "warn that there is no God but Me; therefore fear Me!"."

---

1 Each other. God sent Iblis (Satan) with an army of angels who killed them. See also the other traditions ascribed to Ibn Wāhab, which says that God said to the angels: 'I want to create in earth and to appoint a successor over them' (at that time none but the angels were created). Another tradition ascribed to Ibn 'Abbas says that God wanted to appoint a leader to the people to lead them to righteousness after their corruption. All these narratives and traditions seem to have their original source in Gen.1.26. Cf. Midr. Rabbahon Num.iv.par.19. Compare Midr. on Gen.1. par.8,17.

1 Different readings of the word خـ. Some read it as double (z) while others as single. The former indicates the order of God to the angels to descend with the Spirit, while the latter makes the angels descend on their own accord. Some of the Kufi reciters read with a (t) and not a (y). In this verse the commentators explain the Spirit to mean revelation (Ibn 'Abbas)."
xl.15.
"Of exalted grade, of the Throne possessed,
He sendeth forth the Spirit at his own
behest on whomever of his
servants He pleaseth, that He may warn of
the day of meeting."\(^1\)

xlii.52.
"And thus have We sent the Spirit, to Thee,
by our Command
Thou knewest
not, ere this, what "the Book" was, or
what the faith. But We have ordained it
for a light: by it will We guide whom We
please of our servants.
And thou verily shalt surely guide into
the right way."\(^2\)

The Madinian verses concerning the RUH.

11.81.
"Moreover, to Moses gave We "the Book" and We
caused apostles to succeed him; and to Jesus,
Son of Mary, gave We clear proofs of his mission,
and strengthened him by the Holy Spirit. So oft
then as an apostle came to you with that which
your souls desired not, did ye swell with pride,
and treat a portion as impostors, and slay others."\(^3\)

---

\(^1\) Here the commentators explained the Spirit to mean
revelation, and the prophecy in the sacred Books.

\(^2\) If this verse is the continuation of verse xlii.50 ff:
"It is not for man that God should speak with
him but by revelation, or from behind a veil
Or he sendeth a messenger to reveal, by his
permission, what He will: verily He is
exalted, wise."

then we can say that in this stage Mohammed was arguing
against the conception of God's action in the universe in a
direct way, and the formation of such a conception of
Intermediaries seems to be patterned according to the
Jewish Alexandrian Theology. (See infra pp.).

\(^3\) See supra pp. According to Tabari's authorities
the Spirit here is Gabriel. A tradition ascribed to Shahr
ibn Hawshab al-)Ash'ari says that certain Jews asked the
prophet "Tell us about the Spirit". He said "I beseech thee
"Some of the apostles we have endowed more highly than others: to some God hath spoken, and He hath raised others of them to the loftiest grade; And to Jesus the Son of Mary We gave manifest proofs of his mission, and we strengthened him with the Holy Spirit. And if God had pleased, they who came after them would not have wrangled, after the clear proofs had reached them. But into dispute they fell: Some of them believed, and some were unbelievers, yet if God had pleased, they would not thus have wrangled; but God doth what He will."

in the name of God and his Days, with Israelites, Dè not ye know that it is Gabriel and he comes to me." They said "Yes."

Others said that the Spirit here is the Evangel. Others said that it is the power through which Jesus performed his miracles. Others said that Gabriel was called the Spirit because he was formed without a father and God called him Holy because he was Pure; similarly Jesus was called the Spirit. Others explained the 'Spirit' as the 'name' through which Jesus used to bring to life the dead.

1 This seems to contradict verse xlii.50 ff.
APPENDIX B.

CHRISTIAN HERESIES IN PRE-ISLAMIC ARABIA.

The ecclesiastical histories introduce us to the establishment of Christian bishoprics in Syria. These bishoprics, and their doctrinal struggles with the Catholic Church and with one another, did not result only in the naming of Arabia as a "source of heresies" (see Bell, Origen, p.20), but also made out of these struggles, in later times, certain grounds for certain political alliances. Of these early Arabian heresies we hear of: Beryll of Bostra, who was the Bishop of Bostra in Arabia in the middle of the third century A.D. He was known in his day as one of the most learned teachers (see Edmund Venables, s.v. Beryll of Bostra in Dictionary of Christian Biographies, vol.1, p.317). We are told that he conceived heretical views which were the occasion for an ecclesiastical synod which assembled at Bostra in 2.4 A.D. These heretical views were of two natures; some belonged to the Monarchian views, who are generally called "Patripassianists", on the person of Christ, while the others "were peculiar to himself, and which is now very difficult to distinguish." (Cf. Hefele, Church Councils, p.91). Alexander J. Grieve (Ency. Brit. 12th ed. p.213 a) tells us that Beryllus of Bostra and Paul of Samosata
were representing similar views of the Adoptionists, who were losing their views on the Synoptic Gospels, and teaching descent from the obscure sect of the Alogia, the Adoptionists under Theodotus of Byzantium tried to found a school at Rome (c.185), asserting that Jesus was a MAN, filled with the Holy Spirit's inspiration from his baptism, and so attaining such a perfection of holiness that he was adopted by God and exalted to Divine dignity. Theodotus was excommunicated by the Bishop of Rome, Victor (c.195), but his followers lived on under a younger teacher of the same name, and under Artemon; while in the East similar views were expounded by Beryllus of Bostra and Paul of Samosata, who undoubtedly influenced Lucian of Antioch and his school, including ARIUS and, later, NESTORIUS. (For a more expounded Christological beliefs of Beryll see J.A. Dorman, History of the Development of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, Division I, vol.ii, p.41.).


