

# THE ORIGINS AND DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN CHRISTIANITY

A Brief Analysis of How It Deviated From  
The True Message of Jesus (peace be upon him)

By Abū Ḥakīm Bilāl Davis





EVENTS • PUBLICATIONS • MEDIA • ONLINE



## The Origins and Development of Modern Christianity

A Brief Analysis of How It Deviated From the True Message of Jesus

by Abū Ḥakīm Bilāl Davis (حفظه الله)



© Copyright Muwahhideen Publications 2020  
Tobago, Trinidad & Tobago

The following is a transcript of a tele-lecture done by Muwahhideen Publications with the noble teacher Shaykh Abū Ḥakīm Bilāl Davis (حفظه الله) on Sunday 14th April 2019. Modifications were made to the spoken language to improve the readability of the document; however, the meaning and accuracy of the information thereof has been preserved.

1



جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَزَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ سُورَةُ الْإِسْرَاءُ ٨١  
"Truth has Come and Falsehood has Vanished" al-Qur'ān, Sūrah al-Isrā' 17:81

## Contents

<b>Introduction .....</b>	3
<b>Jesus in Islām .....</b>	4
<b>The Era of Jesus' Birth .....</b>	5
<b>Discrepancies Regarding the Birth of Jesus .....</b>	6
<b>The Call of Jesus .....</b>	11
<b>The Crucifixion .....</b>	13
<b>Who Actually Bore the Cross? .....</b>	16
<b>The Resurrection .....</b>	20
<b>The Belief of Early Christians Regarding Jesus .....</b>	22
<b>Gentile Conversion to Christianity .....</b>	25
<b>The Call of the Apostle Paul .....</b>	27
<b>Christianity as the State Religion and Its Absorption of Paganism .....</b>	30
<b>Examples of Pagan Beliefs and Practices Present in Modern-Day Christianity .....</b>	34
<b>Conclusion: The Call of Jesus Was the Same as Muḥammad .....</b>	37

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

الحمد لله والصلوة والسلام على رسول الله وعلى آله وصحبه أجمعين

## Introduction

With the approach of the period of Easter, we saw it an apt opportunity to mention a brief discussion on the origins of modern-day Christianity. Of course, the topic that has difficulties when one intends to embark upon discussing it, since there are, in actuality, Christianities. There is not just one manifestation of Christianity. Rather, there are numerous sects, as is well known.

So what we wish to discuss here, is the general manifestation of Christianity, and not details such as the development, for example, of the varying sects and denominations within Christianity itself. Rather, the development of Christianity in the early centuries, and that which is related to some of the practices we now see such Easter and Christmas and other than that, within the Church and Christian world.

Our discussion then, is going to be from a few angles: we want to look at the affair historically, and secondly, we want to look at that which has been mentioned by men of knowledge within the Christian world. Thus, the bulk of what we are going to be mention is going to come from bona fide Christian scholarly sources concerning the realities of Christianity, so it would not be said that we have unjustly spoken about Christianity, or that it is a 'Muslim' take on Christianity and the development of Christianity. So we are going to be quoting from some of the well-known sources within the scholarly realm of Christendom, such as the varying Bible Studies, explanations of the Bible and Bible dictionaries.



## Jesus in Islām

Naturally, when we are speaking about Christianity, we are speaking about the religion that is attributed to ‘Isá Ibn Maryam, who is referred to as Jesus Christ. Christ, of course, is not his second name, as some erroneously believe. Rather, his name was ‘Isá and he was the son of Mary.

As Muslims, we believe that ‘Isá Ibn Maryam was from the greatest of the Prophets and Messengers that Allāh has sent to creation. We believe that he was born miraculously. We believe in the virgin conception. We believe that he carried out miracles while he was alive, and we believe that he ascended to Allāh without being killed.

We do not believe that ‘Isá Ibn Maryam was a part of God or the Godhead. We do not believe that ‘Isá Ibn Maryam died on the cross and was then resurrected. We do not believe that he was with Allāh in the beginning of creation nor participated in creating. We do not believe that he was God on earth. Rather, we believe that he was a Prophet and a Messenger, similar to the Messengers of the past, except that he was from the *Ulul-‘Azm*: the five major firmly intentioned Messengers, who Allāh commanded the Messenger Muḥammad to remain patient as they were patient. As Allāh has mentioned,

﴿فَاصْبِرْ كَمَا صَبَرَ أُولُو الْأَعْزَمْ مِنْ الْرُّسُلِ﴾

“Therefore, be patient (O Muḥammad) as those with firm will and resolution among the Messengers were patient (after they were rejected).”<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Sūrah al-Aḥqāf 46:35

## The Era Of Jesus' Birth

It should be known that ‘Isá Ibn Maryam, as far as Christian sources are concerned, was born in the Greco-Roman era, which began approximately 300 BC, and extended to approximately 300 after the ascent of ‘Isá. In terms of its heyday, the Greco-Roman world stemmed from the period of approximately Alexander the Great to the Roman Emperor Constantine, and ‘Isá Ibn Maryam was born in the middle of that period. What is more correct historically, as some historians establish, is that he was born not in the first year of the Christian Era, but closer to perhaps the third year BC.



## Discrepancies Regarding the Birth of Jesus

A number of differences occur within the New Testament of the Bible concerning the birth of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam. The Gospels are not united upon mentioning that he was born in Bethlehem. In fact, only two of them (namely the Gospel of Matthew 2 and the Gospel of Luke 2), make mention of the fact that he was born in Bethlehem. Some do not mention Bethlehem at all.

From the two that do mention Bethlehem, one (the Gospel of Luke), does not mention that he was *from* Bethlehem, rather that his mother had to *go* to Bethlehem and there Jesus was born. The other (the Gospel of Matthew) alludes to the fact that he was from Bethlehem, but his mother (after his birth) eventually makes a new home in Nazareth. Bible scholars have debated whether the mention of Bethlehem as the place of birth of Jesus is questionable, since only two of the Gospels mention it and, in addition to this, throughout the Gospels he is referred to as Jesus of Nazareth or as the Nazorean or being Galilean. Other than the mention of Bethlehem in these two accounts, he is not referred to as such throughout the Gospels. Thus, some hold he was actually born in Nazareth.

