

6-1-1969

Various Muslim Interpretations of the Crucifixion of Jesus in the Qur'an

Rodney Otto

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, rod.phy@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv>



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), and the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Otto, Rodney, "Various Muslim Interpretations of the Crucifixion of Jesus in the Qur'an" (1969). *Master of Divinity Thesis*. 99.
<https://scholar.csl.edu/mdiv/99>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Divinity Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

VARIOUS MUSLIM INTERPRETATIONS OF THE CURCIFIXION
OF JESUS IN THE QUR'ĀN

An Essay Presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis,
Department of Historical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree
of Bachelor of Divinity

by

Rodney Otto

June 1969

71813

Approved by: William Danker
Advisor

Reader

11-26-69
research paper

CONCORDIA SEMINARY LIBRARY
ST. LOUIS, MISSOURI

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Acknowledgement should be made to several persons for their influence in the decision to study this topic. Professor Walter Boss of Concordia Senior College, the Rev. Roland Miller and Dr. B. H. Jackayya of India, and Professor Herbert Zorn presently of Concordia Seminary by their lives illustrate the Christian commitment to Islam. Their example prompted this study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION	1
II. THE DENIAL OF THE CRUCIFIXION IN THE QUR'ĀN	5
The Presuppositions for the Denial	5
The Sources for the Denial	6
The Qur'anic Evidence	9
The Atonement in the Qur'an	22
III. TWO CONTRASTING MUSLIM INTERPRETATIONS	28
The Ahmadiyyah Interpretation	28
Dr. Kamel Hussein's <u>City of Wrong</u>	31
IV. CONCLUSION	38
V. BIBLIOGRAPHY	42

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The teachings of the Qur'ān in relation to Jesus have been treated many times in the languages of the west since the beginning was made by C. F. Gerock in 1839 with his Versuch einer Darstellung der Christologie des Koran and a similar French work by Edouard Sayous in 1880.¹ The first English work of significance is Samuel Zwemer's The Moslem Christ in 1912. He expanded the previous scope of the topic to include the traditional accounts as well as the Qur'ān. Since that time two works in English have been published on this specific topic. In 1929 James Robson wrote Christ in Islam as a part of the Wisdom of the East Series from the Northbrook Society. And most recently in 1965 Geoffrey Parrinder's Jesus in the Qur'ān takes into account the critical attitude developing in Islam towards the Qur'ān and especially towards tradition by emphasizing the primacy of the Qur'ānic material over traditional accounts. Two French books appeared in 1959 and 1960 by M. Hayek and M. Michaud respectively.

The material in these various studies included accounts of the crucifixion of Jesus, although this was only a small part of each work. For the Christian approaching Islam, the crucifixion of Jesus is most crucial. This is shown in treatments about the Christian approach to Islam such as Kenneth Cragg's The Call of the Minaret. This paper is a beginning

attempt to understand the Qur'ānic teaching on the crucifixion of Jesus. Since the Qur'ān is the basis of all Islamic thought, it is the primary emphasis of the study. This was done through the books of S. Zwemer, J. Robson, and G. Parrinder as well as M. Pickthall's translation of the Qur'ān itself. From this base some attempt has been made to understand the traditions which have grown around the Qur'ān. Because the Ahmadiyyah movement is so vocal in its opposition to the crucifixion, it is treated as an illustration of present day Muslim thought on the crucifixion of Jesus even though it represents only a small heretical sect of Islam. Finally something of the liberal tendencies beginning to show in at least some areas of Islam--whether mere individuals or a trend--has been treated in an analysis of M. Kamel Hussein's City of Wrong.

The denial of the divinity of Christ is an integral part of the Muslim attitude to the crucifixion of Jesus. However, this has not been treated in this paper. A Christian attempt to understand the crucifixion of Jesus in Islam eventually would have to consider this important element. Also, the doctrine of atonement, which has been treated only secondarily, would have to be pursued in depth. But this, too, is outside the scope of this study.

Much difficulty is encountered in studying Islam without knowledge of Arabic. The English publications of the sources of Islam are only a small fraction of the field of Islamic literature. The disadvantages of translations and anthologies for the English reader are obvious. However, much work

has been done by Western scholars which enables a study such as this to be made.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Samuel Zwemer, The Moslem Christ (New York: American Tract Society, 1912), p. 10.

CHAPTER II

THE DENIAL OF THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS IN THE QUR'ĀN

The Presuppositions for the Denial

For the Christian the crucifixion of Jesus is the beginning of His victory over sin and death. However, for the Muslim the crucifixion could not have occurred if Jesus was to be a great prophet of Allah. Success is the mark of greatness for a Muslim prophet. Certainly no great prophet could be crucified. The Jews must have made a blunder. It was not Jesus whom they crucified but another whom the people mistook for Him.¹ If Jesus had been slain by the hostility of evil men, this would have been a divine failure of Allah. All the prophets saw the confusion of their opponents and the vindication of themselves. This emphasis on success may be the explanation for the Muslim acceptance of the historicity of Jesus' life up to the passion and the rejection of the role of history in the passion, this is, from the Garden of Gethsemane to the resurrection.² Even explicit references in the Qur'ān to the slaying of prophets are not persuasive enough to counteract this emphasis on success in the rest of the Qur'ān. (2:87; 3:183)

Most significant of all the presuppositions in Islamic thought is the Muslim conception of God as it affects Jesus. The crucifixion is a sign that Jesus is divine in some way. This assertion is counter to the central doctrine of the unity

of Allah. Thus a consideration of the presuppositions of the Muslim denial of Jesus' crucifixion should include careful study of the Muslim doctrine of God and the person of Jesus. This, however, is outside the scope of this research but is mentioned in order to point the way to possible further study on the crucifixion of Jesus in the Qur'ān.

The Sources for the Denial

There are instances of the denial of the crucifixion of Jesus before the rise of Islam. Whether Muhammad was aware of the previous heretical teaching on the subject, or whether he took the story of the resurrection to mean that Jesus was taken to heaven without dying is not clear. But the claim that Muhammad denied the crucifixion of Jesus in order to counteract Jesus' death as an atonement for sin should not be held, for he gives no indication of knowledge of this teaching.³

The most commonly held source is the Christian heresy of docetism. Because this heresy existed in and around Mecca it is plausible that Muhammad would have known it. The major passage in the Qur'ān teaching the denial of the crucifixion of Jesus used the word, shubbiha: "They slew him not nor crucified, but it appeared so unto them." This word is exactly parallel to the Greek word dokesis, the name of the docetic heresy in the early church. Both this passage in the Qur'ān and docetism teach that the sufferings of Jesus were apparent and not real; they only seemed so. However docetism asserted this because it considered matter, and this included the body, to be essentially evil. Islam does not hold this gnostic

attitude. Islam preserved the docetic attitude without its gnostic implications.⁴

