

## The Gospels in the Muslim Discourse of the Ninth to the Fourteenth Centuries: an exegetical inventorial table (part I)

---

MARTIN ACCAD

**ABSTRACT** *Whereas it is generally accepted that Muslim polemicists against Christianity habitually condemned the Gospels as corrupt, a surprising number in fact quoted from all four Gospels, and employed them in arguments that were both directed against Christian beliefs and constructed to defend Islam. This article brings together in tabular form more than 1270 Gospel references from 23 works by 20 Muslim authors, from the early third/ninth century to the early eighth/fourteenth century, and by means of a system of keys shows how they were deployed in support of a range of doctrinal points.*

*The article is divided into four sections that appear in the four issues of ICMR vol. 14 through 2003.*

### Introduction

At about the same time as I was completing my doctoral thesis on the Islamic exegesis of the Gospels in Muslim–Christian dialogue (eighth–fourteenth centuries), at the University of Oxford in July 2001, Professor Tarif Khalidi published a superb collection of Muslim traditions about Christ in a book entitled *The Muslim Jesus*.<sup>1</sup> The sayings and stories collected can be traced back for the most part to between the mid-first and mid-second centuries of Islam (c. 700–800 AD).<sup>2</sup> Comparable to the apocryphal gospels that arguably arose in early Christian circles as a result of felt lacunae in the canonical Gospels—lacunae attached to specific characters or intriguing passages in want of further development—the ‘Muslim gospel’ probably arose, as Khalidi explains, ‘from a felt need to complement and expand the Qur’anic account of his [i.e. Christ’s] life’. Indeed, as Khalidi asserts, the Qur’ān itself ‘was primarily concerned with rectifying a certain doctrinal image of Jesus and had little to say on his ministry, teachings, and passion’.<sup>3</sup> Thus, the tone of the ‘Muslim gospel’ collected in *The Muslim Jesus* is serene from the perspective of Muslim–Christian relationships. It is more at the level of intra-Islamic relations that it has an axe to grind, various parties attempting to champion their own cause by trying to gain the support of, among others, Jesus, or simply one group holding Jesus as a supreme model for piety or asceticism.

The centuries that followed the beginning of the second/ninth century witnessed, apart from further redactions of the early Islamic sayings, new usages of ‘Christian’ Jesus traditions. Much more in line with the early Qur’anic spirit that denounced Christian ‘doctrinal heresy’ by cleansing Jesus of all supra-prophetic connotations, Muslim authors of that second period were eager to exonerate Christ of all Christian doctrinal ‘excesses’ through a thorough reinterpretation of the Christian Gospels. If such treatises were often quite polemical against Christians, they were on the other hand, for the most part, quite positive about the Bible. In the light of our common

assumption that Islam throughout its history has held a rigid view of *'taḥrīf al-lafẓ'* (textual corruption) with regard to the Judeo-Christian Scriptures, the idea of an extensive rereading of a text supposedly deemed 'corrupt' should seem odd enough. The fact that this same text is sometimes used even as final authority in Ḥadīth authentication<sup>4</sup> tells us that any simplistic approach to the Islamic use of the Gospel text is doomed to failure. In my doctoral research, I have collected from 23 treatises of some 20 Muslim authors about 1273 citations from the four canonical Gospels alone. In all, I have identified about 648 different Gospel references, each containing anywhere between one and twenty verses. These I have inventoried in Table 1.

## Lists of Abbreviations and Index of Citations

### *Abbreviations of Authors and Treatises*

Although my choice of Muslim authors seeks to be as comprehensive and as widely representative as possible, it does not pretend to be exhaustive. Indeed it would be impossible for it to be exhaustive due to the sheer amount of biblical material that pervades a considerable number of literary pieces written by Muslim authors. In terms of geographical space, I have limited myself chiefly to writings that emerged in the Middle East—though Ibn Ḥazm of Andalusia is also included because of the important position that he occupies in the history of exegetical discourse. As far as the time-period is concerned, my work covers texts from the beginning of the Islamic era until the beginning of the fourteenth century. Though the second date seems somewhat arbitrary, it conveniently sets the upper limit of the exegetical discourse shortly after the time of Bar 'Ebrāyā, whose exegetical work is the last one I examined on the Christian side in my doctoral thesis. In the context of the present article, the date remains arbitrary.

The following is the key to the abbreviations used in the table for the authors and treatises studied, together with an approximate date when it may be assumed that the treatises were written.

- |            |  |
|------------|--|
| (1) Ras    | Al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm al-Rassī, <i>Al-radd 'alā al-Naṣārā</i> —c. 820                                |
| (2) Jz     | Ibn Baḥr al-Jāḥiẓ, <i>Al-radd 'alā al-Naṣārā</i> <sup>5</sup> —c. 850                              |
| (3) TabRN  | 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, <i>Kitāb al-radd 'alā al-Naṣārā</i> —c. 851  |
| (4) TabDD  | 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, <i>Kitāb al-dīn wa-al-dawla</i> —c. 855  |
| (5) Qut'Uy | Ibn Qutayba, <i>Kitāb 'uyūn al-akhbār</i> —c. 850s   |
| QutMu      | Ibn Qutayba, <i>Kitāb ta'wīl mukhtalīf al-ḥadīth</i> —c. 860s                                      |
| QutMa      | Ibn Qutayba, <i>Kitāb al-ma'ārif</i> —c. 870s  |
| (6) Ya'    | Aḥmad al-Ya'qūbī, <i>Ta'riḫ</i> —completed in 872  |
| (7) 'Um    | (Pseudo-) 'Umar II—ninth century <sup>6</sup>  |
| (8) Nash   | Abū al-'Abbās al-Nāshī' al-Akbar, <i>Al-Kitāb al-awṣaṭ fī al-maqālāt</i> —end of the ninth century |
| (9) Bal    | Abū al-Qāsim al-Balkhī, <i>Kitāb awā'il al-adilla</i> —early tenth century                         |
| (10) Mat   | Abū Maṣṣūr al-Māturīdī, <i>Kitāb al-tawḥīd</i> —900s   |
| (11) Mas   | Abū al-Ḥasan al-Mas'ūdī, <i>Murūj al-dhahab wa-ma'ādīn al-jawhar</i> —943                          |
| (12) Ay    | Al-Ḥasan b. Ayyūb, <i>Risālat Ibn Ayyūb ilā akhīhi 'Alī</i> <sup>7</sup> —before 987               |

- (13) 'Am Abū al-Ḥasan al-ʿĀmirī, *Kitāb al-iʿlām bi-manāqib al-Islām*—before 992
- (14) Baq Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī, *Kitāb tamhīd al-aḥwāʾil wa-talkhīṣ al-dalāʾil*—980
- (15) IH Abū Muḥammad b. Ḥazm, *Kitāb al-fiṣal fī al-mīlal wa-al-aḥwāʾ wa-al-niḥal*—first half of eleventh century
- (16) Juw Abū al-Maʿālī al-Juwaynī, *Shifāʾ al-ghalīl fī bayān mā waqaʿa fī al-Tawrāt wa-al-Injīl min al-tabdīl*—second half of eleventh century
- (17) Ghaz (Pseudo-) Abū Ḥāmid al-Ghazālī,<sup>8</sup> *Al-radd al-jamīl li-ilāhiyyat ʿĪsā bi-ṣarīḥ al-Injīl*—c. 1101
- (18) Shah Abū al-Faṭḥ al-Shahrastānī, *Kitāb al-mīlal wa-al-niḥal*—1127–8
- (19) Qar Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qarāfī, *Al-ajwiba al-fākhirā ʿan al-asʿila al-fājira*—thirteenth century
- (20) Tay Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad b. Taymiyya, *Al-jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ li-man baddala dīn al-masīḥ*—end thirteenth–fourteenth century
- (21) Jaw Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya, *Hidāyat al-ḥayāra fī ajwibat al-Yahūd wa-al-Naṣārā*—first half of fourteenth century

### *The Exegetical Symbols*

The principal concern of my doctoral research was to discover the exegetical strategies adopted by the authors under study, the exegetical themes they derive from their examination of the Gospels and their underlying attitudes towards them. From these emerged what I called a new 'hermeneutical context', within which I believe Middle Eastern Christianity began to express itself in the new language and within the new mentality introduced by the Arab Islamic invader, to the point where I believe one may legitimately speak of that period as the history of Arab Christianity in the making. Thus, one will find in the table various symbols that I call 'exegetical'. Each of them represents an exegetical theme running generally across several Muslim treatises. They are as follows.