The Synods which assembled to consider his unsound faith were three in number (although it was argued), all of them were held in Antioch. According to E. Venables (Dict. of Christian Biog., vol.iv, p.253, cf. also Loof, Paulus von Samosata.), the
teaching of Paul of Samosata "was a development of that of Artemon, with whose heresy it is uniformly identified by all writers." He held THE PURE HUMANITY OF CHRIST; he believed the Christ did not exist before Mary, but received from her the origin of His being; Christ's existence was simply in the Divine foreknowledge. "He started with the Unity of God, denying the existence of aσφία or άνο γός distinct from the Father, and representing the Logos in God as merely that which intelligence or reason is in the human heart. (Epiphan. Haer. 65). He allowed of no difference in KIND between the indwelling of the LOGOS in CHRIST and in any other man. This indwelling was not that of a PERSON, but of a QUALITY. Athanasius distinctly asserts that he taught Θεός ζηκτυβεύει (God from a virgin) Θεός εκ Ναζαρην οφθεδρα (God arising from Nazareth). (Ath. De Salut. adv. Apoll. I p.635); but he laid no particular stress upon it.

His inferior Being was ζηκτυβεύει; his superior Being was penetrated by the Logos, whose instrumentality by it was continually advancing towards God, until the "Jesus Christ from below" became worthy of union with God.

THEREFORE ALTHOUGH HE CALLED CHRIST GOD, IT WAS NOT AS GOD BY HIS NATURE, BUT BY GRADUAL PROGRESS OUT OF THE HUMANITY. He was convicted, according to Eusebius, of asserting that Christ was MERE MAN DEEMED ESPECIALLY WORTHY OF DIVINE GRACE (Euseb. H.E. vii.27). He taught also that as the Logos is not a PERSON, as
also the Holy SPIRIT is IMPERSONAL, a Divine virtue belonging to the Father, and distinct from Him only in conception."

According to Edmund Venables, (Dict. of Christ. Biog. vol.iv, p.250 b), "Paul's divergences from the orthodox faith may be partly attributed to his desire to make the doctrines of Christianity more palatable to his patroness (Zenobia, who was a Jewess), and to the professors of the Neo-Platonic Philosophy by whom she was surrounded." While Loofs' thesis (Friedrich Loofs, Paulus von Samosata, Leipzig, 1942; reviewed in J.T.S. vol.xxvi. p.187 ff by W. Telfer) comprises: "Paul was no deliberate dynamic Monarchian, or Adophianist heretic, but simply a prominent exponent of an archaic traditional form of theology and Christology somewhat exaggerated by motives of reaction against the rising tide of Origenistic metaphysical theology."

The Collydians.

Of the Collydians we know practically nothing. Our knowledge about them is confined to a certain statement by Epiphanius (Haer. LXXIX., cf. Mary in E.R.E. vol.viii.p.476a), which reveals the habit of "certain women in Thrace, Scythia, and Arabia" who were adoring the Virgin as a goddess and offering to her a certain kind of cake. Their practice and the notions underlying it were undoubtedly relics of heathenism always familiar with female deities. Epiphanius' condemnation of them was in the following words: "Let Mary be held in honour, but let the Lord be worshipped."
The belief of these women would be insignificant if it was isolated in itself; but the appearance of the controversies about the name "THE MOTHER OF GOD", "THEOTOKOS", and the disturbances that it caused in the dogma of the church, leads one to think of the part that it played in the history of the church. George Sale (Prel. Dis. p.25), tells us: "This notion of the divinity of the Virgin Mary was also believed by some at the Council of Nicea, who said there were two Gods besides the Father, viz. Christ and the Virgin Mary, and were thence named Marianites (Elmacin. Eutych.). Others imagined her to be exempt from humanity and deified her, which goes but little beyond the Popish superstition in calling her the complement of the Trinity, as if it were imperfect without her." This notion and the term "Theotokos" stirred the Church considerably. Anastasius, the Presbyter of Antioch, and the assistant of Nestorius, is reported to have uttered the following words in a sermon, preached at Constantinople. He said: "Let no one call Mary "THEOTOKOS", she was but a human being. It is impossible for God to be born of a human being." These words, Isaac Gregory Smith says (Dict. of Christ. Biog. vol.1v,p.108): "were eagerly caught up by the enemies of Nestorius: they caused great excitement among clergy and laity, which was greatly increased when the Archbishop, by supporting and defending Anastasius, adopted the language as his own (Soc. H.E.,vii.B.2; Evag. H.E. I.2)."
The Tritheists.