Another one of the affairs that we do not believe in, is that Maryam had a husband known as Joseph—that is not Muslim belief. Christian’s belief, is that Maryam became pregnant with ‘Isá, and then she married Joseph. As far as our (Islamic) texts are concerned, then we have no mention of the presence of a ‘Joseph’ that was married to Maryam. Rather, Allāh mentions the fact that she was untouched by any man, and that when she gave birth, she gave birth alone, and that she did not give birth in an inn, but in actuality, in close proximity to a date palm tree, without any mention of her being married and without any mention of her having a husband whose name was Joseph. So these are purely Christian beliefs.

The Gospels, Mathew, Mark, Luke and John, are supposed to be a account of what actually occurred in relation to ‘Isá. However, not all of them are united in issues such as his birth. We have the mention of the story in the Book of Mathew

and in the Book of Luke, but it is not mentioned in the Book of John, nor in the Book of Mark. The Book of Luke states that the Roman Emperor at that time wanted to conduct a census, and thus individuals had to return to their land of origin in order to be recorded. Joseph, who it is claimed, was the husband of Maryam while she was pregnant with ‘Isá, was a descendant of Dāwūd (David) and was from Bethlehem, so they had to go to Bethlehem because of the census. When they went to Bethlehem, Maryam felt she was going to give birth, and so they were trying to find a place for her to deliver the child. They could not find any room in any inn, as the story goes, and so ‘Isá was born in what resembled a barn or something of that nature. Then shepherds, who were familiar with the scriptures speaking of the coming of a Messiah, came and bore witness that it was the actual birth of the Messiah they were waiting for—that is one narrative.

The bona fide historians questioned this narrative because this type of census would have been extremely difficult to carry out during that period. The historians mention that there was somewhere in the region of 1000 years between Joseph and Dāwūd. How then can it be presumed that the Emperor would demand that all individuals return to their places of origin, the places their bloodlines return to, when here we have somewhere in the region of 1000 years between Joseph and David. So, on account of this, there is some skepticism as to whether the affair actually occurred. And then, it is said, they returned [from Bethlehem] to Nazareth where Maryam was from and where ‘Isá grew.

The account that occurs in the Book of Mathew however, speaks about Joseph seeing in a vision that his wife was pregnant with a child whose name shall be Jesus, and he shall be referred to as Emmanuel, and he will remove the sins of Mankind and save his people. And so, they went to Bethlehem to have the child since this was prophecy. When they were in Bethlehem, King Herod received news that the king of Judah was born, and he subsequently sent individuals to kill the child. Joseph was shown in a dream that this was the case, and thus he fled to Egypt with his wife where they remained until King Herod passed away. This version of the story mentions that it was not shepherds who came to see the child,

but it was wise men.

So, there are discrepancies between the two accounts of what actually happened. We also have the historical unlikelihood of this occurring, since there is no historical mention of any Roman Emperor of that time placing upon his subjects any census whatsoever. Not to mention the difficulty of carrying something like that out and forcing people to return to their places of origin. Thus, there is great unlikelihood that this actually occurred.

And so, the ascription of ‘Isá to Bethlehem as his place of birth, is something that has been considered from the accretions into the Gospels. But we need to understand that there is a reason for the creation of the story. And that is because some of the books in the Old Testament such as Micah and others, mention that a messiah will be born in Bethlehem.

Thus, him being attributed to Bethlehem (without solid established scriptural evidence) would be considered an ‘acceptable’ accretion to the text, congruent with the true nature of Jesus in line with mainstream Christian belief. And many prophesies in the Bible have been attributed to Jesus in this manner, because those verses simply have to be speaking of him! The issue here is not whether those texts are referring to him or not, the issue is the ‘manipulation’ of the text to fit our [i.e. the Christian] narrative and creed. Unfortunately, this type of manipulation of text to fit belief, is commonplace within Christendom.

The Gospels have been attributed to Mathew, Mark, Luke and John,<sup>2</sup> individuals who were for the most part unknown, and Christian Scripture scholars have affirmed that due to the various changes in literary styles within any one Gospel, would have in it an indication of the fact that the Gospels were, in actuality, written

---

<sup>2</sup> Little is known about Matthew and John, who were said to be disciples, while Mark and Luke did not even meet Jesus! Mark was a secretary of the disciple Peter, and Luke was a travel companion of Paul, who both never met Jesus. What makes things worse is that the Gospels were originally anonymous, and not written until at least 50 years after Jesus, then authors were attributed to these texts because they were ‘most likely’ the authors.

by individuals other than those whom they were ascribed to, and were actually written by more than one person.

Even the very character of Jesus and his mission differs from Gospel to Gospel. For example, in the Gospel of Mark, Jesus does not seem too concerned with letting the people know who he is, while in the Book of John, it is virtually the main mission of Jesus. If this Message John portrays was truly the methodology of Jesus and his mission, why would the Books of Matthew, Mark and Luke not find this important to mention?

So, the affair of ‘Isá being born in Bethlehem is something that is not established in our texts, and its establishment is dubious even in Christian sources.<sup>3</sup>

As far as our texts are concerned (the Qur’ān and Prophetic Traditions), we have a mention of something that occurred during the early life of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam that is not present within the Bible, and that is the fact that he spoke in the cradle. The mention of him speaking in the cradle is present in Sūrah Al ‘Imrān and Sūrah Maryam and is likewise mentioned in some narrations that have come from the Prophet (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).

Allāh States in the Noble Qur’ān (the Chapter of Mary, Vs 27-31) discussing the story of the birth of Jesus:

﴿فَأَتَتْ بِهِ فَوْمَهَا تَحْمِلُهُ قَالُوا يَا مَرْيَمُ لَقَدْ جِئْتِ شَيْئًا فَرِيًّا﴾

“Then she brought him to her people, carrying him. They said, ‘O Mary, you have certainly done a thing unprecedented.’”

﴿يَا أُخْتَ هَارُونَ مَا كَانَ أَبُوكِ امْرًا سُوءٌ وَمَا كَانَتْ أُمُّكِ بَغِيًّا﴾

<sup>3</sup> See: Where Was Jesus Born by Steve Mason

“O sister of Aaron (in terms of Lineage), your father was not a man of evil, nor was your mother unchaste.”

﴿فَأَشَارَتْ إِلَيْهِ قَالُوا كَيْفَ نُكَلِّمُ مَنْ كَانَ فِي الْمَهْدِ صَبِيًّا﴾

“So she pointed to him. They said, ‘How can we speak to one who is in the cradle a child?’”

﴿قَالَ إِنِّي عَنْدَ اللَّهِ آتَانِي الْكِتَابَ وَجَعَلَنِي نَبِيًّا﴾

“[Jesus] said, ‘Indeed, I am the servant of Allāh. He has given me the Scripture and made me a Prophet.’”

