

MUHAMMAD

AND THE

BIBLE

BEING AN INQUIRY INTO THE ALLEGATION
THAT CERTAIN PASSAGES IN THE
BIBLE FORETELL MUHAMMAD

Rev. W. GOLDSACK

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE SOCIETY
FOR INDIA

MADRAS ALLAHABAD CALCUTTA COLOMBO

1915

ERRATUM

Page 47, line 2, for 'there is beside His', read 'there is not beside His'

MUHAMMAD AND THE BIBLE

MOST Muslims believe that their Prophet Muhammad has been foretold in the Taurát and Injíl, and some Muslim writers have even quoted various passages from those books in which, it is affirmed, the Arabian lawgiver has been predicted. Such attempts to find the Prophet Muhammad in the Bible are not without reason, for if, as is believed by Muslims, Muhammad was indeed the last and greatest Prophet, and if, by his coming, all previous dispensations have been abrogated, then we should certainly expect to find clear and repeated predictions concerning him in the previous Scriptures, in the same manner that the Lord Jesus Christ was foretold in the Scriptures of the Jews. Muhammad was pleased to call himself the *Ummi* Prophet; and although the exact meaning of the term is disputed, yet there can be little reason to doubt that he never personally read the Scriptures of the Jews and Christians. At the same time there were not wanting Jewish and Christian converts to Islám who undoubtedly led Muhammad to believe that he was a Prophet whose advent was clearly foretold in the Bible. 'The Jewish anticipation of their Messiah, and the perfectly distinct

anticipation by the Christians of the second advent of Christ were thus fused into a common argument for a coming Prophet expected by both Jews and Christians, and foretold in all the Scriptures.' Under such circumstances it is not surprising to find Muḥammad describing himself in the pages of the Qur'án as,

النَّبِيُّ الْأُمِّيُّ الَّذِي يَجِدُونَهُ مَكْتُوبًا تَنْدَهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ
وَالْإِنْجِيلِ

'the *Ummi* Prophet—whom they (the Jews and Christians) shall find described with them in the Taurát and Injil' [Súratu'l-A'raf (vii) 156]. In another place, in still more explicit language, he claims to have been prophesied by name. Thus we read:—

وَإِذْ قَالَ يَسِيُّ بْنُ مَرْيَمَ ابْنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ
الَّذِي كُنْتُ مَوْدَعًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيْ مِنَ التَّوْرَةِ وَ مُبَشِّرًا بِرَسُولٍ يَأْتِي
مِنْ بَعْدِي اسْمُهُ أَحْمَدُ

'And, remember, when Jesus the son of Mary said, "O Children of Israel! of a truth I am God's apostle to you to confirm the Taurát which was given before me, and to announce an apostle that shall come after me, whose name shall be Ahmad"' [Súratu's-Şáff (lxi) 6]. Under such circumstances it is perfectly natural for Muslims to seek the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments for the prophecies which

Muḥammad was persuaded to believe were hidden there. It is our purpose, therefore, in this little book, to examine the principal passages of the Bible quoted by Muslims in which they claim to find predictions, more or less explicit, of the coming of Muḥammad, and to show that in no passage whatever is there the slightest hint of any true Prophet who should come after Jesus the Messiah.

I. One of the passages of the Bible most frequently quoted by Muslim writers in support of the claim that Muḥammad has been foretold in that Book, is found in Deut. xviii. 15-21. It is there written, 'The Lord thy God will raise up unto thee a prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken; . . . 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.' Muslim controversialists, in urging that Muḥammad is foretold in this passage, lay great stress upon the words 'from among their brethren'. These words, they claim, clearly show that the great Prophet whose advent is here foretold, was to arise, not among the Baní Isrá'íl, but amongst their brethren. These latter, we are told, were the Ishmaelites, from whom

was descended Muhammad; hence the passage can refer to none other than the great Arabian Prophet.¹ Great emphasis, too, is laid upon the words 'like unto thee', i.e. Moses, and various resemblances between the latter and Muhammad are pointed out, such as that they both married and had children, they both wielded the sword, etc., neither of which things, the Christian is reminded, Jesus did.

When one comes to examine the passage quoted above in the light of its Muslim exegesis, the latter is seen to be based upon a most obvious fallacy. Nothing less than a perverse obstinacy could persuade any one to believe that the words 'from among thy brethren', mean anything else than Jews, for the word 'brethren' is most consistently used in various places in this very book of Deuteronomy with that meaning. A reference to a few such passages will make the matter clear, and show at once the groundlessness of the claim that the passage denotes 'the brethren of the Baní Isrá'il—the Ishmaelites.' In Deut. xvii. 14, 15, the word 'brethren' is obviously used of the Jews themselves. It is there written, 'When thou art come unto the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein; and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations

The term
'brethren' de-
notes Israel-
ites.

¹ *Proof of Prophet Mohammad from the Bible*, Lahore, p. 5.

that are round about me; thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom the Lord thy God shall choose: one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee: thou mayest not put a foreigner over thee, which is not thy brother.' Comment upon this passage is scarcely necessary, for all are well aware that the first king of the Jews, anointed by the Prophet Samuel, under the express direction of God Himself, was not an Ishmaelite but Saul the son of Kish of the Jewish tribe of Benjamin. This is clear from 1 Sam. x. 20, 21, 24, where we read, 'And when Samuel brought all the tribes of Israel near, and the tribe of Benjamin was taken. And he brought the tribe of Benjamin near by their families, and the family of Matrites was taken: and Saul the son of Kish was taken . . . And Samuel said to all the people, See ye him whom the Lord hath chosen, that there is none like him among all the people? And all the people shouted, and said, "God save the King".' From what has been written above it is clear that the word 'brethren' means, of the same nationality, i.e. Jews.

Again in Deut. xv the word is used with precisely the same signification. It is there written, 'And if thy brother, an Hebrew man, or an Hebrew woman, be sold unto thee, and serve thee six years; then in the seventh year thou shalt let him go free from thee' (verse 12). Yet once again in Lev. xxv. 46, it is written, 'Over your brethren the children of

Israel, ye shall not rule, one over another, with rigour.' From these passages, and many more to the same effect might easily be quoted, it is manifest that when God said to Moses, 'I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren', He meant from among the Baní Isrá'il themselves, and not from the Arab tribe of the Quraish. This is so obvious that one cannot but wonder at the blindness and perversity which persists in urging some other meaning.

