

John Leonetti CSAP 651-01 Islam is self-refuting. Audience: Adult Men's breakfast Saturday morning group.

Introduction

This paper will examine the relationship between the Bible and the Qur'an and how Islam uses those sources for determining ultimate truth. I will argue based on the Qur'an 's views of the impossibility of Allah's word being corrupted, and it teaching the Bible is the Word of God (Pentateuch, Psalms and Gospels), Islam is self-refuting and therefore is a false religion. This presents a dilemma for Islam, since the Qur'an teaches the Bible is the word of Allah, and His *words* can never be corrupted, then the first divine revelation (Bible) should not contradict the subsequent alleged revelation (Qur'an). First, I will mention several benefits for Christians witnessing to Muslims by starting with the Qur'an. Next, I will cite the Surahs (chapters) and ayahs (verses) from the Qur'an that teach Allah's Word cannot be corrupted and His word is found in the Pentateuch, Psalms and Gospels. Then, I will argue a consistent reading of these Surahs would logically drive one to the Bible *alone* for truth. Lastly, I will examine the arguments of Muslim scholars in response to my criticism and then offer counter arguments, followed by a conclusion. In any witnessing situation it is incumbent on the Christian to think strategically in terms of where to begin a conversation. Let us examine some benefits of starting a conversation with an inquiring Muslim with the Qur'an.

Why Start with the Qur'an?

There are many good reasons for Christians dialoging with Muslims to start with the Qur'an. In doing so, the Christian seeks to find common ground to start a conversation. This is wise because Muslims view the Qur'an slightly differently than Christians do the Bible. For example, Islamic scholar Yusuf K. Ibih explains how Muslims view the Qur'an as "an expression of Divine Will. If you want to compare it with anything in Christianity, you must compare it with Christ

Himself.”¹ Since the church has a high view of Christ as God, therefore to take away the Qur'an from the start of a potential conversation with Muslims is tantamount to Christians being asked to not reference Jesus in interfaith dialog. Secondly, it is a disarming tactic as conversations regarding differences in religion can get heated. The Muslim may perceive a “hatred” for the Qur'an if it is disallowed to enter the conversation. Rather, as Biola graduate Alan Shlemon advises Christians, “Instead of pitting one book against the other, show how the Muslim’s source of authority actually endorses our source of authority.”² This is excellent advice as it mirrors the apostle Paul in Acts 17:28 who began witnessing to Greek philosophers by quoting their own poets, and it avoids creating an initial impasse. Finally, when sharing the Gospel with a Muslim, many times he or she will go back to their spiritual leader, an Imam, and it is easier for the conversation to move forward if the subject is *initially* centered on the Qur'an rather than *solely* Biblical verses.

Even though there are benefits to starting with the Qur'an, this paper is *not* arguing for the sufficiency of it *alone* to fully explain the Gospel and the identity of the Triune God to an inquiring Muslim. It is simply a suggested tactic to lower the defenses of a Muslim, thus hopefully giving the Christian an opportunity to use the Bible. Since the Qur'an will be quoted extensively throughout this paper, please refer to the footnote for the bibliographic information regarding the edition and translator used in this work.³

¹ Dr. Yusuf K. Ibish interview with Charis Waddy qtd in Charis Waddy, *The Muslim Mind*, (NY: Longman Group LTD., 1976), 14.

² Alan Shlemon, *The Ambassador’s Guide to Islam*, (Signal Hill, CA: Stand to Reason, 2010), 11.

³ Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Meaning of the Holy Quran. New Edition., with Revised. Translation and Commentary* (Brentwood, Md.: Amana Publications, 1994).

Surahs Stating Allah's Words Cannot Be Corrupted

Before the Surahs that mention the Torah the Psalms and the Gospels are cited, it is necessary to first note the Qur'an teaches in multiples places it is impossible to corrupt the words of Allah. Surah 6:34 says, "Rejected were the Messengers before thee: with patience, and constancy they bore their rejection and their wrongs, until our aid did reach them: There is none that can alter the Words (and decrees) of Allah.⁴" Messengers "before" Mohammed are mentioned here indicating these prophets had some divine guidance. What is of importance is the claim, "There is none that can alter the Words (and decrees) of Allah." In the same chapter, Surah 6:115 teaches, "The Word of thy Lord doth find its fulfilment, In truth and in justice: None can change His Words."⁵ The plain meaning of these ayahs is clear, no one can change the words of Allah. This is confirmed by the fourteenth century Islamic scholar Ibn Kathir, who said, "None from among God's creation can remove Allah's words from His books."⁶ Kathir uses the plural, "books," which, as we shall see, includes material that predates the Qur'an. All Muslims would agree that it is impossible for an all-powerful Allah to have His Words changed.