#### *(a) God*

(1) *There is no god but God (invisible and alone worshipped): symbol ... \**. On the basis of number alone, when it comes to the Gospel passages used by the Muslim authors to demonstrate this first theme, one might have the impression that it did not occupy a very prominent place in the Islamic exegetical discourse. However, for two reasons at least, this first impression is found not to be true. First, several of the Muslim treatises begin with an extensive exposition of God's oneness and uniqueness on qur'ānic and other more typically Islamic grounds, indicating that the theme was fundamental to Muslim thinking, and the basis on which the whole demonstrative endeavour was undertaken. Secondly, one must admit that it is in some ways artificial to separate the theme about God from those about Christ. As can be demonstrated in the detail of the treatises, the most immediate reason for the Christological issues is the demonstration of God's uniqueness. Therefore, the passages that I have indicated with this symbol are chiefly Gospel passages that most immediately and explicitly treat of the nature of God, as clear proclamations of his oneness and uniqueness and singleness in worship, leaving less obvious passages to the Christological section.

*(b) Christ*

(2) *Jesus was a human servant: symbol ... +*. This first Christological exegetical theme is the most important and most extensively used in the Muslim discourse. On the one hand it is thought to destroy the lofty Christian claims about Christ, and on the other it affirms the primary Qur'anic claim that Christ was a mere man and faithful servant of God. In a sense, however, the theme is very easy to establish, since Christianity has always maintained the full humanity of Christ, precisely by affirming the Gospel verses that sustain it. Indeed, Christianity had fought one of its earliest theological battles against Docetic ideas, which had sought to play down the 'real' humanity of Christ and the reality of his suffering on the cross. Christ's full humanity was maintained as an essential point in Christian soteriology, without which the whole idea of incarnation would be devoid of meaning.

With emerging Islam, however, an ever-recurring theme in the Muslim discourse becomes the following: How can Christians acknowledge and uphold the obvious Gospel references to Christ's humanity, while at the same time affirming daily in their creeds that Jesus is 'true God from true God, begotten not made ...'?<sup>9</sup> In this sense, Christians in the context of Islam were finding themselves again in the same situation as early Christianity several centuries earlier, which had gone through the process of developing a coherent theological doctrine while making sense of the diversity of the biblical witness. Back then, Christianity had gone through the process of explaining itself to Judaism's absolute monotheism on the one hand, and to abstract philosophical Greek paganism on the other. And it was in relation to both of these factors that it had defined itself. In the new Islamic context, the process was, in a sense, repeating itself. Only this time, the more institutionalized Christianity did not have as much flexibility to redefine itself in relation to outside factors as it did at the time of its tender youth.

(3) *Jesus was a prophet and apostle: symbol ... !* After stripping the icon of its corrupt layers of painting, it is time for renovation. Having recast the portrait of Jesus where it belongs, in the category of creature, the Muslim Gospel exegete sets out to restore to the picture its 'authentic' Qur'anic identity. Primarily and most importantly, Jesus belongs in the line of biblical prophets, called by God to preach the true religion to people. Secondly, having been called, the prophet is sent by God with a specific message to the world. The apostle recognizes his own calling and confesses his state of servanthood to God.

(4) *Jesus was not God for he related to another God (reinterpretation of 'god'): symbol ... #*. Islam does not admit too close a connection between the divine and the human realms. As a prophet and apostle without reproach, Jesus knew where he stood before God, and never claimed the absurdities later bestowed upon him by his followers. He was a true Muslim and professed the one God of the Qur'an. According to the understanding of the Muslim exegetes, every detail in Jesus' life stood in diametrical opposition to divine life and to the absurd Christian allegations of divinity made about him. Choice evidence used by Muslims against the Christian claims were the Gospel verses where Jesus addressed a divine being outside himself, or where he just mentioned God in his discourse, or even where one of the Evangelists spoke of Jesus in relation to God. These were seen as ideal proof that Christ himself was not God. Alternatively, the concept of

'divinity' could occasionally be preserved and the term 'god' reinterpreted in a symbolic sense when applied to Christ. The evidence belonging under the present theme was primarily 'internal'.

(5) *Jesus was not Son but son (reinterpretation of 'sonship' and 'fatherhood'): symbol ... \$.* A somewhat more creative and illuminated approach adopted by some of the Muslim writers in their exegetical discourse on Christian doctrines was the attempt at rescuing one of the most essential biblical titles for Christ: 'Son of God'. Rather than reiterating the pointless accusation that Christians were attributing human characteristics to God through this title, several Muslim authors undertook to explore alternative implications for the term, reinterpreting 'sonship' and 'fatherhood' into concepts more acceptable to Islamic thinking. It has to be said, to their credit, that several of them did come close to theological solutions that preserved many important aspects of Christian Christology. But it is perhaps due to the fact that the effort was born primarily as a polemical strategy that it was not more fruitful, and did not become the basis of a more creative and mutually upbuilding dialogue.

(c) *The Bible*

(6) *The Injil is an authoritative document, part of the revealed books: symbol ... %.* Ibn Qutayba and al-Ya'qūbī are the two main representatives of this first attitude towards the Gospels. Since Ibn Qutayba's works are quite full of biblical citations, we have limited ourselves to passages taken from three of his works only. These are mainly the ones mentioned in Gérard Lecomte's study of Ibn Qutayba's citations from the Bible.<sup>10</sup> Al-Ya'qūbī, on the other hand, reproduces such an extensive portion of the Gospels with no particular exegetical purpose that most of it could fit under this heading. Due to the nature of the present exegetical theme, it is mainly by comparing the exegesis of these authors with that of others among their coreligionists that the particularity of their position emerges.

(7) *The Injil is a reliable document for Ḥadīth interpretation: symbol ... @.* Even more so than the preceding theme, the present theme reflects a very positive attitude towards the Gospels on the part of a Muslim author. Ḥadīth interpretation was one of the most important disciplines in Islam, and for some Schools, only material originating from within Islam would have been considered a legitimate source both for the interpretation and for the authentication of the genre. That such an important religious figure as Ibn Qutayba should make extensive use of the Bible as an additional tool for the authentication of Muslim traditions is quite significant.

The evidence of Gospel usage in *Kitāb ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth* by Ibn Qutayba is in fact most interesting from among his works for our purpose, as there is a more precise argumentative and exegetical purpose behind it. The author tends to use the Gospel text as a reliable witness to support his own inclination in the authentication of Ḥadīth. He often cites it after he has quoted other traditions, apparently using it as his final word on the matter.

(8) *Islamization of the Gospel text (reinterpretation through translation): symbol ... =.* In this third theme derived from the attitude of Muslim authors towards the Christian

Scriptures, we encounter a less optimistic approach than in the two examined previously. While authors in the last two made virtually unconditional and unqualified use of the Gospels, in this third ‘biblical’ theme, a more critical outlook is displayed. The archetypical example of this approach of ‘Islamization of the Gospel text’ is the treatise of our first author, al-Qāsim al-Rassī, where the first eight chapters of Matthew’s Gospel are retranslated almost in full, but with additions, subtractions and alterations to make them more compatible with the Islamic world-view. In a sense, one can say that the philosophy behind his attitude towards the Christian scriptures is not very different from the early Christian attitude towards the Hebrew scriptures. He viewed Islam as an extension and culmination of God’s revelation to humanity, and he sought the appropriation of former ‘revealed books’ for the new religion. His approach, however, differs from that of the early mainline Christian Fathers in that alterations are brought to the received texts, and doubts are expressed as to the reliability and honesty of the transmitters. A striking parallel attitude among early Christians can be found in someone like Marcion, who charged that the Gospels were full of ‘Judaizing’ influences, and felt it was his duty to purge these received texts from any passages reflecting ‘unfaithful transmission’. Only attention to detail and careful choice of words will usually uncover some of the deeper intentions of authors adopting that approach.