﴿وَجَعَلَنِي مُبَارَّكًا أَئِنَّ مَا كُنْتُ وَأُوصَانِي بِالصَّلَاةِ وَالزَّكَاةِ مَا دُمْتُ حَيًّا﴾

“And He has made me blessed wherever I am and has enjoined upon me prayer and zakāh as long as I remain alive.”

It should be known that there is a lot of skepticism around the text of the Gospels (Mathew, Mark, Luke and John) regarding their authenticity. It has been established relatively recently, that there are various verses within the Gospels that have been added, and this is as we mentioned, not Muslim statements, but statements of scholars within Christendom. And so, there is a lot of ambiguity in terms of authenticity regarding the sources, since there is evidence that portions of the texts are not authentic. This is extremely important when we are looking at the developments of early Christianity. What can we say is possibly authentic and then how have they built their religion around what is actually authentic?



## The Call of Jesus

The affair of the call of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam within the Bible was one that Bible scholars referred to as an Apocalyptic call. This is because he called to the worship of Allāh; that individuals must change their ways, or they will earn the Anger of Allāh and His Wrath, and consequently something that will come from the Creator in the form of punishment, and that punishment is imminent. ‘Isá Ibn Maryam is recognized as a Jew who had this Apocalyptic message.

As Muslims, we believe that ‘Isá Ibn Maryam came with the same call as the rest of the Prophets and Messengers, and that was to worship Allāh alone, to follow his (the relevant Prophet’s) example—since his example was the example that Allāh is pleased with for mankind to be upon—and that they should prepare for the Messenger that would come after him whose name shall be Ahmad, as Allāh mentions in Sūrah al-Ṣaff in the Qur’ān:

﴿وَإِذْ قَالَ عِيسَى ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ يَقِنًّا إِسْرَئِيلَ إِنِّي رَسُولُ اللَّهِ إِلَيْكُمْ مُصَدِّقًا لِمَا بَيْنَ يَدَيَّ مِنْ آتِيَةِ اللَّهِ وَمُبَشِّرًا بِرَسُولٍ يَأْتِي مِنْ بَعْدِي أَمْمَةٌ أَحْمَدُ﴾

“And [remember] when Jesus, son of Mary, said: ‘O Children of Israel, I am the Messenger of Allāh to you, confirming what came before me of the Torah and giving good tidings of a Messenger to come after me whose name is Ahmad.’”<sup>4</sup>

Likewise, in the Christian sources, the Book of John has ‘Isá Ibn Maryam mentioning that, “I must go for indeed if I do not go then the Comforter will not come.” Within Christendom, the Comforter is declared to be the Holy Spirit. For the one who studies his description, when the Biblical ‘Isá spoke of the ‘Comforter’ he described him with a number of descriptions. From them is that he will address them, and this was not something that was known from the characteristics of the

<sup>4</sup> Sūrah al-Ṣaff 61:6

Holy Spirit, not during Jesus' mission nor after he left them. From them is the fact that 'Isá Ibn Maryam mentioned, "I must go, for indeed if I do not go the Comforter will not come"<sup>5</sup>, which again, is contradictory to what we know of the Biblical message in terms of the mission of Jesus, since, we understand, he was aided by the Holy Spirit throughout his mission.

And so, we understand therefore, that the Comforter he spoke of that will come after him would be an individual who will speak. He said that, "He shall not speak of himself but whatever he shall hear, that shall he speak." Again, since it is Christian belief that the Holy Spirit is a part of God, then it would not require for him to hear from God in order to convey, since this was the characteristic of a 'human' Prophet or Messenger. In any case, the call of 'Isá lasted for some 33 years, as we believe. Within Christendom they hold that it was somewhere in the year 30AD/Christian Era that the call of 'Isá Ibn Maryam began to be a problem within the Roman Empire.

---

<sup>5</sup> John 16:7

## The Crucifixion

It was said that one of the reasons he was crucified was because his call upset the men of knowledge among the Jews (the Pharisees, Sadducees and others), because he was claiming to be the Messiah they were waiting for. However, he carried out acts they did not know the Messiah to come and carry out, and he was creating problems and discord. They complained to the Roman Emperor who had ‘Isá confronted and questioned for a period, but he saw that ‘Isá should be let off and should not be punished. They demanded that he be punished and killed, and so ultimately that was the decree that was issued—that is the narrative as far as Christian sources are concerned.

Pontius Pilate was one of the governors of the Emperor, and alongside collecting taxes, one of the main characteristics of those governors was that they were present to maintain the peace, so rabble-rousers were not tolerated. ‘Isá Ibn Maryam was considered a rabble-rouser and so he was to be killed.

As far as the crucifixion is concerned, as Muslims we believe that Allāh informed us concerning the reason Banī Isrā’īl (the Children of Israel) were cursed in the Scripture is because they said, “We have killed the Messiah Jesus, the son of Mary, the Messenger of Allāh” but Allāh informs us:

﴿وَقُولُّهُمْ إِنَّا قَتَلْنَا الْمَسِيحَ عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَمَا قَاتَلُوهُ وَمَا صَابُوهُ وَلَكِنْ شَيْءٌ هُمْ وَإِنَّ الَّذِينَ أَخْتَلُوا فِيهِ لَفِي شَكٍّ مِّنْهُ مَا هُمْ بِهِ مِنْ عِلْمٍ إِلَّا اتَّبَاعُ الظَّنِّ وَمَا قَاتَلُوهُ يَقِينًا﴾

“And because of their saying (in boast), ‘We killed Messiah ‘Isá (Jesus), son of Maryam (Mary), the Messenger of Allāh,’ - but they killed him not, nor crucified him, but the resemblance of ‘Isá (Jesus) was put over another man (and they killed that man), and those who differ therein are full of doubts. They have no

(certain) knowledge, they follow nothing but conjecture. For surely; they killed him not [i.e. ‘Isá (Jesus), son of Maryam (Mary)].”<sup>6</sup>

One of the great scholars of Qur’ānic exegesis, Imām Ibn Kathīr mentions in his book *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* and elsewhere, that Allāh caused one of the followers of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam to resemble him and that he, in actuality, was taken—that occurs in one narration. In another narration he mentions, that when the soldiers of the governor surrounded the house where ‘Isá and his followers were, he demanded that they come out. When they did not appear, he said, “If you do not come out then we will kill all of you” and when they entered upon them, they saw that all of the individuals present resembled ‘Isá Ibn Maryam. Allāh put the resemblance of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam upon all of them; the wrong individual was taken and was crucified and ‘Isá Ibn Maryam ascended to the heavens.