There are additional sections of the Qur'an that also teach Allah's Words can never change. In order to ensure the teaching that Allah's words can never change is taught *throughout* the Qur'an, here are several more citations to solidify this doctrine. In Surah 10:64 the Qur'an plainly says, "Hereafter, that indeed is the supreme triumph; there is no changing the words of Allah."⁷ Again, the meaning is plain, there is no changing the words (plural) of Allah. And lastly,

⁴ Ibid., Surah 6:34, p. 302.

⁵ Ibid., Surah 6:115, p. 328.

⁶ Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir Ibn Kathir*, Volume 2, abridged by Sheik Muhammed Nasib Ar-Rafa'i (London: Al-Firdous Ltd., 2000, 196.

⁷ Ali, Abdullah Yusuf. *The Meaning of the Holy Quran* Surah 10:64, p. 198.

Surah 18:28 states, “Recite that which has been revealed to thee of the Book of thy Lord. There is none who can change His words.”⁸ Since Allah’s Words can never be changed, it is incumbent for one to discover if the Qur’ān teaches these Words include anything in the Bible.

Qur’ān references to the Bible

Many Muslims and Christians are unaware the Qur’ān directs its readers to portions of the Bible. For example, Surah 4:136 states, “Oh you who believe, have firm faith in Allah and His Messenger, *and in the book which He has revealed before it* (Emphasis mine). Whoso disbelieves in Allah, and His angels, and His Books, and His Messengers, and the Last Day, has surely strayed far away.”⁹ Christians interpret this ayah as referring to the Bible (the book which He, Allah revealed before it, i.e. the Qur’ān). Muslims, as we shall see in the counterargument section have a different interpretation of this Surah than Christians.

The Qur’ān refers to the Bible in other places such as Surah 3:84 which says, “We believe in Allah, and in what has been revealed to us, and what was revealed to Abraham, Ismail, Isaac, Jacob, and the Tribes, and in (the Books) given to Moses, Jesus and the Prophets. We make no distinction between one and another.”¹⁰ Christians see this as teaching what the Biblical writers *wrote* was “given” to them by God. This Christian interpretation of Surah 3:84 is also affirmed in *The Study Qur’ān*’s contributing editors as they direct the reader on this ayah to a footnote on Surah 2:136 which notes,

The ranking of the prophets is discussed in v.2:85 where the prophet and the believers are also enjoined to *make no distinction* (Italics in original) between the messengers of God. The present verse is considered by commentators to invalidate the selective tendency to pick and choose condemned in v. 85: *Do you then believe in part of the Book and disbelieve in part?* (Italics in original). See the

⁸ Ibid., Surah 18:28, p. 279.

⁹ Ibid., Surah 4:136, p. 93.

¹⁰ Ibid., Surah 3:84, p. 149.

essay ‘The Quranic View of Sacred History and Other Religions.’ The continuity and wholeness of religion is described in such passages as *He has prescribed for you as religion that with which He enjoined upon Noah and that which We revealed unto thee, and that which We enjoined upon Abraham, Moses and Jesus, that you uphold religion and become not divided therein.* (Italics in original)¹¹

This footnote is saying that Muhammed is rebuking his hearers for believing only a part of the previous revelation given to, “Noah, Abraham, Moses and Jesus.” But that is exactly what modern Muslims do when the Christian brings up the Bible, namely, they believe only a “part of the Book.”

Concerning the Biblical revelation, The Qur'an is even more specific in Surah 57:26-27 which states, “And We sent Noah and Abraham, and established in their line Prophethood and Revelation: and some of them were on right guidance, but many of them became rebellious transgressors. Then in their wake, We followed them up with (others of) Our messengers. We sent them Jesus the Son of Mary and bestowed on Him the Gospel.”¹² There is nothing in the two ayahs above that Christians would fail to acknowledge. Dominican scholar Jacques Jomier summarizes what Muslims believe concerning the Bible and the Qur'an,

For Islam, then, the history of the world is divided into periods in which prophets are the dominant figures. Islam believes in all those prophets, in the Scriptures brought by them in the Torah (Tawrat), the Scripture given by Moses to the Children of Israel; in the Gospel (Injil, singular) given by Jesus to the Children of Israel also, but, above all, in the Koran which is the THE Scripture of Islam preeminent, the sacred book of the last period of history. These three books are regarded by Moslems as the Word of God. Each of them confirms the truth of its predecessors.¹³

¹¹ Seyyed Hossein Nasr, Caner K. Dagli, Maria Massi Dakake, Joseph E.B. Lumbard, Rustom, Mohammed Rustom, eds., *The Study Quran : A New Translation and Commentary. First ed.* Desert Mountain High School Collection. (New York, NY: HarperOne, an Imprint of Harper Collins Publishers, 2015), 61.