The Muslim controversialist is less excusable for such an error from the fact that his own Qur'án contains quite similar uses of the word 'brother'. Thus in Súratu'l-A'ráf (vii) 84, we read:—

وَالِى مَدْيَنَ أَخَاهُمْ شُعَيْبًا قَالَتْ يَقَوْمِ

'And (we sent) to Madian their brother Shu'aib. He said, "O my people". In this passage of the Qur'án Shu'aib is represented as addressing his own tribe as 'my people', and yet God is represented as saying, ' (we sent) to Madian their brother Shu'aib'. Comment upon this passage is superfluous, for the words themselves make it obvious that the word 'brother' is used in the sense of fellow-tribesman.

But we have yet another observation to make with reference to this word 'brethren'. It is this: even granting for the sake of argument, that the word is used in Deut. xviii in the sense attached to it by Muslim writers; yet Muḥammad is still

excluded; for it must be remembered that Ishmael was not Israel's brother but his uncle. The brother of Israel (i.e. Jacob) was Esau.

According to the Muslim argument, 'brethren' would mean Edomites. This is clear from Gen. xxv. 24-6, where we read, 'And when her days to be delivered were fulfilled, behold, there were twins in her womb. And the first came forth red, all over like

an hairy garment; and they called his name Esau. And after that came forth his brother, and his hand had hold on Esau's heel; and his name was called Jacob.' Consequently, even on the showing of Muslims themselves, the promised Prophet would appear, not from the descendants of Ishmael, but of Esau, that is, the Edomites. This is clear from the words of Scripture, which run thus, 'Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother' (Deut. xxiii. 7).

The Muslim attempt to press details of likeness between Moses and Muḥammad in accordance with the words of the prophecy, 'I will raise them up a Prophet from amongst their brethren like unto thee,' is equally futile. The likeness referred to is obviously spiritual and functional rather than personal. Insistence upon

the latter point lands the Muslim in insuperable difficulties. For example, Muslims glory in the fact that Muḥammad was an *Ummi* Prophet, which, according to them, means that he was unable to

The term 'like unto thee' denotes a spiritual and functional likeness

read or write. But Moses, we are told in the Bible, was 'instructed in all the wisdom of the Egyptians' (Acts vii. 22). It will be difficult indeed for our Muhammadan brethren to explain wherein the likeness exists here.

Again we are told in the Qur'an that Moses worked many miracles:—

لَقَدْ جَاءَكُمْ مُوسَىٰ بِالْبَيِّنَاتِ

'Moses came unto you with proofs of his mission'; but the testimony of the Qur'an is equally clear that Muhammad worked no miracle. Thus, for example, he says:—

إِنَّمَا الْآيَاتُ عِزْدُ اللَّهِ وَإِنَّمَا أَنَا نَذِيرٌ مُّبِينٌ

'Signs are in the power of God alone, and I am only a plain-spoken warner' [Súratu'l-'Ankabút (xxix) 49]. And again, still more clearly:—

وَمَا مَنَعَنَا أَنْ نُرْسِلَ بِالْآيَاتِ إِلَّا أَنْ كَذَّبَ بِهَا الْأَوَّلُونَ

'Nothing hindered us from sending (thee, O Muhammad) with the power of working miracles, except that the peoples of old treated them as lies' [Súratu Baní Isrá'il (xvii) 61]. If such personal resemblances are to be pressed, it is difficult to see in what respect Muhammad can be said to be 'like unto' Moses. To say that they both married, and both wielded the sword means little; for so did the false prophet Moseilama, and many others.

But there is another point to be noticed in connexion with the prophecy we are discussing. In the fifteenth verse of the chapter referred to it is said that God would raise up a Prophet 'unto thee', i.e. unto the Baní Isrá'il. Now it is well known that Muhammad proclaimed himself as, in a special sense, sent to the Arabs, and not the Jews. Thus we read in Súratu't-Tauba (ix) 129 that,

لَقَدْ جَاءَكُمْ رَسُولٌ مِّنْ أَنْفُسِكُمْ

'Now hath an apostle come unto you from among yourselves.' Again in Súratu Ibráhím (xiv) 4, we find these words:—

وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَسُولٍ إِلَّا بِلِسَانِ قَوْمِهِ

'We have not sent any apostle, save with the speech of his own people.' And yet again in Súratu'l-Qaṣaṣ (xxviii) 46, we read,

وَمَا كُنْتَ بِجَانِبِ الْخَطَرِ إِذْ نَادَيْنَا وَلَكِنْ رَحْمَةً مِّنْ رَبِّكَ لِتُنذِرَ قَوْمًا مَّا أَتَهُمْ مِنْ نَّذِيرٍ مِّنْ قَبْلِكَ

'Nor wast thou (O Muhammad) on the slope (of Sinai) when we called (to Moses); but it is of the mercy of thy Lord that thou warnest a people, to whom no warner had come before thee.' If the reader will reflect upon the purport of the three

Qur'anic passages quoted above, he will see how far removed from the truth is the statement that Muhammad was sent 'unto thee', i.e. unto the Jews. Muhammad confessedly knew no Hebrew, and in the celebrated *Mishkátu'l-Masábih*,¹ in Kitábu'l-Adáb it is related that he instructed his amanüensis Zaid to learn Hebrew for the purpose of carrying on his correspondence with the Jews. If Muhammad was sent to a people to whom no prophet had been sent before, then manifestly he was not sent to the Jews, to whom a long succession of Prophets had been sent, as the Qur'an itself bears witness. These two significant words 'unto thee' are thus amply sufficient in themselves to refute the claim that the prophet spoken of in the passage quoted can be Muhammad. The plain truth is that the prediction refers to the Lord Jesus Christ, who was in a special sense sent to the Jews, as He Himself affirmed in these words, 'I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel' (Matt. xv. 24).

Yet again the passage in Deuteronomy distinctly states that the promised Prophet would be raised up 'from the midst' of the Jews. This prediction can in no sense apply to Muhammad, who was born, not in Judea, but in Mecca some hundreds of miles away, and in the midst of idolatrous Arabs. It does, on the other hand, describe the Messiah, who

The Prophet foretold was to arise amongst the Jews

¹ Lahore edition, A. H. 1321, vol. iii, p. 231.

was born in Bethlehem 'the city of David', and who lived all His life amongst the people to whom He had been sent. The Messiah was literally raised up 'from the midst' of the Baní Isrá'il, and fulfilled in all its minute particulars this wonderful prophecy of Moses. His great work was the redemption of His people from the thralldom of sin, just as Moses had saved Israel from the thralldom of Egyptian bondage; and He now sits at the right hand of the Majesty on high as the great Intercessor for His people, even as Moses had pleaded with God on behalf of disobedient Israel.