(9) *Tahrīf*: *symbol ... ~*. The general scholarly opinion leans towards the impression that the accusation of *tahrīf* is the starting point of the Muslim polemical discourse. For example, Fr Thomas Michel, in his extensive introduction to Ibn Taymiyya, asserts that ‘the question of *tahrīf* was a central issue in all polemical debates between Christians and Muslims’. Michel discerns two types of accusations on the part of Muslims which started early in the polemical tradition: (1) *tahrīf al-lafẓ*, which refers to actual textual corruption of a revealed book by its receivers; and (2) *tahrīf al-ma’nā*, which rather refers to the misinterpretation of a text. While Michel considers the second accusation as the most widespread in the earlier polemical period of ‘Alī al-Ṭabarī, al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm and al-Ḥasan b. Ayyūb, as well as among the later Ash‘arite polemicists, such as al-Bāqillānī, al-Ghazālī and Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī, he discerns a principal alteration to this mood in the writings of Ibn Ḥazm during the first part of the eleventh century. According to this last writer, the Bible was ‘an anti-scripture, “an accursed book”, the product of satanic inspiration’. Although his extremist position was not adopted generally by subsequent writers, Ibn Ḥazm’s writings marked a definite change in the more optimistic mood of the earlier period.<sup>11</sup>

After a detailed examination of the 23 plus treatises of the present study, although I would agree with most of Fr Michel’s very accurate picture of the *tahrīf* accusation, I would nevertheless question the assumption that the accusation was ‘central’ to the debate right from the beginning. It is true that *tahrīf* became *eventually* a central point of debate between Muslim and Christian polemicists, but it might be useful to attempt to trace its entry into the Islamic discourse in order to determine the exact nature of the argument. In the qur’ānic context, *tahrīf* is principally an ambiguous accusation raised against the Jews (see Q. 2:75, 4:46, 5:13, 5:41). One should not, therefore, too quickly conclude that these verses were automatically understood in the sense of *textual* corruption of the whole Bible.

Although I would not claim, based on a closer study of the material, that Muslim authors considered the Gospels to be at the same level of authority and reliability as the

Qur'ān—that was of course out of the question—nevertheless, I believe it can be demonstrated that until the time of Ibn Ḥazm in the eleventh century, the accusation of *tahrīf* in the sense of ‘intentional corruption of the Holy Scriptures’ was virtually non-existent. Even where some grave and serious suspicions were raised against the integrity of the text, the accusation can certainly not be considered to have been a *central* or *foundational* element of the Muslim discourse against Christianity. If it has become the starting point of that discourse today, it is certainly worth knowing that it has not always been the case, and that it is therefore possible to think otherwise. Even after Ibn Ḥazm, as late as the fourteenth century, Ibn Taymiyya recognized that the Islamic position towards *tahrīf* as textual corruption was still diverse and ambiguous:

If...they [Christians] mean that the Qur'ān confirms the textual veracity [*alfāz*] of the scriptural books which they now possess—that is, the Torah and the Gospels—this is something which some Muslims will grant them and which many Muslims will dispute. However, most Muslims will grant them most of that.

On the other hand, the Islamic position towards misinterpretation was unambiguous:

Concerning the corruption of the meaning of the sacred books by their explanation and interpretation and their replacing its legal judgments with their own, all Muslims, Jews, and Christians witness to this corruption and substitution of theirs.<sup>12</sup>

The two different attitudes that Muslims could hold towards the ‘corruption’ of the Scriptures, as confirmed in Ibn Taymiyya’s first statement, gave rise to two different approaches to biblical exegesis. In the traditional, pre-Ibn Ḥazm period, the Bible was used ‘positively’ to build pro-Islamic arguments against Christian doctrines. In the new approach of Ibn Ḥazm and his inheritors, the Bible is used ‘negatively’ to demonstrate its textual corruption. In the ‘traditional’ approach, some biblical passages do indeed appear unacceptable to the author, and the problem is pointed out in passing as something intriguing, hardly ever in connection with the actual term *tahrīf*. With the ‘new’ approach, on the other hand, the argument of *tahrīf* is actually developed intentionally, and this is done mainly by comparing passages that appear to the author to be contradicting each other. This ‘comparative’ approach to exegesis is the chief basis of Ibn Ḥazm’s work and was hardly found before him. It should be noted as well, however, that Ibn Ḥazm’s close contemporary, al-Juwaynī, made use of a similar comparative critical methodology. The fact that it is difficult to establish a relationship between them, whether direct or indirect, seems to suggest that they had learnt their approach independently. If in all the texts that I have surveyed I have not been able to find this influence, it is clear that some more research needs to be done in this area.

It may be pointed out in conclusion that Ibn Ḥazm’s outrage about the biblical text, which was to affect Muslim–Christian dialogue ever after, was the result of his reading of the Gospels as ‘histories’ through chiefly Islamic eyes, armed with the qur’ānic notion of *‘iṣma* (inerrancy). Like him, al-Juwaynī approached the Bible and the Evangelists from the typically Islamic view of divine inspiration—the same notion of divine dictation applied by Muslims to the Qur’ān, which is meant to guarantee its infallibility.

#### (d) The Church

(10) *Christians are unfaithful receivers of Jesus’ message: symbol ... \.* One interesting

section in (Pseudo-) ‘Umar II, and one which was not common in the polemical works of the time, is the accusation that Christians do not put into practice the precepts that Jesus taught in the Gospels.<sup>13</sup> This section is interesting especially because it contains numerous quotations from the New Testament, once again mainly from the Gospel of Matthew. The author’s purpose in quoting those passages is not to criticize the biblical text or even Christian doctrines, but simply to condemn the Christians for not putting their founder’s teaching into practice. This differs quite a bit from the purpose of most other Muslim writers. But at the same time, it may be seen as belonging to the traditional Muslim claim that Islam is a more worthy and faithful receiver of the Jesus tradition than Christianity. When attention is given to the work as a whole, its rhetorical context begins to emerge. At several points in his final apologetic section, the author introduces his statements with: ‘And you have written, reproaching us ...’, or simply with: ‘And you reproach us for ...’<sup>14</sup> It is clear that the author was writing in response to some precise Christian polemical arguments—namely a letter of Leo III or some fictive developments of it—and the middle section where he criticizes Christian behaviour should be read as his counter-attack, in direct parallel to the final section where he defends Islamic ethical and cultic issues. He is returning the attack of his correspondent, showing that it is Christianity rather than Islam that has misunderstood and taken lightly the Divine precepts.

(e) *Islam and Muhammad*

(11) *Islam and Muhammad are the fulfilment of Christianity: symbol ...* (. And (tell) of Jesus the son of Mary, who said to the Israelites: ‘I am sent forth to you from God to confirm the Torah already revealed, and to give news of an apostle that will come after me whose name is Aḥmad’. Yet when he brought them clear signs, they said: ‘This is plain sorcery’.<sup>15</sup>

One particular Muslim exegetical strategy used for the recommendation of Islam represents the emerging religion as the final fulfilment of God’s revelation. What we are witnessing here is an adaptation to the Christian–Muslim context of the technique used by early Christians to establish continuity with Judaism. From that perspective, the whole Bible is reread from a ‘Muhammado-centric’ perspective, just as early Christians (already in the New Testament itself) had reread the Old Testament from a ‘Christo-centric’ perspective. One leading qur’ānic verse that has sanctioned that effort is from *Sūrat al-Ṣaff* cited above. From the moment that Muslim authors read in their Holy Book the claim of a pre-announcement of their prophet in the words of ‘Īsā, they set about probing the Christian Gospels in search of the hard evidence.