¹² Ali, Abdullah Yusuf. *The Meaning of the Holy Quran* Surah 57:27, p. 1429.

¹³ Jacques, Jomier, *The Bible and the Koran* (New York: Desclée, CO. 1964), 23.

It is clear the Qur'an has a high view of the Bible, however, the word "Gospel" as noted above and in the Muslim's counter argument (detailed below) is defined differently than the way historic orthodox Christianity has understood it. Consequently, it is imperative that Christians understand how Muslims present their arguments which include a different definition for the word "Gospel." So, let us now look at the Muslim argument against the Bible and discover their definition of the word "Gospel."

Muslim Counterargument

When Muslims use the word "Gospel" they are not defining it as Christians do today as in the four historical accounts of the life of Jesus. Rather, the word "Gospel" to Muslims is defined by Mohammed Assad as that which is, "not identical with what is known today as the Four Gospels, but refers to an original, since lost, revelation bestowed on Jesus and known to His contemporaries as under its Greek name of Evangelion ('Good Tiding'), on which the Arabicized form *Injil* is based."¹⁴ Therefore, today when Christians quote from the "Four Gospels," it is automatically disavowed by Muslims as corrupt.

Furthermore, in regards to Surah 4:136 regarding "Allah's Books and Messengers," Muslim scholars see the difficulty in stating that one of Allah's "Books" (in this case the Bible) includes any material in their extant writings presently available because these sources clearly contradict what the Qur'an teaches on major doctrines such as the nature of God and salvation. Mohammed Asad faces this dilemma head-on as he interprets Surah 4:136 noting, "What is meant here is belief in the *fact* of earlier revelation, and not in the earlier-revealed scriptures in their

¹⁴ Muhammad Asad, *The message of the Quran: Translated and Explained by Muhammed Asad* (Dubai: Oriental Press, 2012), footnote 4, for Surah 3:3, 79.

present form, which as repeatedly stated in the Qur'an is the outcome of far-reaching corruption of the original texts.”¹⁵ Asad is excluding the *present* Torah, Psalms and Four Gospels as being part of the “Books” Allah has revealed prior to the Qur'an and believes they are “corrupt.” He further notes there are other places in the Qur'an which back up this assertion. Asad is arguing what was given to Moses in the Torah and the authors of the Psalms, and the Injil (Gospel) given to Jesus has been lost, and therefore any extant writings we have today that claim to accurately represent what the original revelations were, have been corrupted.

Additionally, when it comes to the ayahs in Surahs that teach none of Allah's Words can be corrupted, the Muslim rejoinder to this is it is referring *solely* to the Qur'an. After basically reaffirming Assad's notion the Bible has been corrupted, Muslim scholar Ahaj Ajijola defends the Qur'an by noting it, “is fully preserved and not a jot or tittle has been changed or left out.”¹⁶ In other words, the ayahs teaching that Allah's Words cannot be corrupted refer solely to the Qur'an and not the Bible.

Lastly, an argument is presented by Muslim scholars that centers around Surahs 5:13 and 3:78. Surah 5:13 mentions the Israelites and notes, “Their hearts grow hard: They change the words from their (right) places and forget a good part of the Message that was sent them.”¹⁷ Surah 3:78, again referring to the Israelites says, “There is among them a section who distort the Book with their tongues (as they read).”¹⁸ The Qur'an in the above two passages seems to give

¹⁵ Asad, Muhammad, *The message of the Quran*, footnote, 151, 150. (Italics in original).

¹⁶ Alhaj A. D. Ajijola, *The Essence of Faith in Islam* (Lahore, Pakistan: Islamic Publications Ltd., 1978), 79.

¹⁷ Ali, Abdullah Yusuf. *The Meaning of the Holy Quran*, Surah 5:13, p. 250.