Finally, we remark that, in the word of God, the Injil, it is distinctly stated that this prophecy of Moses refers to the Lord Jesus Christ.

The Injil refers the prophecy to Jesus Christ

Thus in the Book of the Acts we read, 'For Moses indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me; to him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall speak unto you. And it shall be, that every soul, which shall not hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people. Yea, and all the prophets from Samuel, and them that followed after, as many as have spoken, they also told of these days. Ye are the sons of the prophets, and of the covenant which God made with your fathers, saying unto Abraham, And in thy seed shall all the families of the earth be blessed. Unto you first

God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities' (Acts iii. 22-6). Nor is this all; the Messiah Himself, on one occasion, definitely stated the same thing in these words, 'For if ye believed Moses, ye would believe me; for he wrote of me' (John v. 46). Thus the conclusion is clear that the important prophecy recorded in Deut. xviii refers to the Messiah, Jesus Son of Mary, and to none other; and down through all the ages the divine message has sounded the warning that, 'Whosoever will not hearken unto my words which he shall speak in my name, I will require it of him.'

II. The next Biblical passage of importance which Muslim writers quote as referring to Muhammad is found in Deut. xxxiii. 2. The words Deut. xxxiii. 2 are as follows, 'And he (Moses) said, The Lord came from Sinai, and rose up from Seir unto them; he shined forth from Mount Paran.' Concerning this passage Muslim controversialists write as follows, 'The words quoted above may be divided into three sections. In the first the words, "The Lord came from Sinai" are fulfilled in the terrible works of power performed, and in the religion preached by Hazrat Músa. The words of the second section "He rose up from Seir unto them" find their fulfilment in Hazrat Isá, and in the Injil preached by him. Then Alláh mentions by the

mouth of His servant a far-distant event, and in the third section the words "He shined forth from Mount Paran" find a wonderful and literal fulfilment in Hazrat Muhammad.'

If the Muslim writer who penned the words quoted above had first studied the geography of the wilderness wanderings of the children of Israel on their journey from Egypt to the promised land of Canaan, and had examined, with even ordinary attention, a map of that part of the ancient world, he would not have made himself the laughing-stock of all intelligent people; for even the most

cursory glance at a good map of that region will show that Sinai, Seir and Paran are three mountains comparatively near one another, and situated in the Sinaitic Peninsula between Palestine and the Red Sea. The attempt to find a reference to the missions of Moses, Jesus and Muhammad in the passage quoted is not only fanciful, and geographically unsound, but it ignores the real meaning of the passage altogether, which has not the slightest reference whatever to any Prophet. The passage contains a historical reference to past events, and reminds the children of Israel of the wonderful display of divine glory and power at the several places mentioned

¹ Baibele Muhammad. Calcutta, A. H. 1320, p. 17.

The geographical position of Seir and Paran precludes any reference to Jesus and Muhammad

during their long wilderness journey. The reader will easily be able to verify this by a reference to Exod. xix and Numb. xiii, xiv and xvi.

One fatal mistake invariably made by Muslim controversialists is to take a word or a passage from the Christian Scriptures, and by entirely divorcing it from its context subject it to the most fanciful interpretations. It apparently never occurs to them to look for other Biblical references to names and places which might be expected to throw light upon the questions at issue. The result is disastrous, as may be seen from the passage at present under discussion. If Madhu Miah, the writer of *Baibele Muhammad* quoted above, had but taken the trouble to consult the many passages of the Bible in which both Seir and Paran are mentioned, he would never have been so foolish as to have contended that these mountains signify the missions respectively of Jesus and Muhammad, for a study of the geography of the region will make it abundantly clear that Jesus never visited Seir, and Muhammad had no acquaintance with Paran. As a matter of fact Mount Seir was situated in what was then the country of Edom, lying some distance to the south of the Dead Sea. This is clear from Gen. xxxii. 3, where we read, 'And Jacob sent messengers before him to Esau his brother unto the land of Seir, the field of Edom.' The same fact is still more clearly brought out in Gen. xxxvi. 8, 9, where it is written, 'And Esau dwelt

in Mount Seir: Esau is Edom. And these are the generations of Esau the father of the Edomites in Mount Seir.'

Again a study of the wilderness journeyings of the children of Israel will show that in order to pass into the land of Canaan it was desirable to pass through Edom; hence it is recorded that, 'Moses sent messengers from Kadesh unto the king of Edom, Thus saith thy brother Israel, Thou knowest all the travail that hath befallen us . . . let us pass, I pray thee, through thy land, . . . and Edom said unto him, Thou shalt not pass through me, lest I come out with the sword' (Num. xx. 14, 17, 18). This passage makes it clear that on the journey from Egypt, the land of Edom, and so Seir, was reached before Canaan.

Yet again we read in Deut. i. 2, that 'It is eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-barnea.' This quotation confirms, what has been already proven, that Mount Seir lay between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea, both these latter places lying to the south of the Dead Sea. The reader will now be in a position to appreciate the absurdity of the contention—made, strangely enough, by many reputable Muslim authors—that the term 'Mount Seir' has some connexion with the ministry of the Lord Jesus. Thus another Muslim author says, 'Seir is the name of a mountain in Syria, where Jesus used to go, and where he got

commands through angels as to his Gospel.'¹ The latter, we know, was born in Bethlehem, brought up in Nazareth in the northern Province of Galilee, and all His life ministered to the people of His native land. Far from Jesus living in Edom, Ezekiel makes it clear that the Edomites, in other words the people of Seir, were the confirmed enemies of the Jews, and in chapter xxxv the destruction of their cities in consequence is clearly foretold! Consequently the statement that the words, 'He rose up from Mount Seir unto them', find their fulfilment in Hazrat Isá, and in the Injil preached by Him, has not the slightest foundation either in reason or in Scripture.

It cannot but be a matter of most profound regret that the writers referred to are as ignorant of the geographical position of Mount Paran as they are of Mount Seir. Far from Muhammad being born in Mount Paran, or having even lived there, there is most conclusive evidence that that mountain was situated some five hundred miles to the north of Mecca, the acknowledged birthplace of Muhammad; and there is nothing, either in Scripture or in history, to connect the Prophet of Islám with the former place. A comparison of the Biblical references to Paran will make this indisputably evident. As a matter of fact Paran was a mountain to the north of Sinai, as may be seen from the following words of

¹ *Proof of Prophet Mohammad from the Bible.* Lahore, p. 12.