One narration mentions that ‘Isá entered and said, “Who will take my resemblance and for him is Paradise?” None responded from his followers other than one young follower, but ‘Isá ignored him because he was young. And so, he repeated it three times and on the third occasion, Allāh made ‘Isá look like his follower and made the follower look like ‘Isá, and not even the disciples knew that the exchange had occurred. Imām Ibn Kathīr mentions that it is for this reason that even some of the earliest writings among the disciples of ‘Isá speak of him being taken and ultimately crucified. In any case, there are variant versions of the narration and they unite upon one thing, and that is, that ‘Isá was not crucified.

As for the Christian belief in the crucifixion, there is skepticism even in the Christian sources as to whether or not ‘Isá Ibn Maryam was the one that was taken. For example, we have in one of the well-known sources, a statement by Jay Stevenson in a lecture entitled, A New Eusebius, which was transcribed and turned into a book, where he mentions as it relates to the affair of the crucifixion,

“He appeared on earth as a man to the nations of these powers and

---

<sup>6</sup>Sūrah al-Nisā’ 4:157

wrought miracles wherefore he did not himself suffer death, but a certain Simon of Cyrene, being compelled, bore the cross in his stead. Simon was transfigured by him, so that he might be thought to be Jesus, and was crucified, through ignorance and error."

This statement is one that was attributed to an individual known as Basilides (d.138CE)<sup>7</sup>, who was from among those known in early Christendom to have teachings concerning ‘Isá Ibn Maryam. And thus, his statement was one, of course, that created problems within the Christian world since he claimed that Simon of Cyrene was, in actuality, taken instead of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam.

This belief then—i.e. the belief that ‘Isá was not the one that was crucified—was not something only Muslims believe in. Rather, it was believed in by early Christian scholars.

There was a group of Christians known as Docetae. This refers to an early Christian sect who held the belief that ‘Isá Ibn Maryam never had a real physical body but he was an illusion—this was something maintained by this early Christian group. They held that the crucifixion was not apparent and not real. They held that the actual physical Jesus was not crucified though he appeared to be. So even among Christians were those who believed that Jesus was not actually crucified.

---

<sup>7</sup> Said to have been a student of Glaucias, a disciple of Peter.

## Who Actually Bore the Cross?

There is further discrepancy in the Bible concerning whether or not it was Jesus or Simon who bore the cross of Jesus. This is clear when we look at those verses.

### 1. Simon of Cyrene

1. (Matthew 27: 31-32) – “And after they had mocked Him, they took His robe off and put His garments on Him, and led Him away to crucify Him. 32: And as they were coming out, they found a man of Cyrene named Simon, **whom they pressed into service to bear His cross.**”
2. (Mark 15:20-21) – “And after they had mocked Him, they took the purple off Him, and put His garments on Him. And they **\*led Him out to crucify Him.** 21: And they pressed into service a passer-by coming from the country, **Simon of Cyrene (the father of Alexander and Rufus), to bear His cross.**”
3. (Luke 23: 26) – “And when they led Him away, they laid hold of one Simon of Cyrene, coming in from the country, **and placed on him the cross to carry behind Jesus.**”

### 2. Jesus

1. (John 19:17) – “They took Jesus therefore, and He went out, **bearing His own cross,** to the place called the Place of a Skull, which is called in Hebrew, Golgotha.”

The point we are trying to make is that the discrepancy in relation to ‘Isá Ibn Maryam being the one that was crucified, begin even from the point of bearing the cross.

There is a passage in the fifteenth chapter of the Book of Mark which states that when Pontius Pilate interrogated ‘Isá, he found no fault with him and saw that he could be released. There was an uproar from the Jews, who saw that ‘Isá should

be taken, but Pontius Pilate held that another individual, namely Barabbas, should be taken in the place of ‘Isá, and that ‘Isá should be left to remain. The passage speaks of a Passover, since ‘Isá was taken during the period of the Passover.

It should be noted that Barabbas was referred to as ‘Jesus Barabbas’. The early church father and scholar *Origen* of Alexandria himself admits that he was troubled by the fact that his copies of the Gospels gave Barabbas’ name as “Jesus Barabbas”<sup>8</sup>, and he declared that it was impossible this bandit could have had such a holy name. Some therefore argue that the name Jesus being mentioned here ‘must have been’ a scriptural error. The point here being that even within the Christian scripture there is an element of uncertainty.

The scripture mentions the celebration of the Passover as the time that the verdict was passed upon Jesus that he was to be crucified. The Passover was a festival that occurred during the Jewish year and was a celebration of the saving of the children of Isrā’īl from Pharaoh and his armies. It is mentioned in the Bible, that Allāh had placed a number of punishments upon the Egyptians for rejecting the call of Mūsá (Moses) and from them, was that if Fir‘āwn did not release Banī Isrā’īl (The Children of Israel), the first born son of every family shall die, and that was going to occur on a particular day. Banī Isrā’īl were informed that in order for the Angel of Death to ‘pass over’ your house, you would have to slaughter a lamb and smear the blood of the lamb over the doorways, so when the Angel of Death came to take the life of the firstborn of every family, he would pass over the houses that had the lamb’s blood over them. So the firstborn of Banī Isrā’īl, who were living in Egypt at the time, were saved, and the firstborn of every Egyptian was killed. It was not long after that that, they were freed and traveled by night to the Red Sea, and Allāh split the sea for them and saved them.

And so in order to celebrate the period, they have the Passover meal and festivity. They cook unleavened bread to remember the fact that they were unable to wait for the bread they cooked on the night of the Passover to rise, since they had to

<sup>8</sup> Matthew 27:16–17

leave by hastily by night; they eat bitter vegetables in order to remember the bitterness of the chastisement and the torment that they went through in Egypt, and other things they carry out during the Passover.

During the Passover it was said that 'Isá was taken and Pontius Pilate commanded that another individual be taken in the place of 'Isá and that following a Passover custom—unknown outside of the Gospels—Pontius Pilate offered to free a Jewish prisoner and suggested Jesus, but the Jewish masses demanded, that Pilate release Barabbas and crucify Jesus. This was mentioned in The Oxford Companion to the Bible.