¹⁸ Ibid., Surah 3:78, p. 147.

upon a cursory reading the notion the Book (Bible) has been “distorted.” These are serious implications that will now be examined in terms of a Christian response.

Christian Counterargument

Assad’s interpretation of Surah 4:136 fails to consider the words “and in the *book which He has revealed before it.*” This is clearly referring to written Scripture, *prior* to the existence of the Qur’an. Assad also makes the claim that the Qur’an “repeatedly states” the previous messages have been corrupted but he fails to provide additional Surahs and ayahs to back up this claim. In Assad’s work there is no footnote for additional references in the Qur’an for the alleged corruption of the previous messages (Torah, Psalms and Gospel). Assad’s “interpretation” of Surah 4:136 also contradicts Surah 2:136 which states, “Say ye: We believe in Allah, and the *revelation* given to us, and to Abraham, Ismail, Isaac, Jacob and the Tribes, and that given to Moses, Jesus, and that given to (all) Prophets from their Lord: We make no difference between one and another of them.” The revelation was given to “us” (Mohammed) and to Moses and Jesus *in the same way* the Qur’an was given. Since the Qur’an teaches one to not make a “difference” between “one and another” revelation, then to regard one as corrupt and the other uncorrupted is to disobey Surah 2:136.

Asad’s interpretation of Surah 4:136 also overlooks Surah 10:94 where the Qur’an plainly instructs its readers should they be confused to, “ask those who have been reading the Book.”¹⁹ Regarding Surah 10:94, Abdullah, Yusuf Ali in his footnote states, “‘The Book’ in this connection is Revelation, generally, including pre-Islamic revelation.”²⁰ Asad agrees with Yusuf Ali regarding Surah 10:94 as he argues, “The ‘reading’ is here a metonym for belief, namely in

¹⁹ Ibid., Surah 10:94, p. 504.

²⁰ Ibid., footnote, 1475, 504.

the Bible, which notwithstanding the fact that its text has been corrupted in the course of time, still contains clear references to the Prophet Muhammed.”²¹ For Asad it is *solely* belief in the Bible that is referenced here by Allah and *not* the actual accuracy of the Bible in its present form. For the definition of a “metonym” is “a word or phrase used in metonymy, as a substitute for another.”²² According to Asad, Allah was telling Muhammed to check with the people who believe *in* the Book (the Bible) but *not* the Bible itself! That advice is incongruent with the history of both Judaism and Christianity as both religions always believed in the reliability of their Scripture (Jews Old Testament only) and based their doctrine and lifestyles on it.

Also, additional questions arise concerning Ali Abdullah Yusuf’s claim above that the alleged corrupted text of the Bible still, “contains clear references to the Prophet Muhammed.” For example, even if one did find Muhammed in the Christian Bible, how would he or she know this alleged reference is *not* one of the corrupted parts? Furthermore, why would Allah appeal to earlier writings as evidence for Islam if they were corrupted? If the manuscripts of the four Gospels had been corrupted by the time the Qur’an was written, wouldn’t Allah instruct His followers to just get rid of them?

This reasoning presents a dilemma for Muslims as it puts Allah in the proverbial “hot seat.” As Shlemon notes, “If they’re right about the Bible’s corruption, then Allah is either inept or immoral.”²³ This conclusion is not meant to be harsh, but if Allah let the Bible’s message (Torah, Psalms and Gospels) get corrupted, then to direct people to it would be immoral. Also, if Allah let His revelations *prior* to Mohammed to be falsified, then how can Muslims be sure the

²¹ Muhammad Asad, *The message of the Quran*, footnote, 116, 345.

²² *Webster’s New World College Dictionary. Fifth Edition*, Newly Updated. ed. (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2018), 921.

²³ Shlemon, *The Ambassador’s Guide to Islam*, 16.

Qur'an in its present form is not corrupted? If the "book" means a metonym for a belief that is not traceable in historical manuscripts, that is too vague and also contradicts the repeated notion confirmed earlier by Ibn Kathir that no one can corrupt *any* of Allah's Words in His *books* (plural). Asad never states what the already established belief the alleged metonym scenario is referring to in terms of doctrine. Also, if Allah let one of His "Books" get corrupted, how then could He be considered omnipotent?