(12) *Qur’ānic notions of paradise conform with biblical notions: symbol ...* [. Another major problem that Muslims had to deal with in the face of Christian polemics was the very different notion which they held about paradise. However, they managed to find several verses in the Gospels from which they drew a depiction of the Christian paradise that conformed with its qur’ānic counterpart, equally equipped with food, drink and pleasures.

(13) *Muhammad was truly a prophet: symbol ...* {. One factor that quickly became something of an embarrassment for Islam was the fact that Muhammad had performed



no miracles. Criticism of this fact was already being raised during his lifetime, as evidenced in such as the following qur'ānic verses:

They say: 'We will not believe in you until you make a spring gush from the earth before our very eyes, or cause rivers to flow in a grove of palms and vines; until you cause the sky to fall upon us in pieces, as you have threatened to do, or bring down God and the angels in our midst; until you build a house of gold, or ascend to heaven: nor will we believe in your ascent until you have sent down for us a book which we can read'. Say: 'Glory to my Lord! Surely I am no more than an apostle made of flesh and blood'.<sup>16</sup>

The final demand to send down 'a book which we can read' represents the beginning of what, especially in the ninth century, would develop into the elaborate argument of *ī-jāz al-Qur'ān*.<sup>17</sup> Short of the conventional miracles as signs of his prophethood, Muhammad's answer to the demand is reflected a few verses later. It is the Qur'ān itself that is his miracle, the sign given to him by God: 'We have revealed the Koran with the Truth, and with the Truth it has come down. We have sent you forth only to proclaim good news and to give warning'.<sup>18</sup>

Although this apologetic stance was not very common among Muslim polemicists against Christianity, but was rather confined to the literary genres more specifically concerned with this question, the argument is found in al-Ṭabarī's second work, *Kitāb al-dīn wa-al-dawla*.<sup>19</sup> Like several other sections in this treatise, al-Ṭabarī was introducing here an argument not commonly found in Muslim treatises of the same genre. There is substantial evidence, however, in Christian works of our period—which discussed the different grounds upon which one accepts or rejects a particular religion—that reflects the same scepticism with regard to Muhammad's prophethood on the basis of the same argument.

(14) *Muhammad was the promised Paraclete: symbol ...* <. The Johannine passages on the Paraclete have always been among the most popular with Muslim authors. Very early, after it had failed to secure the support of Christians and Jews, Islam adopted a new tactic, which had already been used in the past by Christianity, namely the demonstration of their founder's authentic prophetic calling through the testimony of the venerable religious books of the religions they were seeking to convince. There was ample praise in the Qur'ān for the *Tawrāt*, the *Zabūr* and the *Injīl* to legitimize such an endeavour as soon as someone would appear with a good enough knowledge of the Judeo-Christian Scriptures. Although early traces of such a usage of the Christian Gospels can already be found in the words of Patriarch Timothy I's interlocutor, the Caliph al-Mahdī, in the late eighth century, this undertaking would not become fully fledged until the contribution of the Christian convert to Islam, 'Alī al-Ṭabarī, in the middle of the ninth century. From this author onwards, the Paraclete passages acquired such a prominent position in the Muslim discourse addressing Christianity that they would quickly come to receive a life of their own. It is for this reason that it has become extremely difficult to sort them out neatly and to separate the different verses from one another in line with their canonical counterparts. When speaking of Paraclete passages, we are therefore dealing with citations of Johannine verses made up of all sorts of

combinations of essentially the following: Jn 14.15–18; 14.23; 14.25–30; 15.7; 15.26–27; 16.7–8; 16.12–14; c. 16.25.

### **Index of Gospel Citations**

Usually when it is not clear from which of the Synoptic Gospels an account is taken, if it is interesting for comparative purposes, I have included an entry in each of the Gospels containing it. When the name of the Gospel is explicitly stated by an author, I have sometimes still included an entry in a parallel account if it is interesting for comparative purposes, usually italicizing it. But more generally, I have confined the entry to the Gospel explicitly stated by the author.

#### *Matthew*

Mt 1.1, Mt 1.2–14, Mt 1.15, Mt 1.16, Mt 1.17, Mt 1.18, Mt 1.19, Mt 1.20, Mt 1.21, Mt 1.23, Mt 1.24–25, Mt 2.1, Mt 2.10–11, Mt 2.13–14, Mt 2.15, Mt 2.19–21, Mt 2.22–23, Mt 3.11, Mt 3.12, Mt 3.13, Mt 3.14, Mt 3.15, Mt 3.16, Mt 3.17, Mt 4.1, Mt 4.2, Mt 4.3–4, Mt 4.5–7, Mt 4.8, Mt 4.9, Mt 4.10, Mt 4.11, Mt 4.12–14, Mt 4.15–17, Mt 4.18–22, Mt 4.23–25, Mt 5.1–3, Mt 5.4–5, Mt 5.6, Mt 5.7, Mt 5.8, Mt 5.9, Mt 5.10–12, Mt 5.13–14, Mt 5.15–16, Mt 5.17, Mt 5.18, Mt 5.19, Mt 5.20, Mt 5.21, Mt 5.22, Mt 5.23–24, Mt 5.25, Mt 5.27–28, Mt 5.29, Mt 5.30, Mt 5.31, Mt 5.32, Mt 5.33, Mt 5.34, Mt 5.35, Mt 5.36, Mt 5.37, Mt 5.38, Mt 5.39, Mt 5.40–41, Mt 5.42–43, Mt 5.44, Mt 5.45, Mt 5.46, Mt 5.48, Mt 6.1, Mt 6.3, Mt 6.4, Mt 6.5, Mt 6.6, Mt 6.7–8, Mt 6.9–10, Mt 6.11, Mt 6.12, Mt 6.13, Mt 6.14, Mt 6.16–18, Mt 6.19, Mt 6.20, Mt 6.21–y22, Mt 6.23, Mt 6.24, Mt 6.25–26, Mt 6.27, Mt 6.28–31, Mt 6.32, Mt 6.33, Mt 6.34, Mt 7.1, Mt 7.2, Mt 7.3, Mt 7.4, Mt 7.5, Mt 7.6, Mt 7.7, Mt 7.8–11, Mt 7.12, Mt 7.13–14, Mt 7.15–16, Mt 7.17–18, Mt 7.19–20, Mt 7.21, Mt 7.22–23, Mt 7.24–27, Mt 7.28–29, Mt 8.4, Mt 8.11–12, Mt 8.19–22, Mt 9.2, Mt 9.9, Mt 9.12, Mt 9.18, Mt 9.23–25, Mt 10.1–6, Mt 10.(9–)10, Mt 10.12–14, Mt 10.16, Mt 10.20, Mt 10.23, Mt 10.33, Mt 10.34, Mt 10.35–36, Mt 10.40, Mt 10.41, Mt 11.2–3, Mt 11.9–10, Mt 11.11, Mt 11.13, Mt 11.14–15, Mt 11.25, Mt 11.27, Mt 12.18, Mt 12.(38–)39, Mt 12.40, Mt 12.41, Mt 12.46, Mt 12.47–49, Mt 12.50, Mt 13.31–32, Mt 13.53, Mt 13.54, Mt 13.55, Mt 13.56, Mt 13.57, Mt 13.58, Mt 14.1–2, Mt 14.3–5, Mt 14.6–7, Mt 14.8, Mt 14.10–11, Mt 14.12, Mt 14.13, Mt 14.(22)25–31, Mt 15.24, Mt 16.13–15, Mt 16.16, Mt 16.17, Mt 16.18, Mt 16.19, Mt 16.21–22, Mt 16.23, Mt 16.26, Mt 16.28, Mt 17.5, Mt 17.10–12, Mt 17.14–18, Mt 17.19–20, Mt 17.22–23, Mt 18.15–17, Mt 18.18, Mt 18.19–20, Mt 18.21–22, Mt 19.16, Mt 19.17, Mt 19.21, Mt 19.28, Mt 19.29, Mt 20.1–16, Mt 20.20–23, Mt 21.1, Mt 21.2, Mt 21.3–7, Mt 21.18, Mt 21.19–21, Mt 21.22, Mt 21.42, Mt 21.43, Mt 21.44, Mt 21.45–46, Mt 22.30, Mt 22.41–46, Mt 23.9, Mt 23.10, Mt 23.30, Mt 23.32–33, Mt 23.34, Mt 23.35–39, Mt 24.20, Mt 24.24, Mt 24.35, Mt 24.36, Mt 25.32, Mt 25.33, Mt 25.34, Mt 25.35, Mt 25.40, Mt 25.41, Mt 25.42–43, Mt 26.14, Mt 26.15, Mt 26.24, Mt 26.26–28, Mt 26.29, Mt 26.31, Mt 26.33, Mt 26.34, Mt 26.35, Mt 26.37, Mt 26.38, Mt 26.39, Mt 26.40, Mt 26.41, Mt 26.42, Mt 26.47, Mt 26.48–50, Mt 26.51, Mt 26.52, Mt 26.53, Mt 26.54, Mt 26.56, Mt 26.58, Mt 26.60–61, Mt 26.63, Mt 26.64, Mt 26.67–68, Mt 27.3–5, Mt 27.11, Mt 27.26, Mt 27.29, Mt 27.30, Mt 27.31, Mt 27.32, Mt 27.34, Mt 27.37, Mt 27.38, Mt 27.39, Mt 27.40, Mt 27.42, Mt 27.44, Mt 27.46, Mt 27.48, Mt 27.50–52, Mt 27.59–60, Mt 28.1, Mt 28.2–4, Mt 28.5–6, Mt 28.7–8, Mt 28.9–10, Mt 28.19, Mt 28.20.