Evidences of the docetic heresy are found from the time of the early church. Already with Ignatius (115 A.D.) the reference is made to some that believed that Jesus "suffered in semblance." The Gospel of Peter from the second century tends towards docetism by a slight twist in reporting Jesus' pain on the cross and His death. The docetic twist is that on the cross Jesus "was silent, since he felt no pain" and at the time of death "the Lord cried out saying, 'My power, my power, you have left me.' And when he spoke he was taken up." This is similar to the Qur'anic description of Jesus' ascension in 5:117: "when thou tookest me. . . ." In another document from this century called the Acts of John Jesus appeared to John in a cave during the crucifixion and said, "John, unto the multitude below in Jerusalem I am being crucified and pierced with lances and reeds, and gall and vinegar is given me to drink. But unto thee I speak." And later the record goes, "Nothing, therefore of the things which they will say of me have I suffered. . . . I was pierced, yet I was not smitten; hanged and was not hanged; that blood flowed from me, and it flowed not." This could easily be a germinal statement for the later Qur'anic position on the crucifixion of Jesus as found in 4:156.⁵ The famous Egyptian Gnostic Christian Basilides (second century) wrote a Gospel, or at least a commentary, which is referred to by Irenaeus (185 A.D.) as teaching that the divine Nous appeared in human form, but at the crucifixion he changed forms with Simon of Cyrene, who had carried

the cross. Simon was crucified and Jesus stood by deriding the Jews before ascending. However, Clement of Alexandria (215 A.D.) said that Basilides taught that the humanity of Jesus could be tainted with sin and rejected the notion of the crucifixion of Simon. Hippolytus (d. 235) also taught that the death of Jesus was an essential condition of redemption according to Basilides. Mani (d. 276) from Persia called Jesus "son of the widow" and thought that the widow's son of Nain was put to death in Jesus' place. Another similar Manichaean document taught that the Devil, who was hoping to have Jesus crucified, himself fell a victim. Some contend that the docetic elements in the Gospel of Barnabas may have influenced the Qur'ān, but this document was unknown until the 16th century.⁶

Docetic positions close to the days of Muhammad were held by the apthartodocetists, who held that the body of Jesus was incorruptible and insensible to the weakness of the flesh. Justinian (483-565 A.D.) belonged to this school of thought. Gregory of Nyssa, surprisingly, taught the naïve idea that Jesus, by assuming human form, deceived Satan into thinking that he had only an ordinary human being to deal with. Julian of Halicarnassus (d. 518), founder of the sect of the Julianists, held that after the incarnation the body of Jesus was not susceptible to corruption. There seems to have been some sort of idea that the suffering of death would be derogatory to the dignity of Jesus, and it may be that Muhammad thought that it would be derogatory to the prophethood of Christ.⁷

How much influence these docetic ideas had on the Qur'^{ān} is an open question. Some say the docetic substitution idea was carried into the Qur'^{ān}, and some say it was not. At least in borrowing there was a whole new use of the idea.⁸ G. Parrinder and E. E. Elder opt for a rejection of the docetic influence, but this is for the sake of the argument to prove that the docetic idea of substitution is not involved in Jesus' crucifixion. Y. Moubarac also finds the relationship distant, while M. Rodinson argues for more significance in the similarities.⁹ Thus there are as many authorities for one side as for the other.

The Qur'^{ān}ic Evidence

New attempts are being made by Christians to show that by good exegesis of the Qur'^{ān} the crucifixion of Jesus is permitted. E. E. Elder in The Muslim World already in 1923 made this contention and G. Parrinder strengthened these arguments in his study published in 1965. The arguments are plausible, but not convincing in the face of the mass of evidence indicating the denial of the crucifixion. The crux of the issue has usually been the tension of 4:156, which at least on the surface denies the crucifixion of Jesus, with 3:47-50, 5:117, and 19:34 which say the death of Jesus will happen. Christians have interpreted 4:156 in terms of the other three passages, while Muslims have interpreted the latter references in terms of 4:156. Although the interpretation of these specific verses is most crucial in deciding the intent of the Qur'^{ān}, the many references to the control of life and

death by Allah set up the conditions for the Muslim denial of the crucifixion of Jesus.

Allah clearly had control over Jesus' death according to the Qur'an. In 5:17 Muhammad urges, "Who then can do aught against Allah, if He had willed to destroy the Messiah, son of Mary and his mother and everyone on earth?" In 3:55 Allah says to Jesus, "I am gathering thee" This phrase may mean "bringing a person to death." Also in 5:117 Jesus says of Allah "when Thou tookest me" This, too, has the meaning of ending Jesus' life. And finally in 19:33 Jesus speaks of the day He will die in the context of His servanthood to Allah. (The same is said of John in 19:15) In these four instances Allah's control over Jesus' death is the same as Allah's victory at the battle of Badr when Muhammad said, "Ye (Muslims) slew them not, but Allah slew them." (8:17)¹⁰ This complete control of Allah over Jesus' death is also reflected in the references to death and life in general throughout the Qur'an.

The complete control of Allah over life and death leaves little participation of the individual in realistically facing the issues of life and death. If death is completely controlled by Allah with no human involvement, then the death of Jesus as a prophet of Allah would have very little willing submission attached to it thus eliminating the whole Christian Gospel based on the crucifixion of Jesus. Then Allah's snatching of Jesus from death is very possible, in fact it is expected. If this assertion is correct, a listing of all the passages containing a reference to Allah's control over death becomes

essential. The following are passages in which this emphasis is most obvious:

- 2:243 and Allah said unto them: Die, and then He brought them back to life.
- 2:259 How shall Allah give this township life after its death? And Allah made him die a hundred years, then brought him back to life.¹¹
- 2:260 And Abraham said (unto his Lord): My Lord! Show me how Thou givest life to the dead, He said: Dost thou not believe? Abraham said: Yea, but (I ask) in order that my heart may be at ease.
- 6:69 Lo! Allah (it is) who splitteth the grain of corn and the date-stone (for sprouting). He bringeth forth the living from the dead, and is the bringer-forth of the dead from living.
- 9:116 Lo! Allah! Unto Him belongeth the sovereignty of the heavens and the earth. He quickeneth and He giveth death.
- 10:32 Who provideth for you from the sky and the earth, or Who owneth hearing and sight; and Who bringeth forth the living from the dead and bringeth forth the dead from the living;
- 10:57 He quickeneth and giveth death, and unto Him ye will be returned.
- 10:105 but I worship Allah who causeth you to die, and I have been commanded to be of the believers.
- 11:7 And He it is Who created the heavens and the earth in six Days Lo! ye will be raised again after death!
- 13:39-40 Allah effaceth what He will, and establisheth (what He will), and with Him is the source of ordinance. Whether We let thee see something of that which We have promised them, or make thee die (before its happening), thine is but conveyance (of the message), Ours the reckoning.
- 15:23 Lo! and it is We, even We, Who quicken and give death, and We are the Inheritor.
- 16:28, 32 Whom the angels cause to die while they are wronging themselves. . . . Those whom the angels cause to die (when they are) good.
- 16:70 And Allah createth you, then causeth you to die, and among you is he who is brought back to the most abject stage of life, so that he knoweth nothing after (having had) knowledge. Lo! Allah is Knower, Powerful.
- 17:75 Then had We made thee taste a double (punishment) of living and a double (punishment) of dying, then hadst thou found no helper against Us.
- 19:66-67 And man saith: When I am dead, shall I forsooth be brought forth alive? Doth not man remember that We created him before, when he was naught?

23:66 And He it is Who gave you life, then He will cause you to die, and then will give you life (again). Lo! man is verily an ingrate.