Scripture, 'And the children of Israel set forward according to their journeys out of the wilderness of Sinai; and the cloud abode in the wilderness of Paran' (Num. x. 12). Moreover it is stated with the utmost clearness that when the children of Israel in their journey from Egypt drew near to the southern borders of Canaan, Moses sent 'from the wilderness of Paran' a number of spies in order to spy out the promised land. Thus we read that, 'Afterward the people journeyed from Hazeroth, and pitched in the wilderness of Paran. And the Lord spake unto Moses, saying, Send thou men, that they may spy out the land of Canaan, which I give unto the children of Israel' (Num. xii. 16; xiii. 1). The return of the spies was the occasion of a special manifestation of the glory of God, as we read in Num. xiv. 10, where it is said that, 'The glory of the Lord appeared in the tent of meeting unto all the children of Israel.' The reader is now in a position to judge whether the words 'He shined forth from Mount Paran' have any reference to a man who lived in Mecca some five hundred miles to the south of Paran, or whether they do not refer to the special 'glory of the Lord' which appeared to the children of Israel in Paran as recorded above.

III. Some Muslim writers claim that Psalm xlv refers to Muhammad, and they quote in particular the third, fourth and fifth verses of that Psalm as having a direct reference to

Psalm xlv

him. The words run as follows, 'Gird thy sword upon thy thigh, O mighty one, with thy glory and thymajesty. And in thy majesty ride on prosperously, because of truth and meekness and righteousness: and thy right hand shall teach thee terrible things. Thine arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies, whereby the people fall under thee.'

If the reader will study carefully the whole Psalm in which this passage is found, he will see that it has no reference whatever to Muhammad. In its primary application it probably had reference to the marriage of King Solomon to a foreign princess.

Such a marriage is actually recorded in the first Book of Kings, where we read that, 'Solomon made affinity with Pharaoh, King of Egypt, and took Pharaoh's daughter, and brought her into the city of David' (chap. iii. 1). But if this Psalm be studied with attention it will be seen that it has a much deeper signification, and points to one, much greater than Solomon, who was possessed in some mysterious way of a divine nature. Thus in the sixth verse—a verse which, it may be remarked, Muslim writers usually discreetly omit to quote—that one is addressed in these terms, 'Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever.' This one sentence is sufficient to prove the groundlessness of the claim that the Psalm refers to Muhammad, for it is acknowledged by all that the latter never claimed divinity. On the other hand,

The Psalm has reference to a divine Being

there is the clearest evidence in the Injil that the Psalm does refer to the Lord Jesus Christ, whom Muslims honour with the titles 'Word of God' and 'Spirit of God'. Thus we read, 'But of the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever' (Heb. i. 8). This passage from God's word makes it clear that the Psalm is Messianic in character, the 'bride' being the Christian Church. This idea of the Christian Church as the bride of Christ is found repeatedly in Scripture, and thus helps to corroborate our view of the Psalm we are discussing. For example, the Apostle Paul, writing to the Corinthian Church says, 'For I espoused you to one husband, that I might present you as a pure virgin to Christ' (2 Cor. xi. 2). And again in the record of the visions of the Apostle John we read that, 'I saw the holy city, new Jerusalem, coming down out of heaven from God, made ready as a bride adorned for her husband' (Rev. xxi. 2).

Muslim controversialists in arguing against the Messianic character of this Psalm point out the reference to 'swords' and 'arrows', and ask in triumph whether Hazrat Isá was ever a man of war—as if this question settled the whole matter. They apparently forget that even the word sword may be used with a spiritual signification. As a matter of fact it is so used in the Injil. Thus the Apostle Paul urges his converts in their fight against 'the rulers of

The Injil quotes the Psalm as Messianic

the darkness of this world, against spiritual wickedness in high places' to take 'the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God' (Eph. vi. 17). How well the Lord Jesus Christ used this sword is evident in the account of His great temptation by Satan as recorded in Matthew iv, when to every suggestion of the evil one He replies by quoting the written Scriptures, and thereby repels his every onslaught.

IV. Another favourite passage of Muslim controversialists is that found in Solomon's Song v. 10-16.

It is there written, 'My beloved is white and ruddy, the chiefest among ten thousand. His head is as the most fine gold, his locks are bushy, and black as a raven. His eyes are like doves beside the water brooks; washed with milk, and fitly set. His cheeks are as a bed of spices, as banks of sweet herbs: his lips are as lilies, dropping liquid myrrh. His hands are as rings of gold set with beryl: his body is as ivory work overlaid with sapphires. His legs are as pillars of marble, set upon sockets of fine gold: his aspect is like Lebanon, excellent as the cedars. His mouth is most sweet: yea, he is altogether lovely. This is my beloved, and this is my friend, O daughters of Jerusalem.'

In the Bengali book *Baibele Muhammad* referred to above, the Muhammadan author comments thus upon the passage here quoted. 'Although Hazrat

The Song of
Solomon v.
10-15

Solomon the Wise, in the verses quoted above, has described the glories of the person referred to in the imagery of poetry, yet the whole description tallies with the form and beauty of the last "Prophet of Light" (Núr Nabí). Not only so, but in the final clauses of the passage quoted, Hazrat Solomon, being moved by the Holy Ghost, has mentioned the name of "His" beloved as Muhammad. We know not whether to describe the translation of the Hebrew word "Muhammadim" in the Bible current to-day as based on ignorance or as the fruit of deceit. In the English translation the word "Muhammadim" has been rendered by the word "lovely", but this is clearly wrong. If the word be correctly translated it must be rendered in English by the words "Illustrious" or "the Praised". In our opinion it would have been better not to have translated the word at all.'

We need scarcely remark in reply to the extraordinary exhibition of ignorance presented in the comments we have quoted, that the passage in question contains no reference whatever to Muhammad. The Song of Solomon is admittedly written in figurative language. It describes, with a wealth of imagery, the bond of love which unites God to His chosen people, and the passage quoted above is simply one portion of that description.

The passage describes the love which unites God to His people

¹ *Baibele Muhammad*, pp. 18, 19.