"As a definite phase in the history of Christian thought Tritheism appeared (c.A.D.550) in Monophysite circles, being associated chiefly with the names of John Askusages and John Philoponus. The latter, an Alexandrian Philosopher and a distinguished Aristotelian, of whose work entitled important fragments have been preserved in the writings of John of Damascus (De Haer.83) appears to have been the most influential, of the school. As a Monophysite John Philopon was opposed to the Chalcedonian description of the Person of Christ as consisting of 'One Person in two Natures', and contended that Christ was a single Nature compounded of the Divine and the Human, that is to say in Christology and were to be viewed as synonymous terms.

The connection of this heresy with Syria and Arabia is shown from the connection between Jacobus Baradōs, [Bishop of Edessa (c.541) who was a Monophysite and whose missionary works affected the Arabs (cf. Gibbon, vol.vi.p.75) (cf. D.C.B. vol.iii.p.334)], and Conon and Eugenius (cf. Nau, Les Arabes Chrétiens, p.57) whom he ordained. Of Conon we know (cf. Venables (s.v.); D.C.B. vol.3, p.621) that he was "Bishop of Tarsus (c.601), a disciple of Joannes Philoponus, whose cause he defended in conjunction with Eugenius against the Eutyohians Paul and Stephen before John Patriarch of Constantinople." "Conon subsequently disagreed with Philoponus as to the perfect equality of the three Natures in the Trinity, and, separating from him, founded a new Church of which he acted as bishop."
The Monophysites.

The Byzantine Empire, to win the favour of the Monophysites, in order to establish stability, security, and order in Syria, appointed two independent Monophysite bishops for the lands on the Arabian frontiers. This appointment met with the approval of Justinian. The Bishops appointed were: Jacobus Baradōs and Theodore.

Of Jacobus Baradōs (Al-Baradî), we know that he was ordained by the Monophysites, as Bishop of Edessa (c.541) with œcumenical authority over the members of their body throughout the East. "He rescued the Monophysite community from the extinction with which it was threatened by the persecution of the imperial powers." (cf. DI.C.D.vol.iii.p.320b). His zeal "breathed new life in the organisation of the church consecrating bishops, ordaining clergy, and uniting its scattered elements - an organisation so well planned and so stable that it has subsisted unharmed through all the political and dynastic storms that have swept over that portion of the world, and preserves to the present day the name of its founder as the Jacobite Church of the East."

He became "a centre of attraction to comers, both lay and clerical. Among his visitors was HARTH IBN JABALA "the Magnificent" the Sheikh of the Christian Arabs (A.D.530-572), who was an adherent of the Monophysite creed, had set out to pay his respects to Jacobus during his residence in Pesilta, but had been turned back by a vision."
Of his missionary work Gibbon (vi.p.75) says: "The expiring faction was revived, and united and perpetuated ... the speed of the zealous missionary was promoted by the fleetest dromedaries of a devout chief of the Arabs. The doctrine and discipline of the Jacobites were secretly established in the dominions of Justinian, and each Jacobite was compelled to violate the laws, and to hate the Roman legislator." His refuge places, we are told (D.C.B.vol.iii.p.338) were amongst the Arab tribes, their chiefs, the people of Syria and Asia Minor. These people offered him their friendly attitude and eluded all attempts to seize him."

The Nestorian chronicler Sin'ert (edited by Addai Seher Pat. Orient.vol.vii.p.142-143) tells us that some of the Monophysites of Syria escaped, after Justin's persecutions, to Hira, but this refuge was interrupted by Justin's order, though al-Mondhir, to expel all the religious refugees who came to his land. Mondhir accordingly requested them to leave, and so some of them escaped while the others remained in disguise. Some, we are told, (ibid) went to Najran, where they settled and introduced the heresy of Julian (يوليا'), the teacher of Severus who says that the body of our Lord the Messiah descended from heaven and that body was spaced all over the world. According to this chronicler, this heresy was corrected and was removed from there by Mar Abda Ibn Hanif. "The essential doctrine of Monophysitism is the assertion of the absolute unity of the Person of Christ", says
Luce (Monophysitism, Past and Present, p.17). Their belief in the one nature of Christ is explained in the following way: "The human nature at the Incarnation was absorbed into the divine. It no more has substantive existence than has the world in a Pantheistic system." (ibid. p.17).

The Monophysite "unwillingness to attribute passibility to God, coupled with the desire to remain in some sort trinitarians, forced many of the monophysites into the Sabellian position. Deity, they said in effect, did not suffer in the Second person of the Trinity, because there is no such person. The Persons of the Trinity are simply characters assumed by the monadic essence, or aspects under which men view it. On this showing, the Logos, who was incarnate, had not personal subsistence. The relation between God and man ever remains impersonal. Christ qua divine, was only an aspect or effluence of deity. This for the Monophysite was the one alternative to the doctrines of a possible God. He was faced with a desperate dilemma. If he retained his belief in a transcendent God, he must surrender belief in a triune God. He could choose between the two, but his Christology permitted no third choice. For him, the only alternative to a finite God, was a lone God. As a result, monophysite theology oscillated between denial of the impassibility of God and denial of his threefold personality. In either case, the orthodox doctrine of the Godhead was abandoned." (Luce, ibid, pp.61,62).
The Monophysite stress on the Divine Nature of Christ leads to another doctrinal belief and the following question:

If there is One Divine Nature of Christ, do they (the Monophysites) consider the Human Nature of Christ as Real or Apparent?