25:3 Yet they choose beside Him other gods who create naught but are themselves created, and possess not hurt nor profit for themselves, and possess not death nor life, nor power to raise the dead.

25:47 And He it is Who maketh night a covering for you and sleep repose, and maketh day a resurrection.

29:57 Every soul will taste of death. Then unto Us ye will be returned.

30:19 He bringeth forth the living from the dead, and He bringeth forth the dead from the living, and He reviveth the earth after her death. And even so will ye be brought forth.

30:24 And of his signs is this: He showeth you the lightning sky a fear and for a hope, and sendeth down water from the sky, and thereby quickeneth the earth after her death. Lo! herein indeed are portents for folk who understand.

30:40 Allah is He Who created you and then sustained you, then causeth you to die, then giveth life to you again. Is there any of your (so called) partners (of Allah) that doeth aught of that? Praised and exalted be He above what they associate (with Him)!

30:50 Look, therefor, at the prints of Allah's mercy (in creation): how He quickeneth the earth after her death. Lo! He verily is the Quickener of the Dead, and He is Able to do all things.

32:11 Say: The angel of death, who hath charge concerning you, will gather you, and afterward unto your Lord ye will be returned.

35:9 And Allah it is who sendeth the winds and they raise a cloud; then We lead it unto a dead land and revive therewith the earth after its death. Such is the Resurrection.

36:50-52 And the trumpet is blown and lo! from the graves they hie unto their Lord, Crying: Woe upon us! Who hath raised us from our place of sleep? This is that which the Beneficent did promise, and the messengers spoke truth, It is but one Shout, and behold them brought together before Us!

40:68 He it is who quickeneth and giveth death. When He ordaineth a thing, He saith unto it only: Be! and it is.

43:11 And who sendeth down water from the sky in (due) measure, and We revive a dead land therewith. Even so will ye be brought forth;

45:6 Allah giveth life to you, then causeth you to die, then gathereth you unto the Day of Resurrection whereof there is no doubt.

46:33 Have they not seen that Allah, Who created the heavens and the earth and was not wearied by their creation, is Able to give life to the dead? Aye, He verily is Able to do all things.

50:11 Provision (made) for men; and therewith We quicken a dead land. Even so will be the resurrection of the dead.

50:43 Lo! We it is Who quicken and give death, and unto Us is the journeying.

53:44 And that He it is Who giveth death and giveth life;

57:2 His is the Sovereignty of the heavens and the earth; He quickeneth and He giveth death; and He is Able to do all things.

63:10-11 And spend of that wherewith We have provided you before death cometh unto one of you and he saith: My Lord! If only thou wouldst reprieveth no soul when its term cometh, and Allah is Aware of what ye do.

75:40 Is not He (who doeth so) able to bring the dead to life?

This fatalistic attitude toward Allah's control over life and death eliminates the need for Jesus as the source of life. Life and death are all in Allah, the all-merciful God. The crucifixion is not necessary as a work of love. Rather it is an offense to the absolute control of Allah. There is no God but one. Jesus' overcoming death would infringe upon this central doctrine by infringing upon Allah's rule over life and death.¹² This issue was approached by the Nestorian Patriarch Timothy I in an apology resulting from two days' conversation with the Caliph Mahdī. For the Caliph Jesus did not die willingly, but for Timothy He did. Agreeing with Theodore of Mopsuestia, Timothy contended that Jesus suffered by God's tacit permission which preserved free will. In considering this debate J. W. Sweetman confirms the validity of the above listing of passages that the Qur'ānic evidence about the nature of Allah is most crucial to the crucifixion of Jesus. For he contends that the crucifixion is a metaphysical

problem and is related to ideas about the Divine being and attributes and not to any questions of atonement or soteriology.¹³ Thus the enumeration of Allah's control over life and death becomes important in considering the crucifixion of Jesus. This evidence is the basis for the Qur'anic denial of the crucifixion of Jesus.

These general references to life and death in the Qur'an are certainly important. But finally, an interpretation of the actual references to the crucifixion of Jesus will be most conclusive. There are several references to the death and ascension of Jesus, but only one reference to the fact of crucifixion. This is in 4:155-169:

Then because of their breaking of their covenant, and their disbelieving in the revelations of Allah, and their slaying of the Prophets wrongfully, and their saying: Our hearts are hardened--Nay, but Allah hath set a seal upon them for their disbelief, so that they believe not save a few--And because of their disbelief and of their speaking against Mary a tremendous calumny; And because of their saying: We slew the Messiah Jesus son of Mary, Allah's messenger--They slew him not nor crucified, but it appeared so unto them; and lo! those who disagree concerning it are in doubt thereof; they have no knowledge thereof save pursuit of a conjecture; they slew him not for certain, But Allah took him up unto Himself. Allah was ever Mighty, Wise. There is not one of the People of Scripture but will believe in him before his death, and on the Day of Resurrection he will be a witness against them--

Sale lists four interpretations from this passage.

For some maintained that he was justly and really crucified; some insisted that it was not Jesus who suffered, but another who resembled him in the face, pretending the other parts of his body, by their unlikeness, plainly discovered the imposition; some said he was taken up into heaven; and others, that his manhood only suffered, and that his god-head ascended into heaven.¹⁴

Obviously from these numerous interpretations this passage permits very diverse exegesis. The context of the passage is important in understanding the passage and finding through the diverse interpretations. The rejection of the prophets in verse 155 indicates that the point of the passage is that men could not kill the Messiah against God's will since God is the best of plotters who overthrows human plots. Therefore according to verse 159 all will come to believe in Jesus, and he will witness to them concerning the resurrection. The intent of these verses is to defend the Messiah against those Jews who maintained that they (alone) had killed and crucified Jesus. The Jews did not, in fact, kill him according to these verses.¹⁵

But what more can be said? This depends upon the interpretation of the one phrase in verse 157, "but it appeared so unto them;" The Arabic is unclear as to the antecedent of "it." The reference may be to the crucifixion itself or to the substitute replacing Jesus. If "it" refers to the crucifixion, Jesus could have been taken up into heaven and only his manhood suffered.¹⁶ Also by translating the verb as "misunderstand" the crucifixion of Jesus is affirmed as a misunderstood fact.¹⁷ But this option is in the minority. The most common orthodox interpretation takes the antecedent of "it" as the person substituted for Jesus, who was raised up to Allah. Here also are many differing ideas. Some assert that Christ remained on earth and was not immediately raised to Allah. Then much later he died and was raised to heaven. Even those who assert that he was raised before the

crucifixion say he will return to earth a second time and then die a natural death.¹⁸ As a summary of the meaning of 4:157, the denial of the crucifixion of Jesus is supported by most interpreters even though two Christian interpreters have found a way of affirming the crucifixion with this passage by respectable exegesis. The many theories of substitution which flow from this passage will be considered after the other references to Jesus' death in the Qur'ān are considered.

The next two passages are considered as a pair because they both have the verb mutawaffika referring to God's action in taking Jesus to himself--considered as death by some but as a mere ascension by others or a combination of both.

3:55 (And remember) when Allah said: O Jesus! Lo! I am gathering thee and causing thee to ascend unto me, and am cleansing thee of those who disbelieve and am setting those who follow thee above those who disbelieve until the Day of Resurrection.