*Mark*

Mk 1.1–2, Mk 1.4, Mk 1.6, Mk 1.9–11, Mk 1.14–15, Mk 1.16–18, Mk 1.19–20, Mk 1.44, Mk 2.16, Mk 4.38, Mk 5.13, Mk 6.2–3, Mk 6.4, Mk 6.5, Mk 9.1, Mk 9.31–32, Mk 10.17, Mk 10.18, Mk 10.19, Mk 10.25, Mk 10.28–30, Mk 10.45, Mk 11.1–7, Mk 11.12–13, Mk 11.21–23, Mk 12.29, Mk 13.22, Mk 13.30, Mk 13.31, Mk 13.32, Mk 14.25, Mk 14.30, Mk 14.31, Mk 14.34, Mk 14.35, Mk 14.36, Mk 14.41–43, Mk 14.50–52, Mk 14.66–72, Mk 15.21, Mk 15.27, Mk 15.28–30, Mk 15.32, Mk 15.34, Mk 15.46, Mk 16.1–7, Mk 16.9–14, Mk 16.15–16, Mk 16.17–18, Mk 16.19.

*Luke*

Lk 1.1, Lk 1.2, Lk 1.3, Lk 1.4, Lk 1.5, Lk 1.6–7, Lk 1.10–25, Lk 1.26–27, Lk 1.28–30, Lk 1.31, Lk 1.32, Lk 1.33, Lk 1.34–35, Lk 1.36, Lk 1.37–38, Lk 1.40–44, Lk 1.57, Lk 1.59–60, Lk 1.64, Lk 1.67–70, Lk 2.1, Lk 2.4, Lk 2.5–6, Lk 2.7, Lk 2.9–10, Lk 2.12, Lk 2.21, Lk 2.22–24, Lk 2.25, Lk 2.27–28, Lk 2.29–30, Lk 2.39, Lk 2.40, Lk 2.41, Lk 2.42, Lk 2.43–45, Lk 2.46, Lk 2.47, Lk 2.48, Lk 2.49–50, Lk 2.51, Lk 2.52, Lk 3.16, Lk 3.23, Lk 3.24, Lk 3.25–38, Lk 4.1–9, Lk 4.10, Lk 4.11–12, Lk 4.16–17, Lk 4.18, Lk 4.19–20, Lk 4.22, Lk 4.23, Lk 4.24, Lk 5.1–11, Lk 6.27–28, Lk 6.35–36, Lk 7.16, Lk 7.19, Lk 7.22–23, Lk 8.42, Lk 8.49–56, Lk 9.20, Lk 9.27, Lk 9.28–30, Lk 9.32, Lk 9.34, Lk 9.52–54, Lk 9.55, Lk 9.56, Lk 9.57–58, Lk 10.1–2, Lk 10.16, Lk 12–10, Lk 12.49, Lk 12.50–53, Lk 13.31–33, Lk 14.13–15, Lk 16.17, Lk 18.31–34, Lk 19.29–30, Lk 22.28–29, Lk 22.30, Lk 22.34, Lk 22.35–36, Lk 22.41, Lk 22.42, Lk 22.43, Lk 22.44, Lk 22.45, Lk 22.51, Lk 22.54–60, Lk 22.64, Lk 23.1, Lk 23.7, Lk 23.9, Lk 23.11, Lk 23.26, Lk 23.33, Lk 23.34, Lk 23.35, Lk 23.39–43, Lk 23.46, Lk 23.52–53, Lk 24.1–5, Lk 24.9–14, Lk 24.15–16, Lk 24.17–20, Lk 24.25–26, Lk 24.33–35, Lk 24.36, Lk 24.37, Lk 24.38–39, Lk 24.40, Lk 24.41, Lk 24.42, Lk 24.43.

*John*

Jn 1.1, Jn 1.2, Jn 1.3, Jn 1.4, Jn 1.5, Jn 1.6–9, Jn 1.10, Jn 1.11, Jn 1.12, Jn 1.13, Jn 1.14, Jn 1.15, Jn 1.16, Jn 1.17, Jn 1.18, Jn 1.19–21, Jn 1.22–23, Jn 1.29–30, Jn 1.32, Jn 1.34, Jn 1.35–42, Jn 1.45, Jn 2.11, Jn 2.12, Jn 2.18–20, Jn 3.2, Jn 3.13, Jn 3.35, Jn 4.19, Jn 4.20–21, Jn 4.44, Jn 5.17, Jn 5.18, Jn 5.21–22, Jn 5.24, Jn 5.26, Jn 5.27, Jn 5.30, Jn 5.31–32, Jn 5.36, Jn 5.44, Jn 6.14, Jn 6.27, Jn 6.28–32, Jn 6.38(–39), Jn 6.51, Jn 6.53–55, Jn 6.56, Jn 6.60, Jn 6.66, Jn 7.3–4, Jn 7.5, Jn 7.14–15, Jn 7.16, Jn 7.17–18, Jn 7.28, Jn 7.29, Jn 7.30, Jn 7.32, Jn 7.45–48, Jn 7.50–52, Jn 8.3, Jn 8.11, Jn 8.12, Jn 8.14, Jn 8.15–16, Jn 8.17, Jn 8.18, Jn 8.26, Jn 8.28, Jn 8.38, Jn 8.39, Jn 8.40, Jn 8.41–42, Jn 8.43, Jn 8.44, Jn 8.48–50, Jn 8.55, Jn 8.56–57, Jn 8.58, Jn 9.5, Jn 9.6–7, Jn 9.35–38, Jn 10.10, Jn 10.11 (10.14), Jn 10.18, Jn 10.24, Jn 10.30, Jn 10.31–32, Jn 10.33, Jn 10.34, Jn 10.35–36, Jn 10.37, Jn 11.1, Jn 11.17, Jn 11.33, Jn 11.34, Jn 11.38–39, Jn 11.41–42, Jn 11.43–53, Jn 12.6, Jn 12.13–14, Jn 12.27, Jn 12.44–45, Jn 12.47, Jn 12.48, Jn 12.49–50, Jn 13.5, Jn 13.15, Jn 13.16/15.20, Jn 13.21, Jn 13.31, Jn 13.33, Jn 13.38, Jn 14.1, Jn 14.2, Jn 14.8, Jn 14.9, Jn 14.10, Jn 14.11, Jn 14.12, Jn 14.15, Jn 14.16, Jn 14.17, Jn 14.18, Jn 14.20, Jn 14.23, Jn 14.24, Jn 14.25, Jn 14.26, Jn 14.27, Jn 14.28, Jn 14.29, Jn 14.30, Jn 14.31, Jn 15.1, Jn 15.7, Jn 15.8, Jn 15.15, Jn 15.23–25, Jn 15.26–27, Jn 16.1, Jn 16.4–5, Jn 16.7–8, Jn 16.12, Jn 16.13, Jn 16.14, Jn 16.16, Jn 16.25, Jn 16.28, Jn 17.1, Jn 17.2, Jn 17.3, Jn 17.4, Jn 17.5, Jn 17.8, Jn 17.11, Jn 17.12, Jn 17.17, Jn 17.18, Jn 17.19–21, Jn 17.22, Jn 17.23a, Jn 17.26, Jn