In terms of History and the study of textual criticism regarding both the Old and New Testaments the thing that is conspicuously absent in the Islamic sources used for research in this paper is the approximate time in history that the alleged corruption of the Biblical text took place. This leads to further implications that need to be explored. For example, if Muslims argue the Bible was corrupted *before* the Qur'an was written (circa 7th century), then why would Allah command Muhammed in Surah 10:68 to, "stand fast by the Law, the Gospel and all the revelation?"²⁴ If the Gospel had been corrupted why does the Qur'an say Christians at the time of Muhammed had the Gospel? For example, Surah 7:157 states, "Those who follow the Messenger, The unlettered Prophet, Whom they find mentioned In their own Scriptures, in the Law and the Gospel."²⁵ This Surah is referencing the Law and the Gospel as Scriptures. There is no ambiguity here as the Law and Gospel are worthy of the designation "Scriptures." There is good historical, manuscript evidence that will now be examined that indicates the Bible, at the time of Muhammed is essentially the same as the extant versions we have today.

The charge Islamic scholars (not the Qur'an) put forth that the Bible has been corrupted is inaccurate. Beginning with the Old Testament, Gleason Archer notes, "It should

²⁴ Abdullah Yusuf Ali, *The Meaning of the Holy Quran*, Surah 10:68, 270.

²⁵ Ali, Abdullah Yusuf. *The Meaning of the Holy Quran New Ed., with Rev. Translation, Commentary and Newly Compiled Comprehensive Index*. Surah 7:157, p. 389.

be clearly understood that in respect [to transmission], the Old Testament differs from all other pre-Christian works of literature of which we have any knowledge. To be sure we do not possess so many manuscripts of pagan productions, coming from such widely separated eras, as we do in the case of the Old Testament.”²⁶ There were so many ancient manuscripts of the Old Testament that were in circulation that to argue that the words were deliberately changed is geographically and textually impossible. In order to corrupt the Old Testament, one would have to literally change thousands of fragments and full manuscripts over a vast area. In terms of the fragments (not full manuscripts), David Dockery et al., documents the number from the Old Testament goes back to the fifth century A.D. when they note,

Near the end of the nineteenth century, many fragments from the sixth to the eighth centuries were found in an old synagogue in Cairo, Egypt, which had been Saint Michael’s Church until A.D. 882. They were found there in a *geniza*, a storage room where worn or faulty manuscripts were hidden until they could be disposed of properly... In this small room, as many as 200,000 fragments were preserved, including biblical texts in Hebrew and Aramaic. The biblical fragments date from the fifth century A.D.²⁷

The sheer number of copies distributed throughout the Ancient Near East makes the notion of the willful changing of the text next to impossible. For example, how is one person or even a group of people to travel this vast area where the Old Testament spread, and then change all the copies without being detected?

Furthermore, the discovery of portions of the Old Testament in 1947 in the form of the Dead Sea Scrolls is paramount in this discussion. According to Archer these scrolls of the Old Testament date, “a thousand years earlier than the oldest manuscript previously known (A.D.

²⁶ Gleason Archer *A Survey of the Old Testament Introduction* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1964), 23.

²⁷ David, S. Dockery, Kenneth A. Matthews, and Robert B. Sloan, *Foundations for Biblical Interpretation*, (Nashville: Broadman and Holman Publishers, 1994), 162-163.

980), and they proved to be word for word identical with our standard Hebrew Bible in more than 95 percent of the text.”²⁸ Muslim scholars should note that this accurate preservation of the text echoes the words of Jesus referring to the Old Testament who said in John 10:35 (ESV), “the Scripture cannot be broken.” In other words, just like the Qur'an and Ibn Kathir teach, no one can change God's Words.

As for the textual and historical reliability of the New Testament, there is also a tremendous amount of evidence modern day translations are essentially very close to the original autographs. There are slightly over 24,000 manuscripts of the New Testament that are extant today and what is significant to note is that of the approximate 24,000 manuscripts, 5,656 date from the second to the fifteenth centuries.²⁹ Muslim scholars cannot point to any discrepancies regarding the New Testament manuscripts from the time of Muhammed with the versions we have today.

Norman Geisler and William Nix sum up this issue when they note,

The New Testament text of Muhammed's day is confirmed by these same manuscripts to be the same basic New Testament text of Jesus' day. For these manuscripts provide an unbroken chain of testimony to the very threshold of the first century for the authenticity of the New Testament text we possess today. For example, the earliest fragment of the New Testament, the John Ryland Fragment, is dated about 117-138. It preserves verses from John 18 just as they are found in later manuscripts and in today's New Testament. Likewise, the Bodmer Papyri from the second century A.D. preserve the whole books of Peter and Jude as we have them today.³⁰

The evidence above will stand against any claims the New Testament was corrupted. In addition to the biblical manuscripts, it is significant to note that Bruce Metzger contends, “If all other

²⁸ Gleason Archer *A Survey of the Old Testament Introduction*, 25.