The writer of the Bengali book *Baibele Muḥammad*, however, has ignored the context in which his quotation is found, and has contented himself with affirming that the word 'Muḥammadim' is a 'proper noun', and that it means Muḥammad!! The truth is that the word is not a 'proper noun' at all, and it does not mean Muḥammad. It is a

The term 'Muḥammadim' is a common, and not a proper, noun

common noun, as the use of the plural here shows, and is used frequently throughout the Bible both of persons and things. We need only refer to one or two of the passages where the word occurs in order to see the absurdity of the contention that the word is a proper noun, and means Muḥammad. If the reader will turn to Ezekiel xxiv. 16, he will find these words, 'Son of man, behold, I take away from thee the desire of thine eyes (Muḥammadim) with a stroke; yet neither shalt thou mourn nor weep, neither shall thy tears run down.' The eighteenth verse of the same chapter makes it clear that the desire of the Prophet Ezekiel's eyes was none other than his wife, whom God caused to die. Will it be seriously contended, we ask, that because in the sixteenth verse quoted above the Hebrew word 'Muḥammadim' occurs, therefore it contains a prophecy of Muḥammad!!

Again in 1 Kings xx. 6, the word 'Muḥammadim' is used of inanimate objects, viz. the goods of the children of Israel. Thus we read, 'I will send my

servants unto thee to-morrow about this time, and they shall search thine house, and the houses of thy servants; and it shall be, that whatsoever is pleasant in thine eyes (Muḥammadim), they shall put it in their hand, and take it away.' The context of this passage shows that it refers to Ben-hadad, the king of Syria, who sent messengers to the king of Israel, and threatened to despoil the houses of the Israelites of all their goods, even the things that were pleasant in their eyes. Again, we ask, can it be seriously contended even for a single moment, that because the Hebrew word 'Muḥammadim' is used in this passage, that, therefore, we have in it a prediction of Muḥammad? Apart from the context, which makes the meaning perfectly clear, can it be affirmed as a matter of history, that Muḥammad was ever seized by a foreign king, and taken away captive to a foreign land? The whole thing is preposterous, and only serves to show how those who, without any knowledge of Hebrew, presume to argue from the meaning of certain Hebrew words, expose their own colossal ignorance. Indeed the whole argument is childish in the extreme, and unworthy of thoughtful men. If a superficial resemblance between the Hebrew word 'Muḥammadim' and the name of Muḥammad is to be construed into a prophecy of the latter, why, it may well be asked, should not the Hindus find in the Qur'án a reference to their Avatár Rám, because,

forsooth, the word Rum is found in the pages of that book!!

V. It is much to be deplored that some Muslims, in their eagerness to find in the pages of the Bible some reference to Muhammad, often resort to the most unreasonable and fanciful methods of exegesis. If their eye but meets the word 'sword' in the pages of that Book, there is immediately an hysterical cry raised that the word contains some reference to Muhammad. In like manner the word 'camel' is invariably sufficient to raise a chorus of asseveration that, at last, a distinct prophecy of the Arabian lawgiver has been found!! We are moved to these remarks by the Muslim exegesis of Isaiah xxi. 7, which illustrates in a striking manner the fault of which we complain. It is there written, 'And when he seeth a troop, horsemen in pairs, a troop of asses, a troop of camels, he shall hearken diligently with much heed.' Strange as it may appear, Muslim writers profess to find in the words just quoted a prophecy of Muhammad, and the 'troop of asses' we are gravely told, refers to Jesus Christ, because, forsooth, He, on one occasion, entered Jerusalem riding upon an ass; whilst, more wonderful still, the 'troop of camels' refers to Muhammad, because it was his custom to ride on that beast; as if none but Muhammad ever rode upon a camel, or any but Jesus entered Jerusalem upon an ass!!

We have seen many attempts to find Muhammad in the pages of the Old and New Testaments, but this, surely, is the most ludicrous of them all. It has not even the shadow of reasonableness; for there is nothing in the whole context which in any way suggests a reference to the Arabian Prophet. The chapter deals, as a careful perusal will easily show, with the coming destruction of Babylon, and the prediction was fulfilled some two hundred years later when Darius the Persian took that city. Had the writer quoted above but taken the trouble to read the ninth verse of that same chapter he would not have permitted himself to write as he has done, for there we find Babylon distinctly mentioned in these words, 'And, behold, here cometh a troop of men, horsemen in pairs. And he answered and said, Babylon is fallen, is fallen.' Muslim authors must be hardpressed indeed for predictions of their Prophet when they have to argue from such passages.

VI. Isaiah xlii is sometimes quoted as containing a prediction of Muhammad.¹ The first verse runs thus, 'Behold my servant, whom I uphold; my chosen, in whom my soul delighteth: I have put my spirit upon him; he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles.' We shall not

Isaiah xlii. 1
The Injil
quotes the
passage as a
prophecy of
Jesus Christ

¹ See *Pracharak*. A.H. 1303. No. 9. p. 264.

waste the reader's time with a long comment upon this passage. It will be sufficient to refer him to the Injil, where it is distinctly stated that the prophecy finds its fulfilment in the Lord Jesus Christ. This being God's own interpretation of His word, it is needless for us to discuss in detail the imaginations of men. The passage referred to runs as follows, 'And he (Jesus) charged them that they should not make him known: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet saying, Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and he shall show judgement to the Gentiles.'

But Muslims sometimes, whilst admitting the truth of what has been written above, affirm that in the latter part of the forty-second chapter of Isaiah another person, whom they assert to be Muhammad, is clearly foretold. They especially refer to the eleventh verse, which runs as follows, 'Let the wilderness and the cities thereof lift up their voice, the villages that Kedar doth inhabit; let the inhabitants of the Sela sing, let them shout from the top of the mountains.' The word 'Kedar' in this verse, we are told, has a distinct reference to the Arabs, and so, by implication, to Muhammad.

The passage in question, we reply, has no reference whatever to Muhammad. It simply reminds us,

when describing the spread of the Messiah's kingdom, that one day, in the providence of God, the people of Kedar would share in the blessings of that kingdom. It cannot possibly have any reference to Muhammad, because he was not of the tribe of Kedar at all, but of the Quraish, as every Muslim well knows. Moreover in the tenth verse we read, 'Sing unto the Lord a new song, and his praise from the end of the earth;' but singing is prohibited in the worship of Islám, so that the passage cannot possibly refer to it. There is a well-known saying of Muhammad that,

العناء ينبت النفاق في القلب كما ينبت الماء الزرع

'As water causes the grain to spring forth, so singing causes hypocrisy to spring up in the heart.' How then can it be urged that a prophecy concerning a people who should delight in singing the praises of their Redeemer can have any reference to Muslims?