So they mention here that the crowd demanded that Pontius Pilate, who was the governor, release Barabbas and crucify Jesus. I will present here, yet another example of textual confusion, and how, even in the Christian scriptures, it is unclear whether 'Isá Ibn Maryam was the one who was crucified.

As far as the name Barabbas is concerned, it was an Aramaic word, which was a combination of *bā* and *abba*. *Bā* in the Aramaic language, and to this day in the Arabic language (used in the region of Yemen) was used in a similar way that *banī* was used i.e. 'sons of' or 'children of'. For example, we find in the Arabic language *Bāzmul*, *Bāshmīl*, *Bākhashwayn*—all of these names with *bā* at the beginning is a reference to *banī* or 'children of'. *Abba* in the Aramaic language is the same as *ab* in the Arabic language, meaning father. The individual that was left alone and not crucified, was referred to as Jesus Barabbas i.e. Jesus Bā Abba or Jesus the son of the father (the well-known title given to Jesus) in various places in the Greek manuscripts of the Bible.

Thus, there is some confusion regarding the affair of Pontius Pilate was being commanded by the Jews, to release Barabbas and not Jesus, and that he should crucify Jesus, since Barabbas was referred to as Jesus Barabbas, Jesus, Son of the Father.

Muslim sources however, categorically establish that it was not 'Isá Ibn Maryam that was crucified.

Allāh the Most High States:

﴿وَقَوْلُهُمْ إِنَّا قَتَلْنَا الْمَسِيحَ عِيسَى أُبْنَ مَرْيَمَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَمَا قَاتَلُوهُ وَمَا صَبَّوْهُ وَلَكِنْ شَيْءٌ لَهُمْ وَإِنَّ الَّذِينَ

﴿أَخْتَلُوا فِيهِ لَفْي شَكٍّ مِنْهُ مَا هُمْ بِهِ مِنْ عِلْمٍ إِلَّا اتِّبَاعُ الظَّنِّ وَمَا قَاتَلُوهُ يَقِيْنًا﴾

"But they killed him not, nor crucified him, but the resemblance of 'Isá (Jesus) was put over another man (and they killed that man), and those who differ therein are full of doubts. They have no (certain) knowledge, they follow nothing but conjecture. For surely; they killed him not [i.e. 'Isá (Jesus), son of Maryam (Mary)]."<sup>9</sup>

And we have established here, that there is even some skepticism in Christian sources as to whether or not it was 'Isá Ibn Maryam himself or someone else who was killed. And so the affair then is one of ambiguity within the texts that are present within the Bible.

Imām Ibn Kathīr mentions in his compendium of history *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* after mentioning the story of the likeness of Jesus being placed upon all of his companions (one version mentioned by some historians) such that the Roman soldier could not tell them apart. They said: "Indeed you have performed sorcery upon us! Either Jesus come out to us or we will kill you all!" It was at that point that one of his disciples went out to them (sacrificing himself for Jesus), and it was him that they took, killed and crucified. This resemblance was made in order to divert them from the real Jesus. Thus, they thought they had killed him, and the disciples (of Jesus) also presumed he was Jesus."<sup>10</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Sūrah al-Nisā' 4:157

<sup>10</sup> Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 2/93

## The Resurrection

After the crucifixion of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam, as far as the Bible is concerned, then the narrative continues that his body was put in a cave-like tomb, and three days later when Mary Magdalene went to check on the tomb of ‘Isá she found that the stone had been removed from the door of the tomb and he was not present. When she came out of the cave, she saw someone calling her and saying, “It is me, it is me”, who she finds to be ‘Isá. She then went and informed the other disciples that she saw ‘Isá and that he was alive and had risen from the dead.

Again, Bible scholars discuss the affair from a standpoint of the fact that this went against Roman customs, because those who were crucified during the Roman Empire were not ordinarily placed in tombs thereafter, since being buried in a tomb was considered something that ennobled an individual. Rather, those who were crucified were considered wretched and were ordinarily left for vultures to consume them. Their bodies would ultimately disintegrate and whatever was left of the body would be discarded.

Even if it were established that ‘Isá was placed in a tomb, there is no evidence within it that he died on the cross and was raised (in fact, based upon Roman custom, it would be evidence to the contrary). Additionally, the scriptures mention the statement of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam, “As Jonah (Yūnus) was in the belly of the whale, three days and three nights, so shall the Son of Man be.”<sup>11</sup> The question therefore is, how was Jonah for three days and nights in the belly of this large fish? Jonah did not die and come back to life; Jonah was *alive* in the belly of the whale.

It may be argued then, if we do accept the cave story as authentic, that after the exchange had taken place, between Jesus and the one who took on his resemblance, such that not even the disciples were aware of what had happened.

---

<sup>11</sup> Matthew 12:40

Jesus then took to hiding in the cave. He later made himself apparent to some of his disciples before Allāh ultimately caused him to ascend to the heavens.



## The Belief of Early Christians Regarding Jesus

After the ascent of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam, the Christian world—as Imām Ibn Kathīr informs us<sup>12</sup>—was split into a number of groups.

He mentioned that from them were those who believed that ‘Isá was the son of God who walked on earth. From them were those who believed that he was God himself on earth. And from them were those who believed that he was a Messenger from God, which was a group known as the Yā‘qubīyah.

He said this group (the Yā‘qubīyah) was chastised by the first two groups and was ultimately killed by them.

There are some Christian scholars who speak of a group among the early Christians known as the Ebionites, who were Jews. And it should be noted here that the early followers of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam were all likewise, Jews.

When ‘Isá Ibn Maryam was present, it was not known that his followers were considered *Christians*. Rather, ‘Isá Ibn Maryam was a Jew who was sent to Banī Isrā’īl (the Children of Israel) as a Messenger and was not going to establish a new religion. The only thing he came to do was re-establish the law and its application among Banī Isrā’īl (the Jews). He was not a Messenger sent to all of mankind, as Allāh mentioned.

﴿وَرَسُولًا إِلَيْ يَهُودِ إِسْرَائِيلَ أُّنِيْ قَدْ جَعْتُكُمْ بِآيَةٍ مِّنْ رَّبِّكُمْ﴾

“And [make him] a Messenger to the Children of Israel, [who will say], ‘Indeed I have come to you with a sign from your Lord.’”<sup>13</sup>

Similarly, even in the Bible there remains scripture that refer to ‘Isá as a Messenger that was sent to the Children of Israel. Indeed, in the New Testament

<sup>12</sup> Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 2/92

<sup>13</sup> Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān 3:49

of the Bible there is the statement, "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel."<sup>14</sup> So even among the Christians, they likewise have scripture establishing that 'Isá said he was sent to the Children of Israel and not for the whole of mankind.