Luce (ibid, p.67), tells us that the suspicion of the reality of Christ's Human Nature, as a whole, is characteristic of all monophysitic thought. "The fact that the Son of God lived a perfect human life contained no inspiration for them." Thus they idealised the Incarnation. The Incarnation, to them, was not a historical event, and thus in the Incarnation, according to their great champion, Philoxenus, "no addition to His person took place." Accordingly, the problem of the pre-existence of the Logos and the Father did not trouble them. But this doctrine developed in their own spheres, and thus there was no admission to the introduction of "the composition of Natures". And "on this point their Christology passed through several stages of development, the later stage showing progressive improvement on the earlier. They distinguished three senses of the word composition. First, they said, it might mean "absorption", as when a drop of water is absorbed in a jar of wine. Second, it might imply the transmutation of constituent particles, as when a third unlike thing is formed from two. Thirdly, there is composition when, from the association of two whole and entire things, a third whole and entire compound thing is formed
without loss to the components. They illustrated the third mode of composition by the union in man of soul and body.

As to the question of the reality of the body of Christ, the "monophysites" were inclined to regard matter as sinful. They could not conceive the infinite donning a solid robe. "Our body with its hateful wants could not, they thought, be a tabernacle for the Logos." The idea of the native dignity of the human frame and of its being annointed by the King's indwelling was completely foreign to the "monophysites' ways of thinking." As a result their denial of Christ's coming in the flesh, and their conception that "the body had no objective reality. It was a phantom. Its reality was entirely subjective." (Luce, ibid., p. 80). The general feeling among the followers of Eutyches was: "that Christ's physical nature was divine and therefore not consubstantial with ours."

Likewise, the Monophysites deviated from the orthodox belief that Christ, "at ordinary times, used a human reason, perfect of its kind, but still human in all the implications of the word." According to the "monophysites: "They were unbelievers who asserted the ignorance of Christ and set bounds to the vision and knowledge of the infinite." (Luce, ibid., p. 80).

The Nestorians.

The main points which distinguish the Nestorian Church from the other churches are summarised by G.R. Driver and L. Hodgson, in their edition of the Barzaar of Herzielides. 
Eustorius, they say:

(i) Denies that the unity of Christ is a 'natural composition' in which two elements are combined by the will of some external 'creation'.

(ii) Denies that the incarnation was effected by changing godhead into manhood or vice-versa, or by forming a tertium quid from those two GUSIAI.

(iii) Denies that God was in Christ in the same way as in the saints.

(iv) Denies that either the godhead or the manhood of Christ are 'fictitious' or 'phantasmal', and not real.

(v) Denies that the incarnation involved any change in the godhead, or any suffering on the part of the Divine Logos who, as divine, is by nature impassible.

(vi) Denies that the union of two natures in one Christ involved any duality of sonship.

(vii) Asserts that the union is voluntary union of godhead and manhood.

---

1. See Eusaian, pp.9, 36-43, 86-8, 161, 179, 204, 300-1, 303-4, 314.
2. " " pp.14-18, 2418-33-7, 80, 182.
4. " " pp.39-41, 92, 93, 178-9, 181, 184, 210-12.
6. " " pp.37, 179, 181, 182.
(viii) Asserts that the principle of union is to be found in the PROSOPA of the godhead and the manhood: these two PROSOPA coalesced in one PROSOPON of Christ incarnate.¹

(ix) Asserts that this view alone provides for a real incarnation, makes possible faith in a real atonement,² and provides a rationale of the sacramentalism of the Church.³

The Arians.

The doctrine of Arianism is summed up in eight points by Harnack:⁴

"1. The characteristic of the one and only God is solitude and eternity. He can put nothing forth from His own essence. He was not always Father, but only after He begat (i.e. created) the Son.

2. Wisdom and the Word (ὁ γόγος) dwell within this God, but they are powers, not persons.

3. To create the universe, God brought into being an independent substance, as the instrument by which all things were created. This Being is termed, in scripture, wisdom, son, image, word, etc.

4. As regards His substance, the son is a separate Being from the Father, different from Him in substance and nature. Like all rational creatures, the son is endowed with free will, and consequently capable of change.

² " " pp.62-76, 205, 212-14, 253.
³ " " pp.32, 53, 254-6.
5. The son is not truly God, but is only the so-called word and wisdom. He has no absolute, but only a relative, knowledge of the Father.

6. The son is not, however, a creature like other creatures. He is the perfect creature, and has become God, so that we may term Him 'the only-begotten God', etc.

7. Christ took a real body, but it was a the Logos taking the place of the soul. From the gospel record we see that this Logos is not an absolutely perfect being, but is capable of suffering.

8. Amongst other created beings the Holy Ghost is to be placed beside the son as a second independent substance. According to Arius apparently, the spirit is the creation of the son.
APPENDIX C.

THE HANIFS.