VII. Another passage of the Old Testament frequently quoted by Muslims¹ as containing a prediction of Muhammad is found in Habakkuk iii. 3. It runs thus, 'God came from Teman, and the Holy One from Mount Paran.' Those who have studied the ancient geography of Bible lands know that Teman was

Habakkuk
iii. 3
Teman was
500 miles from
Mecca the
birth-place of
Muhammad

¹ See *Proof of Prophet Muhammad from the Bible*, pp. 12, 13.

near Paran, which latter place, we have already shown, was at least 500 miles north of Mecca. As a matter of fact Teman was a part of the country of Edom. This will be made clear from the following passage, 'Of Edom, thus saith the Lord of hosts: Is wisdom no more in Teman?' (Jer. xlix. 7). Again we read, 'Therefore thus saith the Lord God, I will stretch out mine hand upon Edom, and will cut off man and beast from it: and I will make it desolate from Teman' (Ezek. xxv. 13). These quotations are sufficient to fix the locality of Teman, which could not have been many miles to the south of the Dead Sea. It has absolutely no reference whatever to Muhammad. As to the words, 'The Holy One from Mount Paran', we have already shown (p. 15) that Muhammad had no more connexion with Paran than with India. It was at least 500 miles from Mecca, and was a place of which he was probably totally ignorant.

In the second place, if we study carefully the passage under discussion, together with its context, it will be clearly seen that it applies to no human being whatever, but to God Himself. It was God who came from Teman, and He was the Holy One who came from Mount Paran. One has only to remember the many passages in both Qur'an and Ahádith in which the sins of Muhammad are mentioned in order to realize how impossible it is

The passage applies to a divine Being

for this description to apply to him. Nor, again, can it be truly said of Muhammad that, 'His glory covered the heavens', or that 'His ways are everlasting' (verse 6). The whole passage, indeed, can only apply to God; and only the most wilful blindness of heart can see in it any prophecy of Muhammad.

VIII. Muslims not only profess to find in the Old Testament certain predictions concerning Muhammad, but they, in the same manner, quote a number of passages from the New Testament, in which, they affirm, the advent of Muhammad is clearly stated. We shall now proceed to deal with the principal of these latter. The first we shall discuss is found in the Gospel according to Mark, and reads as follows, 'There cometh after me he that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose' (Mark i. 7). In this passage, we are told, Hazrat Isá plainly points to the coming of the last and greatest Prophet Muhammad.

For thorough disingenuousness this claim on the part of some Muslim writers is probably unique. It cannot for the moment be believed that the writers who quote the passage in question have not read the context; and the only conclusion which can be drawn is that they rely upon the ignorance of their Muslim readers in

The words quoted were spoken by John the Baptist, and refer to the Messiah

trying to persuade them that the speaker of the words quoted is Jesus, and the person referred to Muhammad; for the context makes it transparently clear that the speaker is not Hazrat Isá at all, but John the Baptist (Yahya Nabí). Thus in the fourth and sixth verses we read, 'John who baptized in the wilderness and preached the baptism of repentance unto remission of sins. And John was clothed with camel's hair, and had a leathern girdle about his loins; and did eat locusts and wild honey. And he preached, saying, There cometh after me he that is mightier than I, the latchet of whose shoes I am not worthy to stoop down and unloose.'

Moreover John uttered these words, not of Muhammad who did not live until nearly 600 years later, but of the Messiah who was even then living in their midst. Thus we read in another place that 'John answered them, saying, I baptize with water: in the midst of you standeth one whom ye know not, even he that cometh after me, the latchet of whose shoe I am not worthy to unloose' (John i. 26, 27). The passages which we have quoted leave no possible room for doubt that the speaker in the verse quoted was John the Baptist, and that he spake of Jesus the Messiah. There is no possible reference to Muhammad in any shape or form, and it would puzzle the Muslim author referred to to explain how Muhammad baptized men with the Holy Ghost!

IX. Another passage of the New Testament much quoted by Muslims to show that Muhammad was foretold in that book ~~is~~ found in John i. 19-21 John i. 19-21. It is there written, 'And this is the witness of John, when the Jews sent unto him from Jerusalem priests and Levites to ask him, Who art thou? And he confessed, and denied not; and he confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then? Art thou Elijah? And he saith, I am not. Art thou the prophet? And he answered, No'.

The common Muhammadan interpretation of this passage is that three prophets are here mentioned: the Messiah, Elias, and a third, un-named, but spoken of as 'that prophet'. This un-named prophet, we are assured, is none other than the last and greatest Prophet Muhammad. The Jews, we are informed, were expecting a great Prophet, other than the Messiah, and therefore concluded that as John was neither the Messiah nor Elias he must be 'that Prophet'; in other words, they were looking for the coming of the last Prophet Muhammad.¹

Unfortunately for this pretty piece of exegesis there are several insuperable objections to its acceptance by thoughtful people. In the first place, it is not true that the Jews were looking for a Prophet who should come after the Messiah, and of such a belief there is not the slightest trace in the Bible.

Baibete Muhammad, pp. 28-32.

Moreover the statement that they were doing so is inconsistent with the question put to John; for it

must be remembered that, in the opinion of John's questioners, the Messiah Himself had not yet come; consequently it would be foolish and unreasonable on their part to ask, in such a case, whether John were some Prophet who was *to succeed* the

Messiah. The Jews, it is true, were expecting other Prophets *before* the advent of their Messiah. Many of them had not yet understood that the great Prophet foretold in Deut. xviii (see p. 5) was the Messiah, but imagined that he, like John the Baptist, was one of the forerunners of that Prophet. This is clear from the following words of the Injil, where we read that, 'Many of the people, therefore, when they heard this saying, said, Of a truth this is the Prophet. Others said, This is the Christ' (i.e. Messiah). The question, then, for many of the Jews, resolved itself into this: was John the Messiah or one of his forerunners? The question of any Prophet who was to come *after* the Messiah could not arise so long as the Messiah himself had not appeared. Some thought, as we learn from another place, that Jeremiah, or some other of the Prophets would arise as a forerunner of the Messiah. Thus it is written, 'When Jesus came into the parts of Cæsarea Philippi, he asked his disciples, saying,

The Jews were expecting another prophet as a forerunner of the Messiah—not as His successor

Who do men say that the Son of man is? And they said, Some say John the Baptist; some, Elijah; and others, Jeremiah, or one of the prophets' (Matt. xvi. 13, 14). From all this it can be seen how hazy and unreliable were the views of the Jews upon the whole question; consequently, when it is further remembered that these very Jews failed to recognize Jesus as the Messiah, or as, indeed, a Prophet of God at all, but rejected and eventually killed him, it is not surprising that they should have so grievously misinterpreted their Scriptures as to imagine that 'that prophet' foretold by Moses was some other than the Messiah.