Regarding the Ebionites, the Encyclopedia of Religions states,

"They were Jews who accepted Jesus of Nazareth as the Messiah while continuing to maintain their identity as Jews. They cultivated relations with Jews as well as Christians though they were welcomed by neither. They followed the Jewish Law, insisting on circumcision, keeping the Sabbath, celebrating the Jewish festivals (Yom Kippur, the Passover etc.) and observing the dietary laws (e.g. abstention from pork) and other Jewish customs. They repudiated the apostle Paul because of his denigration of the Jewish law. They saw Jesus as a prophet, an exceptional man in the line of Jewish prophets (as described in Deuteronomy 18:15) and denied the virgin birth. They justified their way of life by appealing to the example of Jesus' life. He was circumcised, observed the Sabbath and celebrated Jewish festivals, and taught that all of the precepts of the law should be observed."<sup>15</sup>

In terms of their belief in 'Isá, the Ebionites did not believe in father, son and holy ghost, that Jesus was the son of God or that Jesus was God on earth. They believed that Jesus was a Prophet. So where did they get this belief from?

What is ironic, is that these early followers of 'Isá, by most of Christendom are referred to as heretics and non-Christians. Actually, the true following of 'Isá would necessitate being from Banī Isrā'īl or following the way of Banī Isrā'īl since that was the law 'Isá Ibn Maryam followed, and the only people he declared he had come for. Them believing that 'Isá was not the son of God but a Prophet, was

<sup>14</sup> Matthew 15:24

<sup>15</sup> The Encyclopedia of Religions, pg. 576

something they took from early teachings.

In addition to the Ebionites, there was another sect who followed Ḥisá Ibn Maryam and believed in him known as the Nazarenes. The Nazarenes believed in the Virgin Birth—the Ebionites did not—and they believed that Jesus was a Prophet and a Messiah to the Jewish people. So from these early sects were those who held that Ḥisá was not the son of God and neither was he God. Rather, he was a Prophet.

The Compton Encyclopedia states,

“The early Christians were all Jews. They remained in Jerusalem and partook in the religious observances in the Temple. They differed from their fellow Jews only in that they believed that the Messiah had come. Had they kept quiet about their conviction, they might well have remained a sect within Judaism. However, they insisted on preaching to all who would listen that the Jesus whom the Jewish authorities had persecuted was the one Israel had long awaited. This preaching aroused great hostility on the part of religious leaders and the early Christians were persecuted...these Christians had no thought of venturing beyond the confines of Israel with their message.”

And so the early Church and the early followers of Ḥisá, as far as Christian sources are concerned, were Jews.





## Gentile Conversion to Christianity

Similarly, the Encyclopedia of Religions states that the Ebionites were

“eventually left behind as Christianity adapted to the influx of gentile converts. These Christians eventually became a distinct group that, along with other groups (e.g. the Gnostics), was rejected as heretical by the emerging ‘great’ Church.”

So the Ebionites and Nazarenes who believed that ‘Isá was a Prophet and believed in, and worshipped only one God, were increasingly rejected by the Church, as more and more Gentiles (non-Jews) began to convert to Christianity. When they converted and outnumbered the Ebionites and the Nazarenes, who ultimately died out, the version of Christianity practiced by the Gentile converts became dominant Christianity.

In 1718 John Toland, one of the Christian scholars wrote a book called *The Nazarenes*, which revolved around the early Church and followers of ‘Isá (the Nazarenes). He questions the declaration of most of Christianity that those early Christians (the Nazarenes and Ebionites) were heretics and were not true Christians.

He mentions,

“Since the Nazarenes, or Ebionites, are by all the Church historians unanimously acknowledged to have been the first Christians, or those who believed him from amongst the Jews, who were his own people and apostles, with which he lived and died and witnessed his actions. Considering this, I say, how was it possible for them to be the first of all others (for they were made to be the first heretics), who should form wrong conceptions of the doctrines and designs of Jesus? And how did the Gentiles, who only believed in Jesus after his death from the preaching and information of people that never knew Jesus, have truer notions of

doctrine and Jesus, or whence could they have their information but from the believing Jews.”<sup>16</sup>

He is saying, how is it possible that the first followers of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam (the Nazarenes and Ebionites), who all believed that ‘Isá was a Prophet from Allāh—not the son of God—were the first of the followers of Jesus, yet were wrong about Jesus?! This passage is important since it brings us to a discussion of the affair of Gentile (non-Jews) conversion, since ‘Isá was sent to Banī Isrā’īl. So how then did non-Jews begin to embrace Christianity? That is where we have the advent of the call of Paul.



<sup>16</sup> The Nazarenes, pgs. 73-74

## The Call of the Apostle Paul

The Apostle Paul was originally known as Saul of Tarsus. He was a Jew who, in the beginning used to persecute the followers of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam and then ultimately claimed that he saw ‘Isá Ibn Maryam in a vision, perhaps some 45 years or more after ‘Isá Ibn Maryam.

It should be known, that he is the second most influential figure in Christianity after ‘Isá. In fact, we may argue that modern-day Christianity is, in actuality, Pauline Christianity. In the New Testament there are 27 books, 13 of those 27 books of the Bible are the books and writings of Paul. There is some skepticism regarding some of them, as is the case with other books within the Bible, but almost half of the literature present is in fact the writings and doctrine of Paul.

As we mentioned, Paul was a Jew who used to persecute the Christians and then many years after ‘Isá Ibn Maryam—some 45 years or so—he claimed that he saw ‘Isá in a vision when he was on the road to Damascus and thus became a follower of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam. But the problem is, when Paul came, he changed much of the call of ‘Isá. In fact, Paul changed the religion of ‘Isá and the earlier followers of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam from being the religion that was given to ‘Isá to convey to the Children of Israel, to being the religion *about* ‘Isá.

There were a number of other changes he brought about. As a benefit to the Muslims, one of the reasons our Scholars warn against bid’ah (innovation) is because bid’ah is considered a bridge to kufr (disbelief). And we have a beautiful example here in Paul. Paul, in actuality, was the greatest mutbadi’ (innovator) in Christianity, since he changed the belief and call of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam dramatically. From his changes was he held that the call of ‘Isá could now be spread among the Gentiles, which was not the call of Jesus himself.