Ibn Hisham\(^1\) tells us of the story of the four persons who were dissatisfied with the pagan religion. These four, according to him, were Waraqah ibn Nawfal, 'Ubayd illah ibn Jahsh, 'Uthman ibn al-Huwayrith, and Zayd ibn 'Amr ibn Nufayl. It is said that these four attended the annual festival which Quraysh used to celebrate every year in the sanctuary of one of their idols where they used to offer sacrifices and exalt him. In that festival it was said that these four told each other: "Know, by God, your people do not stand on anything, they corrupted the religion of Abraham, their father, what is the stone we worship; it does not hear nor see, it does not offer either the good or the bad. O people, seek ye some other religion because, by God, you are without anything."\(^2\)

It is said that these people wandered on in other countries to search for the religion of Abraham and we are told that Warakah was converted to Christianity, 'Ubayd illah ibn Jahsh remained in his confused thoughts about religion until Islam came and he adopted it till he migrated to Abyssinia, where he was converted to Christianity and dies as a Christian. 'Uthman ibn al-Huwayrith was converted to Christianity at Byzantium, and as to Zayd ibn 'Amr

---

1 Sira, p.143.
2 Dr. W.M. Watt doubts the historicity of this meeting of the four Hanifs.
ibn Nufayl, he was not converted either to Christianity or to Judaism, but deserted his father's religion and its pagan worship and said "I worship the Lord of Abraham" and told his people the defects in their religion.

This movement of dissatisfaction preceded and anticipated the coming of the prophet Mohammed, who, is taken historically, is one of these people who were dissatisfied with their religion and sought the true religion of Abraham. Where these people failed, Mohammed succeeded and introduced Islam, which, according to the Moslems, is the pure religion of Abraham, Moses and Jesus. This attitude of Mohammed is clearly seen from the Qor'anic narrative of Abraham's search for his God,\(^1\) it is to be shown that Abraham's rejection of his father's religion is the dominating thesis of this narrative. In the first place he rejected the idol worship when he said to his father: "Dost thou take images for Gods? Verily I perceive that thou and thy people are in a manifest error. And thus did we show unto Abraham the Kingdom of Heaven and earth, that he might become one of those who firmly believe." The second step which the Qor'an assigns to Abraham after he rejected his father's religion is to seek for himself the TRUE GOD, and thus we see in the following verse his examination of the Astral Deities which stood to many Semites, especially the South Arabsians, as the real Gods of their worship. The story goes on to say:\(^2\) "And when the night overshadowed him, he saw a

---

1 Qor'ân vi.74-82.
2 vi.76.
star, and he said, this is my Lord, but when it set, he said, I like not Gods which set. And when he saw the moon rising, he said, This is my Lord; but when he saw it set, he said, verily if my Lord direct me not, I shall become one of the people who go astray. And when he saw the sun rising, he said, This is my Lord, this is the greatest; but when it set, he said, O my people, verily I am clear of that which ye associate with God; I direct my face unto him who hath created the heavens and the earth; I am orthodox, and am not one of the idolators. And his people disputed with him; and he said, Will ye dispute with me concerning God? Since he hath now directed me, and I fear not that which ye associate with him, unless that my Lord willeth a thing: for my Lord comprehendeth all things by his knowledge. Will ye not therefore consider? And how should I fear that which ye associate with God, since ye fear not to have associated with God that concerning which he hath sent down unto you on authority? Which therefore of the two parties is the more safe, if ye understand aright. They who believe and clothe not their faith with injustice, they shall enjoy security, and they are rightly directed."\(^1\)

This argument manifests the attitude of Mohammed and those who were not satisfied in their fathers' religion, its denial of

\(^1\) Cf. the narrative of the Book of Jubilees, sect.xii. This is probably the origin of the Qur'anic narrative, but it should be noted that the examination of the moon, the sun and the star is not indicated so in the Book of Jubilees.
the worship of idols and later the worship of the Astral Deities (viz.) the Moon, the Sun and the Star is the main characteristic of the pre-Islamic Arabian religion.

In these verses and in other verses of the Qurʾān we are introduced to a new term which needs investigation. This term is Ḥanīf, which seems to have a technical meaning. Buhl⁴ tells us that it appears in the Qurʾān "as the name of those who possess the real and true religion", and that it is used particularly of Abraham as the representative of the pure worship of God.

This explanation would be, prima facie, adequate to the discussion, but the emphasis of the Qurʾān on the religion of Abraham as the basic religion of all the Monotheistic religions would necessitate an examination of the nature of this Abrahamic, or the so-called Abrahamic religion which is connected in the Qurʾān with the term Ḥanīf and which is distinguished from Judaism and Christianity in Sura iii, verse 60.³ Buhl⁴ infers from the collocation of "Ḥanīf" and "Muslim" which is found in this passage a sufficient evidence to show that "for Mohammed the word was not the name of a particular religious body." And thus he tells us that the theory of Sprenger, which claims that Ḥanifism was an organised body, has no support in the Qurʾān itself. The context of this verse in the Qurʾān points to the polemics between the people of the Book about the nature of Abraham's religion: in

---

¹ Ency. of Islam. vol.ii, p.258b.
² See Qurʾān. Sura x.105; xxii.32; xxx.29; xcvi.4; etc.
³ See supra pp.
⁴ E.I. vol.ii, p.258b.
Sura iii, verse 58, the Qur'ān calls on the people of the Book to stop the dispute and emphasises that Abraham existed chronologically before the revelation embodied in the Old and the New Testament and goes on to say in 60 that Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian, but a Hanif, and a Moslem and that he was not a Polytheist.