Some of the Jews, we learn from the Scriptures, were more open-minded, and, later on, when they saw the miracles of Jesus, were constrained to confess their mistake, and to acknowledge that *He* was 'that prophet'. Thus we read, 'When therefore the people saw the sign which he did, they said, This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world' (John vi. 14).

If further proof were needed that the Messiah and 'that prophet' were one and the same person, it is found in the words of the Apostle Peter who, taught by God, clearly announced their identity in these words, 'Moses indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like

The Messiah and 'that prophet' were one and the same person

unto me; to him shall ye hearken in all things whatsoever he shall speak unto you. And it shall be, that every soul, which shall not hearken to that prophet, shall be utterly destroyed from among the people. Yea and all the prophets from Samuel and them that followed after, as many as have spoken, they also told of these days. . . Unto you first God, having raised up his Servant, sent him to bless you, in turning away every one of you from your iniquities' (Acts iii. 22-6).

From what has been written above it is clear that modern Muslims, like the Jews of the Messiah's time, have grievously erred in imagining that the Messiah and 'that prophet' foretold by Moses were different persons. The Scriptures make it clear that they were one and the same, hence the fiction that, in the passage we have been discussing, there is a reference to the coming of Muhammad, is seen to be worthless.

X. We now come to, perhaps, the most frequently quoted of all the passages of the Bible, in which it is alleged by Muslims we have a reference to Muhammad. We refer to those verses in John xiv, xv, xvi which have a reference to the *Paraclete*, variously translated 'Comforter', 'Advocate', and 'Helper.' The verses mostly relied upon by Muslims in urging that Muhammad is here foretold, are the following, 'And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with

John xiv.
xv. xvi

you for ever, even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him: ye know him; for he abideth with you, and shall be in you' (John xiv. 16, 17). 'But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you' (John xiv. 26). 'But when the Comforter is come, whom I will send unto you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which proceedeth from the Father, he shall bear witness of me' (John xv. 26). 'Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth: for he shall not speak from himself; but what things soever he shall hear, these shall he speak: and he shall declare unto you the things that are to come' (John xvi. 13).

The passages of the Injil quoted above, Muslim writers tell us, all refer to the coming of the last and greatest Prophet Muhammad, who by his intercession at the throne of God has become the true 'Comforter' or 'Peacemaker'. He it is who alone fulfils the predictions made by Jesus, and his name it is which corresponds with the Greek word *Parakletos*.

This claim has been reiterated with such persistence that many uninstructed people have really come to believe that it has some basis in the words of Scripture. We propose, therefore, to deal with this question somewhat more in detail than has been

thought necessary in the case of other passages quoted. The author of *Baibele Muhammad* argues at length that if the Christian interpretation of the passages quoted be correct, and if the Holy Spirit had really been given to teach the Christian Church, then warfare amongst Christians would not be known, and sectarianism would find no place in the Christian Church. At the same time he does not scruple to reiterate the claim that Muhammad was himself the promised *Paraclete*, though he does not stop to explain why, under such circumstances, Muslims still wage war with Muslims, and Shiahs and Sunnis still anathematize each other. If, according to him, the function of the promised *Paraclete* was to preserve from these, then why has Muhammad so signally failed, and why did he himself foretell the day when Islām should be divided into seventy-three sects, all of whom, but one, were destined for the fire. The answer is, of course, that the objector's reasoning is hopelessly wrong. God has not undertaken to force men to uniformity of belief, nor has He said that the presence of His spirit in the Christian Church should quell all the passions of nominal Christians. The real question at issue is whether the passages quoted above can, in a spirit of honest exegesis, be applied to Muhammad; and to an answer to that question we now apply ourselves.

(1) Our first point is one scarcely involving any exegesis at all. It resolves itself into a simple

reading of the text as it stands. Thus we read that the promised *Paraclete* was 'the Spirit of truth' (John xiv. 17), and 'the Holy Spirit' (John xiv. 26). If these terms mean anything,

The Paraclete was to be a divine Spirit they surely mean that the promised one was to be, not a mere man at all, but a divine Spirit. This

latter Muhammad never claimed to be. Rather he never tired of asserting his essential humanity, and in the Qur'an we repeatedly find such passages as,

هل كنت إلا بشر 'Am I ought but a man?'

(2) That the one referred to was no mere man is further emphasized by the words, 'He shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you for ever' (John xiv. 16).

The Paraclete was to abide forever How, we ask, can these words possibly apply to Muhammad, who lies buried in his grave at Madina? Did not Muhammad rebuke his followers upon the field of Uhud in these words, 'Muhammad is no more than an Apostle; other Apostles have already passed away before him: if he die, therefore, or be slain, will ye turn upon your heels' [Súratu 'Alí 'Imrán (iii) 144].

(3) In the next place we remark that the promised Spirit was to be invisible to the eyes of men. Thus we read that he was a spirit, 'Whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not' (John xiv. 17). Such language as this can never apply to

The Paraclete was to be invisible

Muhammad, or, indeed, to any mere man. It can only apply to a divine Spirit, such as the Bible teaches was sent in fulfilment of the promises of Jesus recorded above.

(4) Again we observe that the promised *Paraclete* would dwell spiritually in the hearts of men. Thus we read, 'He abideth with you, and shall be in you' (John xiv. 17). It is almost an insult to the reader's intelligence to point out how impossible it is that such language can, in any sense, refer to Muhammad.

(5) Once more, in Acts i. 4, 5, we read that the promised *Paraclete* should come, not to men living six hundred years later in the distant land of Arabia, but to the very disciples to whom the promise was addressed, and in Jerusalem itself, 'not many days hence.' It is there written, 'And being assembled together with them, he charged them not to depart

from Jerusalem, but to wait for the promise of the Father, which, said he, ye heard from me: for John indeed baptized with water; but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence.' This passage shows clearly that the disciples were to 'wait' for the fulfilment of the promise made to them by Christ; and only after its fulfilment were they to go forth to obey

The Paraclete was to dwell in the hearts of men

The Paraclete was to come during the life-time of the apostles of Christ

the great command to preach the Gospel to all the world. It is further recorded that, before leaving the earth, the Lord Jesus called His disciples together and said, 'Behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you: but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high' (Luke xxiv. 49). These words of the Messiah make it clear that the *Paraclete* was to come during the life-time of those addressed, and first of all, in the city of Jerusalem. This is so obvious from the words of the Injil, that only people blinded with prejudice would dare to assert that they can refer to Muhammad.