5:117 I was a witness of them while I dwelt among them, and when Thou tookest me Thou wast the Watcher over them.

Muslim interpretations have traditionally attempted to reconcile these verses with 4:157. In doing this Baidāwī gives five alternative meanings for the verb mutawaffika: 1) Achieve the whole of thy term and tarry till thy appointed end. 2) Take thee from earth. 3) Take thee to myself sleeping. 4) Destroy in thee the lusts which hinder ascent to the world of spirits. 5) God let him die for seven hours and then raised to heaven.¹⁹ A Chinese translation has even another, "I will surely protect your life."²⁰ Parallel usage of this word (tawaffā) indicates the right meaning is to die a natural

death. Some say that it is unclear when and how the death happened or should happen.²¹ Others contend that there is no way to interpret death as occurring after his return from heaven back to earth on the supposition that he is now alive in heaven, because verse 5:117 clearly limits the connection of this death to the people of his own day and not those when he returns.²² The exegesis of 3:55 could translate the verb as "calling into death" or "causing you to die." Then the question could be placed as to whether or not this phrase may not describe the actual rejection of Jesus that came to its fulness on the cross. The passage then relates to the inward rejection of Jesus symbolized by the crucifixion. In this case the phrase "and am cleansing thee of those who disbelieve" would refer to the vindication of Jesus as God raises him to himself.²³ Yet in these passages as well as 19:33 the death of Jesus in one form or another is asserted.

Building on the interpretation of these verses, a consideration of the various Muslim understandings of the crucifixion will be considered. Here we must turn to tradition since no sect in Islam relies solely on the Qur'ān for its source of faith and practice. Evaluations must be made of the traditions since they are often contradictory and written for personal or political ends.²⁴ In a commentary by Rāzī no less than five possibilities of Jesus' escape from the crucifixion are noted. He admits that these possibilities conflict with one another, but he asserts, "But Allah knows better what really happened."²⁵ These traditions are hard to collect together for the English reader with only a passing knowledge of the traditions.

The two most useful resources are Zwemer's The Moslem Christ and Robson's Christ in Islam. Since the traditions are often predictable, a presentation of these two collections should suffice to cover the various Muslim understandings about the crucifixion of Jesus.

Ibn al Athīr relates the tradition of an anonymous person made to resemble Jesus. He also includes the ascension.

And when the Jews seized the person who had been made to resemble him, they bound him and began to lead him with a rope and say to him, "You were raising the dead. Can you not save yourself from this rope?" And they were spitting in his face and putting thorns on him; and they crucified him on the cross for six hours. Then Joseph the carpenter asked for him from the governor who was over the Jews, whose name was Pilate and whose title was Herod, and buried him in a grave which the aforementioned Joseph had prepared for himself. Then God sent down the Messiah from heaven to his mother, Mary, when she was weeping for him, and he said to her, "Verily God has raised me to Himself and nothing but good has befallen me." And he gave her instructions, and she gathered the disciples to him and he sent them through the earth as messengers from God and he ordered them to convey from him (the message which) God had commanded him: Then God raised him to Himself and the disciples scattered where he commanded them.²⁶

Kalbi relates the substitution of one Phelatanus who was sent by the Jews to kill Jesus and was made to resemble Him in the process.

Jesus met a mob of Jews who accused Him and his mother of being a sorcerer and sorceress. God cursed them to be swine, which terrified the Jews and caused them to want to kill Jesus. They questioned him and He replied, "O company of Jews, verily God hates you." Their hate for Him grew and they gathered to kill Him. God most High lifted him from the building and took him away. The chief of the Jews commanded Phelatanus to enter the building and kill him. He did not find Jesus and after waiting a while (long), he came out. God made him appear like Jesus and he was killed by the Jews who thought they were killing Jesus.²⁷

Makatal substitutes a guard placed over Jesus by the Jews who was made to look like Jesus as God raised Jesus to heaven when they were on a mountain. He was believed to be Jesus and crucified in spite of his objection, "I am not Jesus; I am So and So, the son of So and So;"²⁸ Katada relates the request of Jesus to one of his disciples.

"Which of you is willing to take my form, and he will be killed?" A man from the crowd, Ashus, the son of Kandir, answered: "I, O Prophet of God." Therefore he was crucified and Jesus was lifted up into heaven.²⁹

Wahab relates the substitution of Judas for Jesus, yet he has Jesus die for three hours. Ibn Sa'id has an abbreviated account of the substitution of Judas also.³⁰ Wahab follows the Gospel accounts of the passion closely until the point of the crucifixion.

And when they came to crucify Him upon the tree, the earth was darkened, and God sent angels, and they descended between them and between Jesus; and God cast the likeness of Jesus upon him who had betrayed Him, and his name was Judas. And they crucified him in His stead, and they thought that they crucified Jesus. Then God made Jesus to die for three hours, and then raised Him up to heaven; and this is the meaning of the Koran verse, "Verily, I will cause Thee to die, and raise Thee unto me, and purify Thee above those who disbelieve."³¹

A long account of a tradition from some "ancient books" has been recorded in Michael Asin's collection of traditions. This relates his miracles and the attempts of the "king of the Children of Israel" to capture him. He meets with his disciples and gives them a commission to carry on his work. Then he is taken and his "humanity" is crucified and buried. The disciples discover that he is no longer in the grave. (They dig it up.) Following his injunction, the

disciples carry his claim to the east and west.³² Abu Huraira takes up the return of Christ and supplies the tradition for the Qur'anic statements that Jesus will die. Since Jesus' death is still awaited after he returns, there is a tomb for Jesus in the Hujrah in Madina beside the tomb of Muhammad, Abu Bakr and Omar. Jesus' activities upon his return are outlined in this tradition.

And He will break the Cross and kill the swine, and take away the poll-tax; property will be plentiful, and He will grant peace, and fight for the religion of Islam until God shall destroy in His day the people of every other faith except Islam, and worship shall be God's alone. . . . Then Jesus will tarry in the earth forty years, will marry a wife from the daughters of Ghassan and will have children. Then he will die in Medina, and be buried next to the grave of Omar bin Khitab (may God be pleased with him), and blessed be Abu Bakr and Omar, who will be raised in the resurrection between two prophets.³³

These traditions form the popular belief about the crucifixion of Jesus for Muslims. Of these different traditions the substitute as Judas would probably be encountered most often. This version is popularly thought to illustrate the effectiveness of God's counter strategy.³⁴

Yet there have been a few conscious attempts among Muslims to reject the substitution idea. Sheikh Muhammed Shaltut made a fatwa to this effect which is a statement by the theocratic officer to regulate the life of the Muslim community. He contends that the snatching of Jesus from the midst of his enemies and his exaltation to heaven in the body would not be a triumph of God's plotting over the plotting of his enemies. Rather there should be plotting on the same level making a comparison such as when God delivered

Muhammad from the plots to kill him. He specifically treats the traditions on the descent of Jesus and finds them contradictory and coming from Jewish converts to Islam. He discredits another tradition on the basis of only one narrator and no isnād. And finally, he challenges the literal interpretation of another tradition about seeing Jesus and John the Baptist in the second heaven.³⁵ As more critical study of the traditions ensues, there should be more and more reserve about Muslim assertions concerning a substitute for Jesus at the crucifixion. The trend according to 'Abd al-Tafāhum is toward asserting only what the Qur'ān clearly says, namely, that Jesus was not allowed to suffer.