These apologies of some Christians or Jews "was first suggested, it would seem, by St. Paul in Rom.iv.10-12" where"it is argued that Abraham's faith was accounted unto him for righteousness before he had received the mark of Judaism, so that he might be the father of all non-Jewish believers." Margoliouth referring to the foreign etymologies of this word and recording its meaning as a "heathen", "which", he says, "is, indeed, the ordinary sense of the Syriac Ḥanpā, occurring in the Peshittā, where the Greek has "Gentiles" or "Greeks". This etymology is adopted by Grimme in his Life of Muḥammad (I, 13) who suggests that the Qur'ānic phrase هنيئًا مَا كَانَ مِنِ الشَّرَكِينَ should be rendered "a Hanif, YET NOT A POLYTHEIST."3

If Muḥammad, in this verse, excluded Abraham from being a Jew, a Christian, and a Polytheist, then it would be necessarily

1 And here Moslem is to be taken to mean who submits to God, and not a member of the Moslem institution, which was dated with Muḥammad. This term Moslem is used often in the Qur'ān, e.g. calling the Jews and the Christians and the Saints Moslems.
3 Cf. Bell, Who were the Hanifs? (Moslem World,vol.xx.no.2 April 1930, who considers the Hanifs to be the pre-Islamic Arabs who were not converted to Christianity. He goes a step further to suggest that to Muḥammad the true Abrahamic religion was the original and uncorrupted religion of the pre-Islamic Arabs.
thought that Mohammed was referring to a special organised religious body which has a distinct belief, of which Abraham was the originator, and that leads us to the attractive suggestion which Sprenger offered, which according to Margolicouth, "would want a very little external evidence to turn it into History."¹ This theory as given to us by Margolicouth, says that the word Hanif is the Hebrew HANEF (Hypocrite or evil-liver) and was at first applied by the Jews to some heretical sect, probably professedly followers of Abraham, to whom strangers afterwards applied the term without evil intent.

This explanation supplementing the literal Arabic meaning of the word Hanif as "the contorted of the feet"² which gives the sense of the diversion from an established phenomenon and the story of Zayd ibn (Amr ibn Newfayl, who diverted from his fathers' religion and was searching for the true worship of the Lord of Abraham, gives us ground to believe that there existed in Arabia a religious body who were not satisfied with their fathers' religion and who were converted neither to Judaism nor to Christianity.

This meaning is also strengthened by the fact that the word Hanif was applied to the righteous people as it is shown in the following verse:³

---

¹ Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1903. p.479.
² See Lisan Al-Arab. S.V.
³ Taken from Lisan Al-Arab. vol.x, p.404.
"When they saw the dawn, they faced its light as if they were the birds of the plain or perhaps they were... And they witnessed the night terminating.
After the worshipper (الْكَنْفِ) has finished his night's prayer."

Here this verse indicates the prayer at night, but Hanif also has the sense of an ascetic which could be inferred from this line of poetry:¹

"She stayed there like the stay of the Ḥanifs in the two months Jamad and Safar."

The ascetic practice was known in pre-Islamic Arabia; Ibn Ishaq² tells us that the prophet Muhammad used to go to Mount Hira¹ for worship a month every year. The word which Ibn Ishaq used for this kind of worship is TAHANATHA which Ibn Hisham identified with Al-Taḥanuf. Lisan el-Arab.³ tells us that one of the meanings of the word TAHANATHA is the act of worship and the avoidance of idol-worship like the word TAHAHANAF. Duhl tells us that⁴ Hirschfeld, Lyall, and Deutsch wished to derive this word TAHAHANAF from the Hebrew word TEHINNOTH which means supplication.

Few evidences could be cited about such people who were dissatisfied with their fathers' religion and who did not accept the Jewish and the Christian religions; one of these evidences is Nuḥsin ibn Abi Kais, who was of the Sons of Wail and from the Arabian tribe of Aws. Ibn Sad⁵ tells us: "There was not one in

¹ Taken from Lisan el-Arab. vol.x, p.404.
² Ibn Hisham, p.152.
³ Vol.ii, p.443.
⁵ Tabaqat, IV.ii,94.
the Aws and the Khazraj, who characterised and searched for the Hanafiyah, more than Abi Kais ibn el-Aslat, who asked the Medinian Jews about the religion and who refused to accept their religious teachings and went to Damascus to the people of Jafnah and to the Christian priests and when they asked him to accept Christianity he refused and said: "I would not enter it at all." Then a Christian priest in Damascus said to him: "You want the religion of the Hanafiyah." Then Abu Kais answered: "Yes, this is what I want": then the priest said: "This religion is in the place which you left, it is the religion of Abraham." Then Abu Kais said: "I am of the religion of Abraham, and I shall remain so till I die": and he returned to the Hijaz and stayed there, then he went to Mekka to perform the pilgrimage and there he met Zayd ibn Aur ibn Nufail. When Abu Kais told him the story of his search for the Abrahamic religion Zayd said: "I went to Damascus and to the Jazirah and to the Medinian Jews and I found their religion corrupted and that the true religion is that of Abraham who did not associate anything with Allah, and who used to pray facing this temple and who used not to eat what was offered to things other than Allah; and Abu Kais said: "There are no followers of the religion of Abraham, except you and me."