(6) In the next place, in John xvi. 13, it is clearly stated that the Lord Jesus Christ, addressing his disciples, said that the promised spirit 'shall declare unto you the things that are to come.' But every reader of the Qur'an knows that Muhammad was absolutely ignorant of future events. Thus in *Súratu'l-Ahqáf* (xlv) 10, he says,

زَمَا أَدْرِي مَا يَفْعَلُ بِي وَلَا بِكُمْ

'Neither know I what will be done with me, or with you.' Whilst in *Súratu'l-An'am* (vi) 51, he says,

لَا أَقُولُ لَكُمْ عِنْدِي خَزَائِنُ اللَّهِ وَلَا أَعْلَمُ الْغَيْبَ

'I say not to you, "In my possession are the treasures of God." Neither say I, "I know things

secret". Muḥammad once, upon a certain occasion, ventured a prediction, it is true, but as the people of his time were unable to verify it, his ignominious failure did him no harm. The occasion is recorded in the *Mishkátu'l-Maṣābiḥ*, in the *Kitābu'l-Fitān* in the section entitled 'the signs of the resurrection'. It is there stated that

عن ابي قتاده قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
الآيات بعد المتين

'It is related from Ubi Quatādā that he said, The Apostle of God (upon whom be the peace and blessing of God) said, "The signs (of the resurrection) will be after two hundred (years)".' Thirteen hundred years have passed since these words were uttered, but the 'signs', which, as every Muslim knows, include the rising of the sun in the west, are still in the distant future!! How different is the record of that Spirit who was given to guide and teach the infant Christian Church. Of that Spirit we read that the Apostle Paul, addressing the elders of the Ephesian Church said, 'The Holy Ghost testifieth unto me in every city, saying that bonds and afflictions abide me' (Acts xx. 23). In another place we read that, 'There came down from Judæa a certain prophet, named Agabus. And coming to us, and taking Paul's girdle, he bound his own feet and hands, and said, Thus saith the Holy Ghost, So shall the Jews at Jerusalem bind the

man that owneth this girdle, and shall deliver him into the hands of the Gentiles' (Acts xxi. 10, 11). These predictions were literally fulfilled a few days later, thus clearly showing that the 'spirit' promised by the Lord Jesus Christ to His disciples came and showed them things to come, even as it had been promised.

(7) Yet once again let us notice that in Acts ii the actual coming of the Holy Spirit, in accordance with the promise of Christ, is clearly

The actual coming of the Paraclete is recorded in Acts ii recorded. We have already seen that he was to come during the lifetime of the immediate disciples of Christ. In Acts i it is further stated that his coming was to be accompanied by a manifestation of great power. 'Ye shall receive power' said Christ, 'after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you' (verse 8). In accordance with this prediction it is recorded that a few days later, when the disciples were gathered together in a certain place, suddenly 'they were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance' (Acts ii. 4). The great promise had been fulfilled, and the disciples went forth in the new-given power preaching everywhere the words of life, and, 'fear came upon every soul: and many wonders and signs were done by the Apostles' (Acts ii. 43).

Such was the promise of the Holy Spirit, the

Comforter as revealed by John, and such its fulfilment as recorded by Luke. The reader will now be in a position to judge how impossible it is for the prediction to apply, in any sense, to Muhammad, a man of flesh and blood, seen by thousands, and living in Arabia some six hundred years after the time announced for the appearance of the *Paraclete*.

XI. One other so-called prophecy must claim our brief attention before we bring this little booklet to a close. It is contained in John xiv. 30 and reads as follows, 'The prince of the world cometh: and he hath nothing in me.' Many Muslim writers gravely quote these words as a prediction of the coming of the Prophet Muhammad, who, they point out, rose to be a prince over all Arabia.¹

It has been well said that the best commentary on the Bible is the Bible itself. This remark is well illustrated in the verse under discussion, and if we put before the reader those other passages of the Bible in which the 'Prince of the world' is mentioned, he will see at once that the person there referred to, far from being the Arabian Prophet Muhammad, is none other than Satan himself!! Thus in John xii. 31 we read, 'Now shall the prince of this world be cast out.' Again in John xvi. 11 we read, 'The prince of this world hath been judged,'

The 'prince of this world' is Satan

¹ See *Proof of Prophet Mohammad from the Bible*, p. 18.

whilst in 2 Cor. iv. 4 we read, 'The God of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them.' Yet once again in Eph. ii. 1, 2 we read, 'And you did he quicken, when ye were dead through your trespasses and sins, wherein aforetime ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, of the spirit that now worketh in the sons of disobedience.' Comment upon these passages is needless. They show beyond question, that the words 'prince of this world' apply to Satan, and to no one else. Thus in ascribing the passage to Muhammad Muslims have fallen into a most egregious error, and have illustrated in a very startling manner the unwisdom of taking a single passage of Scripture, and, without reference to parallel passages, building upon it a theory of interpretation which makes them the laughing-stock of all intelligent people.

Our task is completed, and we desire to add little to what has been written above. We are, however, constrained, in closing, to give one piece of advice. Let Muslims first of all prove to the world that Muhammad was in any sense a true Prophet of God; and then it will be time enough for them to search the Bible for prophecies of his advent. For ourselves, we challenge any one to prove the presence in the Bible of a single prediction

of Muhammad, except as a false Prophet. With respect to the latter the Lord Jesus Christ spoke with no uncertain sound, and He warned His followers in the gravest terms to beware of false prophets who should come after Him. Thus we read, 'And many false prophets shall arise, and shall lead many astray' (Matt. xxiv. 11). 'For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; so as to lead astray, if possible, even the elect' (Matt. xxiv. 24).

The truth is that if the Bible be studied with attention, the impossibility of any true Prophet coming *after* the Messiah will be clearly manifest. He Himself said, 'Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away' (Mark xiii. 31), and He told His disciples that, 'This gospel of the kingdom shall be preached in the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations; and then shall the end come' (Matt. xxiv. 14); consequently until the gospel, i.e. the Christian religion, has really been preached to all the world, no other dispensation can come from God to abrogate Christianity. Thus there is left no room for either Muhammad or the Qur'án. Moreover the angel Gabriel, when announcing to the virgin Mary the coming birth of her son Jesus, distinctly conveyed the message from God that, 'Of his (i.e. Christ's) kingdom there shall be no end' (Luke i. 33). Let the Muslim reader ponder

upon these words, and he will see that Jesus is the 'Last Prophet', and that there is beside His, 'any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved' (Acts iv. 12).