There would appear to be in thoughtful Muslim circles a tendency to abandon, as crude and unwarranted, the idea of a physical substitute for Jesus, with the same external identity, who suffered in His place. Rather it is taken to mean that a mystery supervenes which we must accept with reverence and forbear to press into inquisitive formulations. Jesus was not allowed to suffer: more than that we cannot say.³⁶

'Abd al-Tafāhum goes farther in evaluating the table mentioned in Surah five as a festival carried out throughout Christian history as a sign from God. Therefore it has the status of a returning feast linked with the basic Qur'ānic concept of Divine signs. By asking the question, what this feast signifies, the crucifixion becomes an integral part of the message of the Qur'ān.³⁷ The trend is also furthered by Dr. Kamel Hussein who is lauded for his opposition to the substitution idea. Little subtle movements are occurring such as the cover of a novel about Jesus by 'Abd al-Hamīd al-Shakhar. Even

though the author denies that Jesus was crucified, the cover has a picture of Jesus wearing the crown of thorns.³⁸

In view of these trends to more open attitudes towards the crucifixion of Jesus the question about what the Qur'ān says in this matter becomes vital. G. Parrinder has argued that the "cumulative effect of the Qur'ānic verses is strongly in favour of a real death and a complete self-surrender of Jesus."³⁹ But this whole argument depends upon the unique interpretation given to the key phrase in 4:157, "but it appeared so unto them." Rather the Qur'ān clearly teaches the hostility of the Jews toward Jesus so that they intended to crucify him. The reasons for this hostility are not clearly outlined.⁴⁰ But the fact can be maintained that because of this hostility Jesus was conscious of his coming crucifixion and moving into death. The crucifixion, whether he was the victim or not, was the actual climax of the rejection that he experienced from the Jews.

Even a Jesus of Whom it is said that His death was "seeming," and to whom God said, "I am causing Thee to die," is a Jesus of enough significance to be a perpetual disturber of all Islamic (and human) concepts that disapprove this terrible meekness, whether by wanting to rescue it so that its blinding light is veiled, or by conspiring to crucify it afresh.⁴¹

This point of the intent of the Jews to crucify Christ is the main emphasis of Dr. Kamel Hussein's City of Wrong which will be taken up later.

The Atonement in the Qur'ān

The Christian concept of atonement by the death and resurrection of Jesus is irrelevant to Islam. Muslims discard the

crucifixion as of little consequence since the significance is not in the event itself but is a matter of consequences deduced about the event. Therefore many Muslims consider the debate about the actuality of the crucifixion as quite unfortunate and fruitless. And yet the significant difference of Christianity from Islam is found in this event. For soteriology and the relics of nature cults which survived in the Christian church are the basic divergences of the two faiths. The repudiation of the trinitarian concept of the Unity of God by Islam is more a secondary outgrowth than the deciding factor.⁴² What is most clear about Jesus in the Qur'ān is that he is not the Redeemer of men. Islam has the mercy of Allah in place of this which is adequate since there is no original sin. (39:7) Each man stands alone before God rather than under his Redeemer. (6:164-165)⁴³ This concept of Allah as having all power and all mercy eliminates the need for atonement. God can do what he wishes. The Islamic doctrine of fate further impairs any conception of Jesus' atonement in the mercy of God. Allah is an arbitrary God, and man's very offenses seem to be determined by an inexorable fate.⁴⁴ Furthermore redemption in the Qur'ān is not connected to this life but is merely deliverance from the Day of Judgement. Sacrifice is not needed, but only obedience to the cult as evidence that a person believes in Allah. Therefore redemption lies in what man does.⁴⁵

The universality of God or his unchanging goodness and his unbounded grace towards all men in all ages can be seen in the Bible as well as the Qur'ān. But medieval legalistic views

of atonement tended to obscure this aspect of the biblical view.⁴⁶ Islam, on the other hand, completely ignores the redemptive suffering of Isaiah, Jeremiah and other prophets of the Old Testament. Nor has Islam caught the emphasis on forgiveness as superior and more essentially God's nature than revenge.⁴⁷ The only place redemptive ideas appear in Islam is the Shi'ah and Sufi segments. The massacre of Husain in the Shi'ah Passion Plays is a voluntary and redemptive sacrifice for the sins of Muslims. Husain is pictured as having acquired intercessory powers on behalf of his people by the effusion of his blood. This is a useful parallel to Jesus' crucifixion. However, this is the belief of a sect and is directly contrary to orthodox Islamic thought. The only realistic way of comparing the concept of atonement in Islam and Christianity is to show the contrast.⁴⁸

Both the historicity and the significance of the crucifixion are denied by the Qur'ān. However, an open attitude toward the events surrounding and leading up to the crucifixion has been demonstrated in recent times. This openness has moved in two directions. The Ahmadiyyah movement has used it to discredit Jesus more clearly. Dr. Kamel Hussein, on the other hand, has used this new spirit to build bridges of understanding between Islam and Christianity. Examining these two emphases is the task of the next chapter.

FOOTNOTES

¹L. Bevan Jones, The People of the Mosque (Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1932), pp. 277-278.

²Kenneth Cragg, The Call of the Minaret (New York: Oxford, 1956), p. 295.

³James Robson, "Mohammadan Teaching about Jesus," The Moslem World, XXXIX (January 1939), 41-42.

⁴Abd al-Tafāhum, "The Qur'ān and Holy Communion," The Muslim World, XLIX (July 1959), 242.

⁵Geoffrey Parrinder, Jesus in the Qur'ān (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965), pp. 109-110.

⁶Ibid., p. 111.

⁷J. Windrow Sweetman, Islam and Christian Theology (London: Lutterworth, c.1945), I, 30-31.

⁸Supra, p. 3.

⁹Parrinder, pp. 118-120.

¹⁰Ibid., pp. 120-121

¹¹M. Pickthall's footnote for this verse indicates that the township refers to Jerusalem in ruins.

¹²This collection of verses is the result of reading M. Pickthall's translation of the Qur'ān and is not an attempt at completeness.

¹³Sweetnam, p. 80.

¹⁴George Sale, The Koran (London: Frederick Warne, n.d.), pp. 78-79.

¹⁵Parrinder, p. 108.

¹⁶Adel-Théodore Khoury, "Die Christologie des Korans," Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft, LII (January 1968), 56.

¹⁷E. E. Elder, "The Crucifixion in the Koran," The Moslem World, XIII (July 1923), 257-258.

¹⁸Khoury, p. 55.