18.1, Jn 18.2, Jn 18.3, Jn 18.4–8, Jn 18.9, Jn 18.10–11, Jn 18.12–17, Jn 18.19, Jn 18.22, Jn 18.33–34, Jn 18.36, Jn 19.1, Jn 19.2, Jn 19.3, Jn 19.5–7, Jn 19.9–11, Jn 19.16, Jn 19.17a, Jn 19.17b–19, Jn 19.21–23, Jn 19.25–26, Jn 19.28, Jn 19.29–30, Jn 19.32, Jn 19.34, Jn 19.38–40, Jn 19.41, Jn 20.1–3, Jn 20.5–6, Jn 20.10–11, Jn 20.12, Jn 20.13, Jn 20.14, Jn 20.15–16, Jn 20.17, Jn 20.18, Jn 20.19, Jn 20.20, Jn 20.21, Jn 20.23, Jn 20.24–25, Jn 20.26, Jn 20.27, Jn 20.28, Jn 20.29, Jn 21.1–2, c. Jn 21.13, c. Jn 21.15–17.

*Note:* The number in the first column on the left side of the table indicates simply the number of times that a passage is found in the 23 works studied. The table will be published in four instalments as follows. *Part I:* Citations from the beginning of Matthew's Gospel until the end of the 'Sermon on the Mount'. *Part II:* Citations from Matthew 8 until the end of Matthew's Gospel. *Part III:* Citations from Mark and Luke's Gospels. *Part IV:* Citations from John's Gospel.

## NOTES

1. Tarif Khalidi (ed. & trans.), *The Muslim Jesus: sayings and stories in Islamic literature* (Cambridge MA, Harvard University Press, 2001).
2. *Ibid.*, 30.
3. *Ibid.*, 29.
4. One can refer to many such examples especially in Ibn Qutayba's *Kitāb ta'wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth* (see references to this work in Table 1).
5. When two page numbers occur in a citation of al-Jāḥiẓ, the first represents the pagination of Finkel's edition, the second that of al-Sharqāwī.
6. This entry represents the text edited in D. Sourdel, 'Un pamphlet musulman anonyme d'époque 'abbāside contre les chrétiens', *Revue des Études Islamiques* 34 (1966), 1–33. However, there are some complexities in the history of its transmission whose elaboration cannot find its place in the present article. In fact, the text edited by Sourdel seems to be a late edition of the Muslim side of an early debate that took place between Emperor Leo III and 'Umar II in the eighth century. For all practical purposes and due to remaining uncertainties, I consider it as a representative of ninth-century material. For a good evaluation of the evidence and some light on the complex emergence of the text, refer to Robert Hoyland, 'The correspondence of Leo III (717–41) and 'Umar II (717–20)', *Aram* 6:1 (1994), 165–77.
7. Most of the text of Ibn Ayyūb's *Risāla* survives thanks to Ibn Taymiyya, who preserved it in his treatise entitled *Al-jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ li-man baddala dīn al-masīḥ*. All references to the citations gathered from Ibn Taymiyya are marked with the abbreviation *Tay*, followed by the page numbering of the Cairo edition of *Al-jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ*, vol. I, part 2. The other citations, preceded with the abbreviation *Sep*, are from Floris Sepmeijer's edition of the *Risāla* that he prepared for his PhD thesis: 'Een weerlegging van het Christendom uit de 10e eeuw. De brief van al-Ḥasan b. Ayyub aan zijn broer 'Ali', PhD thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (Kampen, W. van den Berg), 1985. These represent traditions supposedly preserved by Naṣr b. Yaḥyā al-Mutaṭṭabbib, in *Al-naṣīḥa al-īmāniyya fī fadīḥat al-milla al-naṣrāniyya*. Again, the questions relating to the edition of this letter by Sepmeijer are complex. I have argued in my thesis that many of the passages from Naṣr b. Yaḥyā, which Sepmeijer attributes to Ibn Ayyūb, in fact seem to belong to Ibn Yaḥyā himself. This is a question that I cannot discuss further in the present context.
8. The authorship of this work is a complex issue once again. It was originally considered authentic by its editor and translator F. Robert Chidiac, SJ, *Une réfutation excellente de la divinité de Jésus-Christ d'après le texte même de l'évangile*, Paris, 1939, disputed by Bouyges in a posthumous publication in 1959: P. Bouyges, *Essai de chronologie des oeuvres de al-Ghazālī*, ed. M. Allard (Beirut, 1959), 125–6. In 1975, the genuine authorship was extensively refuted by Hava Lazarus-Yafēh, *Studies in al-Ghazzālī* (Jerusalem, 1975). But after a thorough examination of her arguments in my thesis, I remain unconvinced and have therefore left the issue open by attributing it to a (Pseudo-) Ghazālī, keeping the 'Pseudo' between parentheses.
9. See for example al-Ṭabarī, *Radd*, 121; Ibn Ayyūb, *Risāla*, in Ibn Taymiyya, *Al-jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ*, I,

- 2:360; and the citation of the whole Nicene Creed in al-Qarāfī, *Al-ajwiba al-fākhira*, 308–9, followed by a discussion and refutation of the creedal statements on the basis of the biblical text.
10. Gérard Lecomte, ‘Les citations de l’ancien et du nouveau testament dans l’oeuvre d’Ibn Qutayba’, *Arabica* 5 (1958), 34–46.
  11. Thomas F. Michel SJ, *A Muslim Theologian’s Response to Christianity: Ibn Taymiyya’s Al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ* (New York, 1984), 89–90.
  12. This and the previous citation are from Ibn Taymiyya’s *Al-jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ*, according to the English translation of Michel, *A Muslim Theologian’s Response*, 213.
  13. (Pseudo-) ‘Umar II, ‘Un pamphlet musulman anonyme’, 29–31.
  14. *Ibid.*, 31–3.
  15. Q. 61:6.
  16. Q. 17:90–3.
  17. In this argument, the Qur’ān is represented as Muhammad’s greatest and only miracle mainly through the claims of the Book’s inimitability and of the messenger’s illiteracy. For a full discussion of the argument, refer to the article of G. E. von Grunebaum, ‘I’djāz’, *EF*<sup>2</sup>, III, 1018.
  18. Q. 17:105.
  19. ‘The refutation of those who claim that the *muhājirūn* and the *anṣār* entered the religion [of Islam] without [witnessing] any sign’; see al-Ṭabarī, *Kitāb al-dīn wa-al-dawla*, 124–9.