It should be known that, as we mentioned previously and reiterate, Jesus was a Jew who came to the Jews. Paul’s argument revolved around his interpretation of the text, that if ‘Isá was sent to be the sacrificial lamb, then his death should be for the

purpose of purifying all of mankind.

It was not so much the rigidity of the law that we should adhere to, but that which was symbolic within the character of ‘Isá, since he (Paul) and the other Jews believed that ‘Isá did not fulfill all of the characteristics of the Messiah they were waiting for, in terms of that which was present within the text, but Allāh gave him life. So since ‘Isá appeared to have broken some of the laws—and it is present in the Qur’ān that ‘Isá came with a change of some of the laws of the Bible, which were the laws of the Tawrāh—but yet still Allāh gave him life after he was dead, then this indicates that the laws are not as important for the followers of ‘Isá, as they were in early Christendom. Therefore, he saw that da‘wah could be given to the Gentiles since it was not so much about the law, (which necessitated being Jewish), but it was more about what had occurred with ‘Isá i.e. he was given life again, and this life and death was for the purpose of purification of sin and all human beings are equal in that regard, therefore da‘wah may be given to the Gentiles. And so, he set about calling the Gentiles who were present in the Roman Empire to what *he saw* to be the way of ‘Isá Ibn Maryam.

So, it was Paul who changed many of the laws, and from the greatest of those changes is that he allowed the call of ‘Isá to be spread among non-Jews. Once he began this call he had numerous missionaries whom he sent to Asia Minor, Macedonia and elsewhere in and around the regions that were known to be under the Roman Empire [modern-day Turkey and Greece], and their call spread quite rapidly.

By the 3rd century there were a good few million followers of Christianity. Some claimed that there were huge conversions based upon miracles that occurred at the hands of the followers and missionaries of Paul, (some claimed that miracles would be performed by the followers of Paul in front of huge crowds and this caused people to become Christian in multitudes) though that is not established. Some of the historians have mentioned that when you crunch the numbers, for there to be several million followers from the 1st century to the 3rd century then that is similar to the rate of the growth of the Mormon church. So, it did not

necessitate the performance of public miracles for those numbers to have appeared in that timeframe, the spread by word of mouth would have been sufficient.

So that continued until the advent of the Roman Emperor Constantine, who became Christian around the year 312.



## Christianity as the State Religion and Its Absorption of Paganism

When Constantine became a Christian, it was the first time Christianity entered the state. He made Christianity the state religion, after they had been under various forms of paganism. It was on that basis, there was the widespread development of Christianity within the Christian world, particularly within the Western Hemisphere. What should be noted, is that as these pagans—and the majority of those who became Christian were previously pagans—converted to Christianity, concessions were made for them as an encouragement for them to become Christian. And that brings us to our discussion regarding Christianity's connection to paganism.

Paganism was destroyed during the spread of Christianity in those early centuries, but it was not destroyed because of annihilation, but more so because of absorption. That is to say, within that period, the Christian world allowed the continuation of certain pagan practices, which made it easier for pagans to accept Christianity. So they accepted Christianity on the basis of the fact that they were able to retain many of their previous practices and traditions.

In that regard, James Baxter, a Professor of History in St. Andrews University, mentions in his book *Christianity in the Light of Modern Knowledge*,

“Upon the popular interpretation and practice of Christianity, the effect of its establishment as the state religion had been profound. If Paganism had been destroyed, it was less through annihilation than through absorption. Almost all that was pagan was carried over to survive under a Christian name...local pagan statues were labelled with Jesus' name, transferring him to the cult and mythology associated with the pagan deity. Before the fourth century was over the martyr-cult was universal...Pagan festivals were renamed, and Christmas Day, the ancient festival of the sun, was transformed into the birthday of Jesus.”

So he establishes here that in reality, one of the reasons Christianity spread so

rapidly was because they allowed pagan practices to be incorporated into Christianity, and so it made Christianity fair-seeming to the pagans across the Roman Empire who may have perhaps shown some interest in Christianity but did not want to abandon their pagan practices.

We have another statement around the affair of paganism and Christianity by Arthur Findlay in his book *Rock of Truth*,

“It was not until the year 527 C.E. that it was decided when Jesus was born, and various monks equipped with astrological learning were called in to decide this important point.”

Here we have one of the developments within the Christian world: the naming of the date of the birth of ‘Isá. Prior to that it was never said that ‘Isá was born on such and such a date. And these developments, we saw them throughout that early period.

By the 4<sup>th</sup> century, Christians were fiercely debating about whether ‘Isá was the son of God, whether he was a Prophet, or whether he was God himself (much of these debates leading to bloodshed). Due to this the Roman Emperor Constantine, called a huge meeting with the people of knowledge of the various denominations within the Church in the year 325CE. It was known as the Council of Nicaea<sup>17</sup> following which there were subsequent councils such as the Council of Constantinople.

In the Council of Nicaea, they condemned an individual known as Arius, who was the founder of the Arian sect. He was from those who advocated that which the early followers of ‘Isá had been believing in, which was that ‘Isá was not the son of God but a Prophet. However, during the Council of Nicaea they established that the son and the father were equal. So up until this point belief in the trinity had not yet been introduced.

---

<sup>17</sup> An Ancient Greek city in North West Anatolia, a region in the city of Iznik in modern-day Turkey.

In the Council of Constantinople in the year 381, the Holy Spirit was incorporated alongside the Father and the Son and that was when the Trinitarian doctrine was made official within the state.

Since Christianity had become a state religion, thereon after, there were other manifestations of the incorporation of certain beliefs. For example, in 527, the emperors came together to decide on the birth of Jesus.

Arthur Findlay continues,

"Ultimately, the Emperor decided that the 25th of December, the date of birth for the pagan Roman god, Mithra, be accepted as the date of birth for Jesus. Up to 680 C.E. no thought had been given to the symbol of Jesus crucified on the cross and prior to that date veneration was accorded to the Mithraic symbol of the lamb."

Prior to 680, that which was common among Christendom was that they would symbolise Ḥisá with a lamb. That symbol of the lamb was in actuality a symbol that was used for the pagan god Mithra.

He continues,

"From this time onwards it was ordained that in place of the lamb the figure of a man attached to the cross should be substituted."

And so, we have the incorporation of symbolism from the Mithraic paganistic religion into Christianity, as well as other symbols of paganism, which would have been fair-seeming to many of those pagans or Gentiles who became Christian.