- ¹⁹Parrinder, p. 106.
- ²⁰Rolf Syrdal, "Christ in the Chinese Koran," The Moslem World, XXVII (January 1937), 81.
- ²¹Khoury, p. 55.
- ²²C. C. Adams, "A Fatwa on the Ascension of Jesus," The Muslim World, XXXIV (July 1944), 214-215.
- ²³Parrinder, pp. 106-107.
- ²⁴Samuel Zwemer, The Moslem Christ (New York: American Tract Society, 1912), pp. 53-54.
- ²⁵Khoury, p. 56.
- ²⁶James Robson, Christ in Islam (London: John Murray, 1929), pp. 40-41.
- ²⁷Zwemer, pp. 100-101.
- ²⁸Ibid., p. 103.
- ²⁹Ibid.
- ³⁰Robson, Christ, p. 40.
- ³¹Zwemer, pp. 101-103.
- ³²Robson, Christ, pp. 86-89.
- ³³Zwemer, pp. 106-107.
- ³⁴al-Tafāhum, p. 242.
- ³⁵Adams, pp. 215-216.
- ³⁶al-Tafāhum, p. 242.
- ³⁷Ibid., pp. 240-241.
- ³⁸Parrinder pp. 112-113.
- ³⁹Ibid., p. 121.
- ⁴⁰Cragg, p. 294.
- ⁴¹al-Tafahum, p. 242.
- ⁴²Ibid., pp. 116-117.
- ⁴³Khoury, p. 57.

⁴⁴Jones, p. 278.

⁴⁵W. Knietschke, "The Koran Doctrine of Redemption,"
The Moslem World, II (January 1912), 61-63.

⁴⁶Parrinder, pp. 117-118.

⁴⁷Cragg, p. 301.

⁴⁸Ibid., p. 302.

CHAPTER III

TWO CONTRASTING MUSLIM INTERPRETATIONS

The Ahmadiyyah Interpretation

The fulcrum of Ahmadiyyah doctrine is the contention that Christ was crucified but did not die on the cross. He was taken down alive and traveled to Kashmir where he lived to old age. This contradicts the substitution theory. Ahmād devised this story in order to relieve the advantage of Christians over Muslims by having a living prophet. He thus destroyed the prospect of Christ returning in a similar manner as his miraculous ascension (which the substitution theory upholds).¹ This forecloses all apocalyptic significance for Jesus and bypasses the whole Christian meaning of a redeeming cross and the resurrection. This, in Muhammad Ali's words, means "the crumbling of the whole (Christian edifice) like a pack of cards . . . to undo the influence of Christianity and to open the way for the conquest of Islam in the world."²

A host of arguments is propounded by the Ahmadiyyah movement for the resuscitation of Jesus after he was crucified. A beginning in this area was made by Sayyud Ahmād Khān.

Crucifixion itself does not cause the death of a man, because only his hands, or the palms of his hands and feet are pierced . . . After three or four hours Christ was taken down from the cross, and it is certain that at that moment he was still alive. Then the disciples concealed him in a very secret place, out of fear of the enmity of the Jews.³

A special ointment from the Middle East with a name similar to Jesus was used on Jesus and has been attested to by thousands of physicians of every nationality and creed as aiding in the prevention of death.⁴

The burial place of Jesus is also supported by scientific arguments. Jesus is said to have gone to Kashmir to gather the ten lost tribes of Israel. So the Muslim tomb at Srinagar in Kashmir is that of the prophet Yūs Āsaf. Yūs is supposed a reference to Jesus and Āsaf means "gather" referring to Jesus' activity in Kashmir. A spurious attempt has been made to document Jesus' activity in Kashmir from a document found in a Buddhist monastery in Tibet by Nicholas Notovitch in 1887.⁵

The Ahmadiyyah movement also denies the atonement in vivid terms, calling it a blood-bath. Mahūd Ahmād said the atonement overthrew the Law and asserted that Christian teachers have released man from all moral and religious obligations.⁶ The crucifixion of Jesus is illogical since it is contrary to reason that Jesus chose the cross for himself and committed suicide. Just as illogical is the orthodox Muslim claim that Jesus is wasting precious years of his life by sitting idle in the heavens. The Ahmadiyyah solution is intended as the resolution of the tension between the Christian and Muslim view of the crucifixion of Jesus.⁷

The Qur'ānic evidence for the Ahmadiyyah doctrine of the crucifixion is long on quantity but very one-sided and obviously used to prove the Ahmadiyyah view of the crucifixion of Jesus.

No less than thirty verses in the Qur'ān are used to deny Jesus' death on the cross and his burial at Kashmir.⁸ The one-sided approach to the Qur'ān can be seen in Muhammad Ali's exposition of 2:72-73. This was usually interpreted as the description of a miracle at Medina. Ali applies this to Jesus and expands "smite" to "smite him partially". This same twisting of words in the Qur'ān occurs at 4:157 where "crucify" is expanded to "cause his death on the cross." Also the words "it appeared so unto them" are interpreted and translated as "he was made to appear like one crucified."⁹ Besides this the Qur'ānic interpretation is backed up by references to the Gospels. This interpretation of 4:157 that the Jews attempted to kill Jesus but failed is supported by John 19:34 which indicates that blood and water flowed from Jesus' side when he was pierced. This is assumed a scientific proof that a man was not dead when this happened.¹⁰ Other biblical evidence is in John 11:16 which indicates that he had to tend to other sheep before he returned to the Father (the ten lost tribes of Israel in Kashmir). Also the parallel of Jonah to Jesus in Matthew 12:39 shows that Jesus did not die. For as Jonah was alive in the whale, so Jesus was alive in the grave.¹¹ The removal of the stone from the grave indicates that Jesus was stolen since the stone would not have had to have been moved if Jesus had been miraculously raised. The fact that Jesus appeared in secrecy is said to indicate that he had not won the victory over death, for then secrecy would not be needed. The blood on the shroud of Jesus and the open

wounds indicate that nothing miraculous had happened. And finally, the Ahmadiyyah movement uses the usual Qur'ānic argument that God protects his messengers and therefore would not let Jesus die.¹²

These and many other arguments are made to discredit the death of Jesus by crucifixion. The intent of these and most efforts of the Ahmadiyyah movement is to discredit Christianity. Ishaq Husayn lists eight points of agreement between Christianity and Islam and then asks, "Could one infer from these eight fundamental principles, in which the two great religions agree, that Islam and Christianity are basically identical, and that the gap between the two communities was widened in later centuries mostly for political reasons?" He finds that the "bone of contention" between Christianity and Islam is the interpretation of the "symbolism" rather than the "essence of faith" which is completely compatible in the New Testament and the Qur'ān. He notes more lenient attitudes in Islam towards Christ in modern Muslim literature.¹³ However it is obvious that this leniency does not involve the death of Jesus in crucifixion. Rather in this respect the Ahmadiyyah movement has moved farther from Christianity than any other sect of Islam.

Dr. Kamel Hussein's City of Wrong

In contrast to the Ahmadiyyah attempt to discredit Christianity Dr. Kamel Hussein's book represents the recent trend in Islam to understand and appreciate Christianity. The significance of this work for a consideration of the

crucifixion of Jesus in Islamic thought lies in the issues that are not raised. The stumbling blocks surrounding the previous arguments between Muslims and Christians concerning the historicity of the crucifixion of Jesus are overcome. Rather the emphasis is on the forces of wickedness that caused the crucifixion and on Jesus' will to the crucifixion, as Kenneth Cragg points out in his introduction to this book.