## Bibliography of Primary Sources

### Ras

DI MATTEO, Ignazio, ‘Confutazione contro I cristiani dello zaydita Al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm’, *Rivista degli Studi Orientali* (Rome) 9 (1922), 301–64 (abbrev: Al-Rassī, *Radd*).

### Ĵz

AL-JĀḤIZ, Abū ‘Uthmān ‘Amr b. Baḥr, *Three Essays of Abū ‘Othmān ‘Amr b. Baḥr al-Ĵāḥiẓ*, ed. J. Finkel, Cairo, 1926.

AL-JĀḤIZ, Abū ‘Uthmān ‘Amr b. Baḥr, *Al-mukhtār fī al-radd ‘alā al-naṣārā*, ed. Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh Sharqāwī, Cairo, 1984.

### TabRN

KHALIFÉ, I. A. & KUTSCH, W., ‘Ar-radd ‘alā-n-naṣārā’, *Mélanges de l’Université Saint Joseph* (Beirut) 36:4 (1959), 115–48 (abbrev: Al-Ṭabarī, *Radd*).

### TabDD

AL-ṬABARĪ, ‘Alī, *The Book of Religion and Empire*, trans. A. Mingana, Manchester, 1922.

AL-ṬABARĪ, ‘Alī, *Kitāb al-dīn wa-al-dawla*, ed. A. Mingana, Manchester, 1923.

### Qut’Uy

IBN QUTAYBA, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. Muslim, *Kitāb ‘uyūn al-akhbār*. 4 vols, Cairo, 1925–30.

### QutMu

IBN QUTAYBA, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. Muslim, *Kitāb ta’wīl mukhtalif al-ḥadīth*, Cairo, 1908.

IBN QUTAYBA, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. Muslim, *Le traité des divergences du ḥadīth d’Ibn Qutayba*, trans. G. Lecomte, Damascus, 1962.

### QutMa

IBN QUTAYBA, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdallāh b. Muslim, *Kitāb al-ma’ārif*, ed. Saroite Okacha, Cairo, 1960.

### Yā’

AL-YA’QŪBI, Aḥmad b. Abī Ya’qūb, *Ta’rīkh*, ed. M. Th. Houtsma, 2 vols, Leiden, 1883.

### ‘Um

(PSEUDO-) ‘UMAR II, ‘Un pamphlet musulman anonyme d’époque “abbāsīde contre les chrétiens”’, ed. & trans. D. Sourdel, *Revue des Études Islamiques* 34 (1966), 1–33.

*Nash*

VAN ESS, Josef, *Frühe Mu'tazilitische Häresiographie: Zwei Werke des Nāshi' al-Akbar (Gest. 293 H.)*. Herausgegeben und Eingeleitet, Beirut, 1971.

*Bal*

(Preserved in Ibn Zur'a's refutation of the work) in Sbath, Paul (Ed.), *Vingt traités philosophiques et apologétiques d'auteurs arabes chrétiens du IXème au XIVème siècle*, Cairo, 1929, 52–68.

*Mat*

AL-MĀTURĪDĪ, Abū Mansūr Muṣammad b. Muḥammad b. Maḥmūd al-Samarqandī, *Kitāb al-tawḥīd*, ed. Fathallāh Khulaif, Beirut, 1970.

*Mas*

AL-MAS'ŪDĪ, Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī b. al-Ḥusayn, *Murūj al-dhahab wa-ma'ādīn al-jawhar*, ed. Ch. Pellat, Beirut, 1965.

*Ay*

IBN TAYMIYYA, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad, *Al-jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ li-man baddala dīn al-masīḥ*, 4 parts in 2 vols, Cairo, 1905.

*(Ibn Ayyūb/Naṣr b. Yaḥyā)*

SEPMEEJER, Floris, 'Een weerlegging van het Christendom uit de 10e eeuw. De brief van al-Hasan b. Ayyub aan zijn broer 'Alī', PhD thesis, Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam (Kampen: W. van den Berg), 1985.

*'Am*

AL-'ĀMIRĪ, Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad, *Kitāb al-īlām bi-manāqib al-Islām (On the Merits of Islam)*, ed. Ahmad Abd al-Hamid Ghorab, Cairo, 1967.

*Baq*

AL-BĀQILĀNĪ, Abū Bakr Muḥammad b. al-Ṭayyib, *Kitāb tamhīd al-awā'il wa-talkhīṣ al-dalā'il*, ed. Richard J. McCarthy, Beirut, 1957.

*IH*

IBN ḤAZM, Abū Muḥammad 'Alī b. Aḥmad, *Kitāb al-fiṣal fī al-mīlāl wa-al-ahwā' wa-al-niḥāl*, 3 parts, Egypt, 1900.

*Juw*

AL-JUWAYNĪ, Abū al-Ma'ālī 'Abd al-Malik b. 'Abdallāh, *Textes apologétiques de Ġurwainī (m. 478/1085): Shifā' al-ghalīl fī al-tabdīl; luma' fī qawā'id ahl al-sunna*, ed. & trans. Michel Allard SJ, Beirut, 1968.

*Ghaz*

(PSEUDO-) GHAZĀLĪ, Abū Hāmid, *Al-radd al-jamīl li-ilāhiyyat 'Īsā bi-ṣarīḥ al-Injīl (Une réfutation excellente de la divinité de Jésus-Christ d'après le texte même de l'évangile)*, ed. & trans. Robert Chidiac, Paris, 1939.

*Shah*

(In the margins of) IBN ḤAZM, Abū Muḥammad 'Alī b. Aḥmad, *Kitāb al-fiṣal fī al-mīlāl wa-al-ahwā' wa-al-niḥāl*, 3 parts, Egypt, 1900.

*Qar*

AL-QARĀFĪ, Shihāb al-Dīn, *Al-ajwiba al-fākhira 'an al-as'ila al-fājira*, ed. Bakr Zakī 'Awaḍ, 2nd edn, Egypt, 1987.

*Tay*

IBN TAYMIYYA, Taqī al-Dīn Aḥmad, *Al-jawāb al-ṣaḥīḥ li-man baddala dīn al-masīḥ*, 4 parts in 2 vols, Cairo, 1905.

*Jaw*

IBN QAYYIM AL-JAWZIYYA, Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad b. Abī Bakr, *Hidāyat al-ḥayāra fī ajwibat al-yahūd wa-al-naṣārā*, ed. Aḥmad Ḥijāzī al-Saqqā, Egypt, 1980.







**Table—Continued.**

	Ras	Jz	Tab RN	Tab DD	Qut	Ya'	'Um	Nash	Bal	Mat	Mas	Ay	'Am	Baq	IH	Juw	Ghaz	Shah	Qar	Tay	Jaw	
3	Mt 3.15	325 =	140 +		76 =																	
3	Mt 3.16		141 +									Tay 323							314 +			
2	Mt 3.17		141 +								+	Tay 323										
5	Mt 4.1	324 =	132 +		76 =										2.16 ~				216 + =			
5	Mt 4.2	324 =	132 +		76 =										2.16 ~				217 + =			
7	Mt 4.3-4	324 \$ =	132 +	128 !{	76 =							Tay 324			2.16 + = ~				216-17 + =			
5	Mt 4.5-7		132 +		76 %							+ =			2.16 + = ~				217 + =			
5	Mt 4.8	324 *	122 *									Tay 325			2.16 ~				217 * + =			
			132 +									* +										
5	Mt 4.9	324 *	122 *									Tay 325			2.16 ~				217 * + =			
			132 +									* +							312 + =			
6	Mt 4.10	324 *	122 *		76 *							Tay 325			2.16 ~				217 * + =			
			132 +									* +										

Table—Continued.