²⁹ Norman L. Geisler and William Nix, *A General Introduction to the Bible*, 2nd ed., (Chicago: Moody Press, 1968), 365.

³⁰ Norman Geisler & Abdul Saleeb, *Answering Islam: The Crescent in Light of the Cross*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1993), 213.

sources for our knowledge of the text of the New Testament were destroyed, [the patristic quotations] would be sufficient alone for the reconstruction of practically the entire New Testament.”³¹ These church fathers wrote long before the time of Muhammed and no one questions the historical reliability of their writings.

Lastly, regarding Surahs 5:13 and 3:78 which note a “distortion” of the Old Testament by the Israelites Shlemon notes, “Both of these passages, in their context, suggest that people were *misinterpreting what was already written.*”³² John Wijngaards of the Catholic Truth Society echoes Shlemon, “In the first four centuries after Muhammed (600-1000 AD) no Muslim theologian seriously contended that the Gospel texts were not authentic. They might accuse Christians of giving a wrong interpretation to the words, but they would not dispute the words themselves...It was only with Ibn-Khazem who died at Cordoba in 1064 that the charge of falsification was born.”³³ While this is significant in regard to the New Testament, it should also be noted, there is an absence of a charge in early Islam that the Old Testament was corrupted. Ibn Kathir draws upon two more scholars regarding Surah 3:78, Ibn Abbas, Mohammed’s cousin and Wahb bin Munabbih as Kathir’s commentary notes, “‘Although none of Allah’s creation can remove the words of Allah from his books, they alter and distort their meanings.’ Wahb bin Munabbih said, ‘The Tawrah and Injil remain as Allah revealed them, and no letter in them was removed.’”³⁴ It is difficult to argue against the words of Mohammed’s cousin who would count as a primary

³¹ Bruce M. Metzger, *The Text of the New Testament*, (New York and Oxford: University Press, 1968). 86.

³² Shlemon, *Ambassador Guide to Islam*, 19.

³³ John Wijngaards, *Can we trust the Gospels?: a letter to my Muslim brothers.* (London: Catholic Truth Society, 1985), as quoted in <https://www.answering-islam.org/Bible/Text/wijngaards.html>.

³⁴ Ibn Kathir, *Tafsir Ibn Kathir*, vol. 2, 196.

source, and Wahb bin Munabbih who died sometime in the eighth century but admitted the Tawrah (Torah) and Injil (Gospel) of his day were intact.

Conclusion

The Qur'an says the words of God cannot be corrupted. It also says the Bible is the Word of God. Therefore, based on the Qur'an's authority, the Bible was not changed or corrupted as Muslims argue today. The comments from Islamic scholars noting the alleged corruption of the Bible have been documented and refuted through both reasoning and textual criticism. In terms of reasoning, if it's true the Bible has been corrupted, this would still present a dilemma for Muslims. For if the Bible is corrupt, then the Qur'an's message is inconsistent because it repeatedly classifies the Bible as revelation from Allah. If the notion the Bible has been corrupted is false, then Muslim scholars will have to explain how an alleged second divine revelation from Allah (i.e., the Qur'an) would contradict the previous revelation in the Christian Scriptures. Despite all the evidence from the Qur'an, Muslim scholars insist the Bible has been corrupted. As W. Muir a scholar on Islam notes, "There is not a passage in the whole Coran which could, by any possible construction, cast the slightest suspicion upon Christians tampering either with their Gospel or with their copies of the Jewish Scriptures."³⁵ Rather the Bible is held in high esteem by the Qur'an. In closing, Jomier succinctly sums up the *duty* of all who read the Qur'an, "The Koran mentions the earlier Scriptures in words of praise, as Scriptures which have been transmitted by the messengers of God. It is a duty for the Moslem to believe in those Scriptures, and in those messengers of God."³⁶ May the Triune God of Scripture give His people a heart and strategy to reach Muslims for Christ and direct them to the Bible.

³⁵ W. Muir, *The Beacon of Truth*, (London: The Religious Tract Society, 1894), 231-232.

³⁶ Jomier, *The Bible and the Koran*, 25.