The fascination of this book is that this theme has here been sensitively explored and presented, probably for the first time, by a thinker from within the faith of Islam. For the first time, inasmuch as the great and vast household of Islam down the centuries has been adamantly disposed to deny the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth. Where Christians ever since the first Muslim century have been at pains to re-assert the event, the upshot, for the most part, has been a strife about historicity which, important as it was, and remains, has tended to obscure the significance in and beyond the history. The author of the book here offered to English readers invites his fellow Muslims to transcend the resultant polemic and, without transgressing the Qur'anic limits on which the Muslim belief that the crucifying of Jesus did not happen depends, makes a penetrating analysis of the will to His crucifixion.¹⁴

Kenneth Cragg finds real value in the City of Wrong as a movement away from many Muslim beliefs that run counter to Christianity and a beginning step to reconciliation.

One clear result of his work is to remind Christians that they should think again before they crudely and hastily assert that the Muslim holy Book denies the Cross. In a very crucial sense it affirms it. For the Cross is not only a redemptive deed which Christ embraces as both messianically and Divinely central to love's scheme for human retrieval and forgiveness. It is also, seen from the manward side, the deed of rejection in which men registered their verdict against the teaching and personality of Jesus. . . . It is unmistakably clear, through all the tortuous controversy over "made to seem so to them," that the Qur'an affirms incontrovertibly that, at least as far as the intention

of the perpetrators was concerned, the Cross on Golgotha was the Cross of Jesus. All the antecedent antipathy which reached its climax in this decision for His death constituted, with that death (considered as man's intention), a tremendous moral encounter in which the issues of the human situation are mirrored and man's inclusive crisis can be studied. It is this the author has set himself to understand and depict. The fact that he does so, from within a system of faith and practice which traditionally neglects the implications of its own sacred, scriptural affirmation of Christ as a Teacher men so desperately willed to refuse that to thward them required a Divine ex machina rescue of this sort involving His crucifixion by proxy, is what gives to City of Wrong its uniqueness and force.¹⁵

Of course this is not enough for Christian acceptance. In fact it may be that this approach reduces the Gospel to a teaching from the record transmitted by Jesus and takes away from the essential truth of the death of Christ.¹⁶ This is true of Hussein's consideration of the essence of Jesus as a prophet. He finds the heart of Jesus' commission to his disciples to be the sermon on the mount.¹⁷ In this respect the crucifixion of Jesus is not accepted. Hussein's interpretation of the crucifixion complies with the orthodox view:

There is one thing about the events of this day of which I am aware which you do not know. It is that God has raised the Lord Christ to Himself. He was the light of God upon the earth. The people of Jerusalem would have nothing to do with him except to extinguish the light. Whereupon God has darkened the world around them. This darkness is a sign from God to show that God has forbidden them the light of faith and the guidance of conscience.¹⁸

But Hussein clearly does find the crucifixion the center of history. For him the main task in this life is to maintain one's conscience as an individual in the face of the

community. The crucifixion is the "supreme tragedy of humanity" for "on that day men willed to murder their conscience. . . . The events of that day do not simply belong to the annals of the early centuries. They are disasters renewed daily in the life of every individual."¹⁹ "It may well be that to the end of time there'll never be a crucifixion such as this prophet's."²⁰ For "in the events of Good Friday all the factors in evil and sin were present. Every day of life its tragedy is repeated."²¹ Although these references are picked from the context, this same theme runs through the book uniformly. Such significance to the events of Good Friday is a new emphasis in Islam begun by Hussein.

The idea of atonement comes up in this novel. Although the implications are not clear, there is at least some tolerance for it. The references could just as well be explained in the traditional Muslim sense of a prophet's work. The idea occurs in the story of the woman of Magdal. The woman is a prostitute whose pride and rejection of a lover caused the death of her brother along with other men in the town of Magdal. She went to Jerusalem weary with guilt, which she expressed in pride. She tried to expiate herself by the humiliation of prostitution but this only made it worse. Upon meeting a young soldier, she finds her first hint of forgiveness in the love he shows to her. "It became clear to her that the pride which was her great sin could only be atoned for by the way of pure love. For it was that which

had humbled and cleansed her." At this point she meets Jesus and experiences His greater love. "She learned that he forgave trespasses and pardoned sins. . . . The realisation came upon her that her salvation would be through this man. . . . She had made up her mind that he would be her captain of salvation."²²

However, because Hussein finds the source of the doctrine of Christian atonement in the guilt of the disciples for not saving their Lord it is clear that Hussein still rejects the whole idea of atonement.²³ He finds it based on a psychological complex common to nations, races, religious and cultural groups.²⁴

FOOTNOTES

¹Humphrey Fischer, Ahmadiyyah (London: Oxford University Press, 1963), p. 68.

²Kenneth Cragg, Counsels in Contemporary Islam (Edinburgh: University Press, 1965), p. 161.

³Geoffrey Parrinder, Jesus in the Qur'an (New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965), p. 113.

⁴Fischer, pp. 69-70.

⁵Ibid., p. 70

⁶Ibid., pp. 67-68.

⁷Ibid., p. 55.

⁸Abdul Rehman Chowdry, The Gospel Account of Jesus' Death (London: The London Mosque, n.d.), pp. 37-38.

⁹Fischer, pp. 71-74.

¹⁰Ishaq Mūsā al-Husaynī, "Christ in the Qur'an and in Modern Arabic Literature," The Muslim World, L (October 1960), 299.

¹¹Fischer, pp. 68-69.

¹²Imam Mohammad Jawad Chirri, Inquiries about Islam (Beruit: 1st ed., 1965), p. 63.

¹³al-Husaynī, pp. 298-302.

¹⁴M. Hussein, City of Wrong, Translated from the Arabic by Kenneth Cragg (New York: Seabury, c.1959), pp. ix-x.

¹⁵Ibid., pp. xii-xiii.

¹⁶Parrinder, pp. 114-116.

¹⁷Hussein, p. 194ff.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 183.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 4.

²⁰Ibid., p. 11.

²¹Ibid., p. 210.

²²Ibid., pp. 71-84.

²³Ibid., p. 124.

²⁴Ibid., p. 223.

CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

An attempt has been made to understand how Muslims view the crucifixion of Jesus. Agreement has been found in the denial of the crucifixion of Jesus. However, the events of Good Friday are variously interpreted beyond this common starting place. The basic theory is the substitution of another man for Christ and Allah's rescue and taking of Jesus into heaven. However, variations from this have existed since the beginning of Islam. The Qur'ān, itself, does not explain how the crucifixion occurred. It affirms only that the Jews did not smite nor crucify him. On this evidence the traditions have grown. Some Christians have attempted to show that Muhammad actually believed that Jesus was crucified and died in the crucifixion, but these attempts are not convincing in the face of the uniform emphasis in the Qur'ān on Allah's control over life and death and considering that the argument rests on the translation of one word in the Qur'ān. But even if death by crucifixion were proved, this would still not change the Qur'ānic denial of the atonement by his crucifixion. For all mercy resides in Allah, the only God. The spectrum of Muslim interpretation of the Qur'ān concerning the crucifixion of Jesus is very large. Thus two representatives from opposite ends of this spectrum were considered

showing open antagonism to the crucifixion in the Ahmadiyyah movement and an attempt at reconciliation by Dr. Kamel Hussein. A significant observation that has not been noted before in this study is the small amount of attention given to the crucifixion by the Qur'ān. Were it not for Christianity the crucifixion probably would not have been mentioned in the Qur'ān. And that is the actual significance that it plays in the world of Islam.