This story and the following verse of his poetry indicate the essence of the Hanifa' religion, which stood as a religion distinct from Judaism and Christianity, and which, in all probability, prepared the way for Islam:
If our Lord wished it, we would have been Jews
And Judaism does not have doubt
And if our Lord wished it, we would have been Christians
With the Christian monks in Mount Karmel
But we were created to be Hanifs
And our Hanif religion is sound all through the ages.
CONCLUSION.

When Mohammed started his prophetic mission, he like some other individuals (who were called the Manifs) was dissatisfied with his religious practices. They sought a higher religion from the Jews and the Christians. Some of these individuals were converted to Christianity while one or two were reported to have stayed on searching for what they called "the Abrahamic Religion".

Mohammed seems to be one of those who searched for a better religion than the one practised by his community. His contact with the Jews and the Christians enabled him to be acquainted with some Biblical teachings which he thought to introduce to his people. Of these teachings, it is highly probable that he came to know of the Jewish expectation of the Messiah.

Mohammed did not introduce the worship of the true and the one God to his people as a Christian or Jewish missionary but as the prophet who was sent to the Arabs who, unlike other nations, did not receive a warner and a prophet.

Mohammed's mission was to ask his people to worship the one and only God and to abandon associating with His worship the worship of the Angels and the demons.

Mohammed's mission was contested, he and his followers were persecuted, and above all he was accused of being a poet, a man
possessed by the devil and that what he says was merely "the Fables of the Ancients" which he learnt from some individuals whose language was not Arabic. Moreover, his claims for prophecy were rejected on the basis that he was not a supernatural being.

The rejection of Muhammad's claims for prophecy on the grounds that he was not a supernatural being, on the one hand; and his answer to these Arabs that none of the previous prophets possessed a supernatural form on the other, and his appeal to them to go and ask the people who received the knowledge on the third, and his claims that he receives his revelations through the SPIRIT on the fourth, are of great importance in the study of the Qur'ān as they show how Muhammad formulated his theology.

When the pre-Islamic Arabs rejected Muhammad's claims and forced him and what remained of his followers (some of his followers migrated to Abyssinia prior to the immigration to Medinah) to migrate to Medinah, he appealed to the Jews to accept him as the prophet whose advent was foretold in their Scriptures. The Qur'ānic verses which lodged this appeal show that Muhammad was relying on certain Biblical passages in which the advent of the prophet is spoken of.²

The Jewish rejection of this appeal of Muhammad was manifested in various aspects:

(a) They asked him to perform a miracle which would test his prophecy.

(b) They asked him to state his religion.

---

1 See Chapter one, p. 6
2 See Chapter one, pp. 14-17
The first aspect occasioned the first stages of the polemics against the Jews. These polemics are not originated by Mohammed but were used in Old Testament as well as in the New Testament. The essence of these polemics is that the Jews are an unbelieving race, they are "stiffnecked" and they resist and kill the prophets.

Their demand to test the prophecy of Mohammed was in line with their traditional teachings and this demand is very likely connected with the Biblical narrative of the contest of Elijah with the prophets of Baalim, and with the accepted sacrifices of Solomon by the Fire descending from Heaven.

Mohammed's polemics that the Jews were an unbelieving race and that they rejected former prophets who provided them with signs, is illustrated by the Qur'anic verse which accuses them of accusing Solomon of being an unbeliever, and accusing him of being the teacher of magic and sorcery. The Qur'an here, besides showing acquaintance with the Biblical and Apocryphal teachings ascribed the introduction of Sin to the fallen angels and defends the faith of Solomon.

Regarding the second demand of the Jews: Mohammed said that his religion is that of Abraham, the Jews said that Abraham was a Jew and Mohammed contested this view by saying Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian. The argument of the Qur'an concerning Abraham is revealing; it shows Mohammed's acquaintance with the controversies between the Jews and the Christians concerning the
Seed of Abraham, and the blessedness of this seed by God. It explains also why Mohammed called his religion, the religion of Abraham. The Qur'anic views that Abraham chronologically speaking came before the Torah and the Evangel were revealed and that he was the first monotheist, clarifies the insistent views of Mohammed that Abraham was neither a Jew nor a Christian but a Hanif, a Moslem.