	Ras	Jz	Tab RN	Tab DD	Qut	Ya'	'Um	Nash	Bal	Mat	Mas	Ay	'Am	Baq	IH	Juw	Ghaz	Shah	Qar	Tay	Jaw	
5	Mt	4.11	132	+	76	%						Tzy			2.16				217			+ =
2	Mt	4.12-14	325-6									+			~							
1	Mt	4.15-17													~	2.18						
2	Mt	4.18-22													~							
1	Mt	4.23-25	326												~							
2	Mt	5.1-3	326		76	%									~							
1	Mt	5.4-5	326												~							
3	Mt	5.6	326		76	=									~							
3	Mt	5.7	326												~							
2	Mt	5.8	326												~							
2	Mt	5.9	326												~							
1	Mt	5.10-12	326												~							
2	Mt	5.13-14	326												~							
1	Mt	5.15-16	326-7												~							
4	Mt	5.17	326-												~							

Table—Continued.

	Ras	Jz	Tab	Tab	Qut	Ya'	'Um	Nash	Bal	Mat	Mas	Ay	'Am	Baq	IH	Juw	Ghaz	Shah	Qar	Tay	Jaw
			RN	DD																	
7	%											1.63			\		402		265	\	\
2	Mtr	5.18	326-7												2.21	1.63					
			%												\						
3	Mtr	5.19	327												2.21						
			=												\						265
															2.21						\
1	Mtr	5.20	326-7												\						
			%																		
2	Mtr	5.21	327		76																
			=		%																
4	Mtr	5.22	327		76	30															
			=		%	\															
2	Mtr	5.23-24	327		76	30															
			%		\																
1	Mtr	5.25			76																
1	Mtr	5.27-28	om.		76																
			=		%																
3	Mtr	5.29	om.		77	30															
			=		%	\															
2	Mtr	5.30	om.			30															
			=			\															
1	Mtr	5.31	om.																		
			=																		
3	Mtr	5.32	om.		77																
			=		=																343
																					\

Table—Continued.

	Ras	Jz	Tab RN	Tab DD	Qut	Ya'	'Um	Nash	Bal	Mat	Mas	Ay	'Am	Baq	IH	Juw	Ghaz	Shah	Qar	Tay	Jaw		
2	Mt 5.33	327 %			<i>Mtu</i> 269 @																		
4	Mt 5.34	327 %			<i>Mtu</i> 269 @	77 =	30 \																
3	Mt 5.35	327 =			<i>Mtu</i> 269 @	77 =																	
2	Mt 5.36	327 %			<i>Mtu</i> 269 @	3	Mt 5.37327 \	% 327				269 <i>Mtu</i>		30									
2	Mt 5.38														2.22 ~				263				
6	Mt 5.39		133 (			77 %	29 \								2.22 ~				263			214 ~	
4	Mt 5.40-41		133 (			77 %	29 \												263				
3	Mt 5.42-43	327 %				77 %													263-64				
5	Mt 5.44	327 %				77 %	(29), 30 \												263				
4	Mt 5.45	327-8 =					<i>om</i> = 2 \	30											263			264	
2	Mt 5.46	328 %				77 %													\$				
2	Mt 5.48					<i>om</i> =													\$			263 \	

Table—Continued.

	Ras	Jz	Tab RN	Tab DD	Qut	Ya'	'Um	Nash	Bal	Mat	Mas	Ay	'Am	Baq	IH	Juw	Ghaz	Shah	Qar	Tay	Jaw	
3	Mt 6.1	328			77													2.63				
	=				=													\$				
2	Mt 6.3				77	30																
					%	\																
1	Mt 6.4	328																				
	=																					
2	Mt 6.5	328			77				%													
2	Mt 6.6	om.			77	30																
	=	3			=	\																
2	Mt 6.7-8	328				30																
	%					\																
6	Mt 6.9-10	323	25		77														290			57
	\$				%														\$			\
		328	102																			
	=	\$																				
3	Mt 6.11	328			77																	
	%				%																	
3	Mt 6.12	328			77	30																
	%				%	\																
2	Mt 6.13	328			77																	
	%				%																	
3	Mt 6.14 <sup>†</sup>	328				30																
	=				Mu	\																
					347																	
					@																	
3	Mt 6.16-18	328			77	30																
	=				=	\																
4	Mt 6.19	328			Uy2	77	31															
	%				270	%	\															
					%																	

Table—Continued.

	Ras	Jz	Tab RN	Tab DD	Qut	Ya'	'Um	Nash	Bal	Mat	Mas	Ay	'Am	Baq	IH	Juw	Ghaz	Shah	Qar	Tay	Jaw	
3	Mt	6.20	328		'Uy2	77																
			%		270	%																
2	Mt	6.21-22	328	'Uy2																		
			%		270	%																
1	Mt	6.23	328																			
			%																			
2	Mt	6.24	328-9	%		'Uy2																
					270																	
					%																	
4	Mt	6.25-26	329	'Uy2	77-8																	
			=		270-1	=																
					%																	
					<i>Mtu</i>																	
					347																	
					@																	
1	Mt	6.27			'Uy2																	
					271																	
					%																	
2	Mt	6.28-31	329		'Uy2																	
			%		271																	
					%																	
3	Mt	6.32	329		'Uy2																	
			=		271																	
					%																	
2	Mt	6.33	329		'Uy2																	
					=																	
					271																	
					%																	
3	Mt	6.34	329		'Uy2	31																
			%		271																	
					%																	
						\																
					%																	

Table—Continued

	Ras	Jz	Tab RN	Tab DD	Qut	Ya'	'Um	Nash	Bal	Mat	Mas	Ay	'Am	Baq	IH	Juw	Ghaz	Shah	Qar	Tay	Jaw	
1 Mtr 7.1	329																					
2 Mtr 7.2	329	%			'Uy2 271																	
4 Mtr 7.3	329	%			'Uy2 271	31	\															
					%																	
					Mtu																	
					15																	
					@																	
2 Mtr 7.4	330	%				78																
2 Mtr 7.5	330	%				%																
4 Mtr 7.6	330	%					31															
					'Uy2 271	78	\															
					%																	
3 Mtr 7.7	330	%			'Uy2 271	78																
					%																	
1 Mtr 7.8-11	330	=																				
3 Mtr 7.12	330	%			'Uy2 271		30															
					%		\															
3 Mtr 7.13-14	330	=			'Uy2 271	78	=															
					%																	
3 Mtr 7.15-16	330	=				78	31															
						=	\															



Table—Continued.

	Ras	Jz	Tab RN	Tab DD	Qut	Y'a'	'Um	Nash	Bal	Mat	Mas	Ay	'Am	Baq	IH	Juw	Ghaz	Shah	Qar	Tay	Jaw	
2	Mt 7.17-18	330				78																
		%				%																
1	Mt 7.19-20	330																				
		%																				
2	Mt 7.21	330	135																			
		=	+																			
2	Mt 7.22-23	330-1																				
		=																				
2	Mt 7.24-27	331				78																
		%				=																
1	Mt 7.28-29	331																				
		=																				

<sup>1</sup> The fact that al-Rassī omits the teaching of Mt 5.27-30 on adultery and 31-2 on divorce is perhaps significant, since Christ's teaching here is in contradiction with the teaching of Islām. This would represent a further strategy in the 'islamization' of the Gospel text.

<sup>2</sup> Al-Y'a 'qubī's omission of Mt 5.45 and 48 is probably significant in the middle of a section which he otherwise reproduces quite faithfully. Both verses are recommendations for the disciples to imitate their 'heavenly Father'. This terminology is typically disliked by the Muslim polemicists, and its omission represents an 'islamization' of the Gospel text.

<sup>3</sup> It is probably significant that al-Rassī omits Mt 6.6 containing Jesus' teaching on prayer in one's room.

<sup>4</sup> The reverse form of this statement (found in Mt 6.15) is omitted by all three Muslim authors. This is possibly because it implies that God's forgiveness might be dependent on humans forgiving one another.