With this in mind it is no wonder that the Christian approach with Jesus' death by crucifixion as the heart of Christianity becomes an offense in Muslim eyes. And the claim of Jesus over Muhammad is the cause of a never ending argument.¹ The field is covered with previous presuppositions that drown out any attempt at dialogue. Perhaps dialogue would better begin at another point such as the impregnable rigidity of the genuine Islamic system of faith and law which Hendrik Kraemer considers the real problem for Christianity.²

One of the contemporary developments not discussed in this study is the present beginnings of an historical-critical approach to the Qur'ān. Perhaps this will change the picture. Or this impersonal approach may find little acceptance due to the devotion given to the Qur'ān by the Muslim faith.

Also, many other sects and theologians should have been consulted for a well-rounded view of the Muslim picture. This study has ignored major developments in Sufism and in

the Shi'ah sect. The Wahhābīah movement of the eighteenth century and the Bahai movement of the nineteenth century could be usefully studied as minor developments.

This essay has been of help to the writer as a beginning attempt at understanding Islam in relation to Christianity. This is a life long task. In this sense any misunderstandings here exhibited will hopefully be lessened as the years go by.

FOOTNOTES

¹D. Wherry, "Christ Superior to Mohammed," The Moslem World, IX (July 1919), pp. 252-264.

²Hendrik Kraemer, The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938), pp. 357-358.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ali, A. Yusuf. The Holy Qur'an: Text, Translation and Commentary. Combridge: Murray Printing Co., 1946.
- Arberry, Arthur J. The Koran Interpreted. New York: Macmillan, 1955.
- Adams, C. C. "A Fatwa on the 'Ascension of Jesus'," The Muslim World, XXXIV (July 1944), 214-217.
- Chirri, Imam Mohammad Jawad. Inquiries about Islam. Beirut: 1st ed., 1965.
- Chowdry, Abdul Rehman. The Gospel Account of Jesus' Death. London: The London Mosque, n.d.
- Cragg, Kenneth. The Call of the Minaret. New York: Oxford, 1956.
- Cragg, Kenneth. Counsels in Contemporary Islam. Islamic Surveys 3. Edinburgh: University Press, 1965.
- Cragg, Kenneth. Sandals at the Mosque. New York: Oxford, 1959.
- Din, Maulvi Muhammad. "The Crucifixion in the Koran," The Moslem World, XIV (January 1924), 23-29.
- Elder, E. E. "The Crucifixion in the Koran," The Moslem World, XIII (July 1923), 242-258.
- Fischer, Humphrey J. Ahmadiyyah: A Study in Contemporary Islam on the West Coast of Africa. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.
- Fomier, Jacques. The Bible and the Koran. Translated by Edward P. Arbez from the French. New York: Desclee Co., 1964.
- Gerock, C. F. Versuch einer Darstellung der Christologie des Korans. Hamburg and Gotha: n.p., 1839.
- Gibb, Hamilton. Mohammedanism: An Historical Survey. New York: Oxford University Press, 1962.
- Guillaume, Alfred. The Traditions of Islam: An Introduction to the Study of Hadith Literature. Beirut: Khayata, 1966.
- Hamid, Abdul. Islam and Christianity. New York: Carlton Press, 1967.

- Henninger, J. "Spuren Christlicher Glaubenswahrheiten im Koran," Neue Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft, II (January 1946), 109-122.
- Houtsma, M. Th., et al., editors. The Encyclopedia of Islam: A Dictionary of the Geography, Ethnography and Biography of the Mohammadan Peoples. 4 Vols. Leyden: Brill, 1908.
- Hughes, Thomas Patrick. A Dictionary of Islam Being a Cyclopeadia of the Doctrines, Rites, Ceremonies, and Customs, Together with the Technical and Theological Terms of the Muhammadan Religion. New Jersey: Reference Book Publishers, 1965.
- al-Husaynī, Ishaq Mūsā. "Christ in the Qur'an and in Modern Arabic Literature," The Muslim World, L (October 1960),
- Hussein, M. K. City of Wrong. Translated from the Arabic by Kenneth Cragg. New York: Seabury, c.1959.
- Jones, L. Bevan. The People of the Mosque. Calcutta: Baptist Mission Press, 1932.
- Kellerhals, Emanuel. Der Islam: Seine Geschichte, Seine Lehre, Sein Wesen. Basel: Basler Missionsbuchhandlung, 1956.
- Kellerhals, Emanuel. Koran und Bibel. Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1963.
- Khoury, Adel-Théodore. "Die Christologie des Korans. Stellungnahme des Heiligen Buches des Islam über Jesus, den Sohn der Maria," Zeitschrift für Missionswissenschaft und Religionswissenschaft, LII (January 1968), 49-63.
- Knietschke, W. "The Koran Doctrine of Redemption," Translated and condensed by F. J. Barny, The Moslem World, II (January 1912), 60-65.
- Kraemer, Hendrik. The Christian Message in a Non-Christian World. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1938.
- Michaud, Henri. Jesus selon le Coran. Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1960.
- Parrinder, Geoffry. Jesus in the Qur'an. New York: Barnes and Noble, 1965.
- Pickthall, Mohammed Marmaduke. The Meaning of the Glorious Koran. New York: Mentor New American Library, n.d.

- Rahman, Fazlur. Islam. London: William Cloves & Sons, 1966.
- Robson, James. Christ in Islam. London: John Murray, 1929.
- Robson, James. "Muhammadian Teaching about Jesus," The Moslem World, XLIX (July 1939), 37-54.
- Sale, George. The Koran: or Alcoran of Mohammed: With Explanatory Notes; and Readings from Savary's Version; also a Preliminary Discourse. London: Frederick Warne, n.d.
- Smith, Henry Preserved. The Bible and Islam. Or the Influence Of the Old and New Testaments on the Religion of Mohammad. Being the Ely Lectures for 1897. New York: Scribner's Sons, 1897.
- Smith, W. C. Islam in Modern History. Princeton: University Press, 1957.
- Spencer, H. Islam and the Gospel of God. A Comparison of The Central Doctrines of Christianity and Islam, Prepared for the Use of Christian Workers among Muslims. Mysore City: Wesley Press, c.1956.
- Sweetman, J. Windrow. Islam and Christian Theology: a Study of the Interpretation of Theological Ideas in the Two Religions. 3 Vols. London: Lutterworth, c.1945.
- Syrdol, Rolf A. "Christ in the Chinese Koran," The Muslim World, XXVII (January 1937), 72-83.
- al-Tafāhūm, 'Abd. "The Qur'ān and Holy Communion," The Muslim World, XLIX (July 1959), 239-248.
- Watt, W. Montgomery. Companion to the Qur'ān Based on the Arberry Translation. London: George Allen and Unwin, 1967.
- Wherry, D. M. "Christ Superior to Mohammed," The Moslem World, IX (July 1919), 252-264.
- Wilson, J. Christy. Introducing Islam. New York: Friendship Press, c.1959.
- Zwemer, Samuel M. The Moslem Christ: an Essay on the Life, Character and Teachings of Jesus Christ According to the Koran and Orthodox Tradition. New York: American Tract Society, 1912.
- Zwemer, Samuel M. "The Stumbling Block of the Cross," The Moslem World, III (April 1913), 147-158.