If these polemics are occasioned by certain incidents, they are by no means the important ones, as we can see that the Qur'anic lodged other polemics against the conception of the Jews saying 'Uzayr is a Son of God. The identity of 'Uzayr is by no means certain. Of all the possible identifications we found that of Casanova is the most probable as it identifies him with Azazel who was the chief of the fallen angels and who is connected with the narrative of Gen. vi. 1-6 which speaks of the Sons of God marrying the daughters of man. The significance of this identification is not only concerned in clearing to us the identity of 'Uzayr but it also makes it possible to see how Mohammed came to know of the development of angelology and demonology of the Jews. Mohammed's knowledge of the development of angelology and demonology in the Jewish teachings on the one hand, and his polemics against the Jews saying 'Uzayr is a Son of God and the Christians saying the Messiah Jesus is a Son of God seem to be connected with the Qur'anic charges against the Jews and the Christians who were accused of interpolating their
Scriptures. In these changes the Qur'an does not suggest a textual interpolation but a perversion of religious doctrines and teachings and an introduction of certain unauthorised views. These perversions and innovations resulted in sectarianism in Judaism and in heresies in Christianity. The differences among the Jews made it necessary that a prophet should come to them to clear to them the points on which they differed; but when Jesus came to perform this mission, the people who followed him differed concerning him and introduced the various Christian heresies which differed among themselves concerning the nature of Christ, whether he is divine or human.

In both cases the difference is concerning the office and the nature of the Messiah. In Judaism it started with the Jewish conception of God and the ways through which this God reveals Himself to His people. The relation between God and man was conceived in early narratives as God in His own agent: He reveals Himself to His people in the human form. In latter stages it was the angel of Yahweh who at times was considered to be God himself and at others he was a creature angel, a messenger of God. These manifestations of God seemed to the Jews in later times to be a danger to the transcendental conception of God and thus they formulated the conception of the Spirit which endows the prophet or the king with the powers to equip him for his appointments. The Targum, however, introduced the word Meshira in the places where the Biblical passages showed any anthropomorphic tendency. For
its application to the conception of the Jewish Messiah, the Jews in later times witnessed the formation of two schools of thought. One conceiving the Messiah as the Spirit of the Lord which is incorporeal, and invisible, while the other conceived the Messiah as the Angel of the Lord.

For the Christian teachings the Messiah is conceived as the Incarnate God in Jesus, and thus their conception of the nature of the Messiah is that He possessed equally the Divine and the Human Nature. He is Co-Substantial and Co-Eternal with the Father. This orthodox view gave rise to certain heretical movements which disputed about many doctrines concerning the Godhead. The main dispute which is indirectly reflected in the Qur'an is that which centres around the Reality of the Body of Christ and the tendencies of the denial of His Divine Nature.

Mohammed's reaction against the Divinity of Christ, and the exposition of the Qur'anic conception of Jesus as a prophet who was sent to the Israelites to clear up to them their differences, seems to originate from:

a) his polemics against the Jews as an unbelieving race who rejected and killed the prophets; and

b) from his polemics against the developed angelology of the Jews.

Mohammed's denial of the Crucifixion of Christ was also connected with his polemics against the Jews. His saying that they did not crucify Him but that it seemed so to them. Although this is connected with the teachings of Basilides, yet it does not show that Mohammed adopted his views. He used his theory just to
rebut the Jewish claims that they crucified Christ.

The Qur'anic saying that Christ was the WORD and the Spirit of God is connected with Muhammad's conception of Revelation, which seems to have developed in the Qur'an as a reaction against the conception of the nature of the Intermediaries between God and man. This development is manifested in the Qur'an in its conception of the "SPIRIT", the "WORD" and the "AMP".

The "AMP" is the Divine Command which is used in the Qur'an in three ways:

a) as the Divine will, signifying Revelation as: God's Command.

b) as the Divine Command to the Angels, signifying the absolute supremacy of God over the angels.

and

c) as the Divine Command by which the Angels and the Spirit descend on the prophets.

The WORD is again the Divine Will of God which is transmitted to the prophets through Revelation. The identification of Jesus with the Word is explained to mean that the miraculous birth of Jesus was due to the Creative Word of God which is (BE).

This identification of the Word with Jesus does not suggest that Muhammad was using the "WORD" as an equivalent to the Christian (LOGOS). This suggestion is clarified by the Qur'anic statement which says Christ was like Adam; both of them were created by the Creative Word. (iii.52 of the Qur'an.)
The Spirit is used in the Qur'an in different senses. Muslim commentators took it to mean Gabriel, but it is difficult to accept this identification as it used in other verses to mean the gift of prophecy. Its connection with Jesus as Being the Spirit from God, and its usage as the Holy Spirit strengthening Jesus (Qur. ii. 254, 81) show that the Spirit is not conceived as an angel but as the Divine Gift through which the prophet comes to "know the Book and the wisdom."

According to these usages of the words Amr, Word, and Spirit, and according to verse xlii. 50

"It is not for a man that God should speak with him but by revelation, or from behind a veil; Or He sendeth a messenger to reveal, by his permission, what He will; verily He is Exalted, wise!"

we suggest that the polemics of the Qur'an against the Divinity of Christ was in line with his polemics against the conception of the supernatural nature of the prophet.

The Qur'anic polemics against the conception of the Christian Trinity seems to be directed against the erroneously conceived idea that Mary is a member of the Holy Trinity. The erroneous idea could have had its origin either in the Christian controversies concerning the term (THEOTOKOS) (Mother of God), or in the tendency of some women who used to adore the Virgin as a goddess (these women were the Collyridians).
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