In a similar vein, Sir James Fraser in his work *The Golden Bough* mentions,

"In respect both of doctrines and of rites, the cult of Mithra appears to have presented many points of resemblance to Christianity. Taken all together, the coincidences of the Christian with the Heathen festivals are too close and too numerous to be accidental. They mark the compromise which the Church in its 'hour of triumph' was compelled to make with its vanquished

and yet still dangerous rivals."

Due to the fact that the pagans had been overcome but were still dangerous, and many of them were considering embracing Christianity, there was the incorporation of many practices and symbolism into Christianity that were actually pagan.



## Examples of Pagan Beliefs and Practices Present in Modern-Day Christianity

The following are some of the beliefs related to the pagan god Mithra that bear striking similarities to the Christian belief in Jesus:

- He was a mediator between man and God.
- He was born in a cave.
- He was born on the 25th of December. If we look at the Christian narrative as it relates to Ḥisá however, this could not have been possible because he was born during the harvest season, which was nowhere near December.
- Mithra was born of a virgin.
- He traveled far and wide with twelve disciples, who were represented by the zodiac signs.
- He died in the service of humanity.
- He died and rose again from his tomb.
- His resurrection was celebrated and rejoiced in.
- Mithra was referred to as the saviour and was figured with the lamb.

The winter solstice, which is a festival related to Mithra, occurred during the time that was attributed to his birth i.e. the 25th of December. It was a period in which they would worship and have a festivity known as a solstice, which was the birth of the new sun. This is the period that was said to be the birth of Ḥisá.

When questioned, many of the Christian scholars say, “We know that the 25th of December was not the date of the birth of Jesus; it is not the actual date of birth of Jesus we celebrate, but it is the celebration of the *fact* that he was

born." Again, we see how being easygoing with beliefs and concepts being incorporated into the religion, leads to this blurring of the lines and leads to nothing other than shirk (polytheism) in a religion that is supposed to be monotheistic.

Even if you look at the days of the week, though there are some attempts to claim that they are inspired by Christianity, the reality is, they are inspired by nothing but paganism.

Monday comes from the moon and the worship of the moon: The Moon Day, in actuality. Thursday for example was based upon the Nordic god Thor. Friday, based upon the Nordic (Norse) god Freya. Saturday, based upon the Roman god Saturn, which was related to Saturnalia, another period of celebration, which we discussed in a previous lecture, wherein there was debauchery and all types of practices [such as] incest and paedophilia and other than that. Sunday was referred to as such not because of the son of God but because of the sun, which was a period in which the sun was worshipped.

Many pagan practices were incorporated into Christianity and thus, as we approach Easter, we see another example of that. Easter was a festivity related to one of the Babylonian female gods named Ishtar, who was the goddess of love and fertility. The symbols of Ishtar are the well-known eggs and rabbits, since rabbits are known to bear many litters each year and are highly fertile. This period of eggs and Easter rabbits was not celebrated by 'Isá Ibn Maryam nor is there anything related to him. What we do have is that the apparent crucifixion (as we established earlier, was not of 'Isá), occurred during the Passover and some have argued that it was a similar period to Easter, however it was not the same.

Ishtar and its set date were periods wherein the pagan gods were worshiped, and we find that those periods remained the same year after year. These are but a few examples of the incorporation of paganism into the call and religion that was left

by Ḥsá Ibn Maryam.<sup>18</sup>

There is no doubt, that there is much that may be said and this subject really requires an in-depth detailed analysis of the statements that have been attributed to Ḥsá Ibn Maryam and the statements of the Bible scholars, and compare that with the Islamic position concerning the true Ḥsá Ibn Maryam. But what we wanted to do was just shed some light upon the deviation that occurred in the early part of Christendom and the fact that the manifestation of Christianity in our time is nothing other than an incorporation of the innovated call of Paul, not the call of Ḥsá Ibn Maryam, and that the symbolism present within the religion now, is either that of paganism, or is paganistic in origin, or was developed through blameworthy innovation, (the dubious nature of the authenticity of the Gospels and the ambiguity of their authors only adds to the problem) and then propagated and disseminated by state leaders such as Constantine, or by innovators in the religion such as Paul.

As a result, we are left with an extreme dilution of the message of Ḥsá, and a great straying away, from what was left by one of the greatest of the Prophets and Messengers that ever lived: Ḥsá Ibn Maryam.

It is for this reason that Allāh sent the Qur’ān, in order to correct the distortion that occurred within previous scripture. That mankind would return back to the true meaning of Monotheism and return back to the path of all of the Prophets and Messengers of the past, through the example of the final Messenger Muḥammad Ibn ‘Abd Allāh (صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ). You owe it to yourself to study this final scripture and look into the life of the final Messenger sent to mankind in order to correct the balance and establish the manifest truth.

---

<sup>18</sup> The eating of the flesh (of Jesus) and the drinking of (his blood) the wine (i.e. the Eucharist) being another example. This practice is found in the book of Corinthians, another one of the writings of Paul!

## Conclusion: The Call of Jesus Was the Same as Muhammad

So the one who looks at the early true message of 'Isá Ibn Maryam, he will see that there is no doubt, that his call was the same as the call of the Messenger Muhammād, and the early followers of 'Isá Ibn Maryam are most resemblant to Muslimīn in our time. In terms of their practice, belief, morals and ethics, they are more resemblant to Muslims than they are to proponents of the Christian faith.

Their call revolved around:

1. The belief that Allāh alone is the Creator and Sustainer of creation. Therefore, He alone is deserving of worship.
2. That the greatest sin is Shirk, which is to attribute partners to Allāh in those things that are His Sole Right (such as creation, sustaining creation and being worshipped and called upon etc.).
3. That the Prophets and Messengers all called creation to worship Allāh alone, and not themselves.
4. That they were sent to be an example for mankind.
5. That Jesus was no different in that regard, and thus he never refers to himself as Allāh or part of Allāh, even in the distorted scriptures of the Bible.
6. Salvation is through believing in Allāh and performing righteous deeds and continual repentance.
7. That one needs no intermediaries in order to do so.

8. That our Forgiving Lord does not require a physical sacrifice in order to forgive sin.
9. That no bearer of a burden will bear the burden of another, not Ḥisá Ibn Maryam—May the peace of Allāh be upon him—or anyone else for that matter. We will all be recompensed for what we have earned.

وَصَلَى اللَّهُ عَلَيْنَا مُحَمَّدٌ وَعَلَى آلِهِ وَصَحْبِهِ وَسَلَّمَ

