

In Defense of the Gospels of the New Testament
In Light of Muslims' Objections

Submitted to Krista Bontrager
World Religions and Science
Biola University
June 5, 2010

One of the central claims Muslims make about the Gospels is that the existing Gospels of the Christian Bible are corrupt and thus, should not be taken as an accurate account of the life of Jesus and his deeds. Muslims categorically base their rejection of the Gospels on the basis of what the Qur'an teaches about Jesus. But the Muslims' conclusion on the corruptness of the Gospels flies in the face of the massive hard evidence that we have about the reliability of the Gospels. In light of this, the goal of this short paper is to give a defense of the reliability of the Gospels. Hence, first I will briefly explain the Muslims' view of the Gospels; second, I will give two major reasons for Muslims' rejection of the Gospels; third, I will respond to two major objections Muslims raise against the Gospels. Finally, I will conclude that in light of the historical evidence, the reliability of the Gospels is a well attested fact which the Muslims can hardly dismiss.

I. Muslims' (Qur'anic) View of the Gospel/s

The Gospel versus the Gospels

In Christianity, the word *gospel* stands for 'good news.' For Christians, the 'good news' precisely refers to the salvific work of Jesus as described in the four canonical Gospels¹ of the New Testament. Likewise, Muslims also relate the Gospel to Jesus. The Qur'an claims that the *Injil* or the Gospel is a scripture that God gave to Jesus (spelled '*Isa*' in the Qur'an). For example, the Qur'an mentions it (5.46; 57.27).² But the Qur'anic usage of the Arabic term *Injil*, is always in the singular as opposed to more than one Gospels. Hence, most Muslims endorse a single Gospel which they believe is described in the Qur'an. That means that as Sidney H. Griffith remarks, the term *Injil*, in the Qur'an, does not denote multiple Gospels.³ At this point, one may

¹ For Christians, these four Gospels are known as the Gospel according to Matthew, the Gospel according to Mark, the Gospel according to Luke and the Gospel according to John.

² The numbers inside the parenthesis indicate chapter and verse division respectively of the Qur'an text.

³ Sidney H. Griffith, *Gospel in Encyclopedia of the Qur'an* V. 2, E-I., Gen. ed., Jane Dammen McAuliffe (Boston: Brill, Leiden, 2002), 342.

ask: would it make any difference whether or not the Qur'an mentions a single Gospel as opposed to multiple Gospels and vice versa?

Of course, the answer for the above question depends on who is being asked. For example, in his excellent article *Dispelling Muslim Myth about the Gospel*, Doug Smith argues that the Qur'an's silence on the specific number of the Gospel does not by itself justify those Muslims who claim that the Qur'an does not recognize the four Gospels of the Bible. This is because, there are no Qur'anic verses that state that the Gospel is different from the canonical books that the Christians endorse.⁴ On the other hand, however, some prominent Muslim commentators argue that the Gospel that is mentioned in the Qur'an has very little to do with the four Gospels of the New Testament or the Christian Scriptures. As Muslim commentator and translator, Yusuf Ali describes it:

The Injil (Greek, Evangel=Gospel) spoken of by the Qur'an is not...the four Gospels now received as canonical. It is the single Gospel which, Islam teaches, was revealed to Jesus, and which he taught. Fragments of it survive in the received canonical Gospels and in some others, of which traces survive....Muslims are therefore right in respecting the present Bible...though they reject the peculiar doctrines taught by orthodox Christians or Judiasm.⁵

As I see it, Ali makes a definitive statement regarding the difference he claims exists between the Gospel mentioned in the Qur'an on the one hand and the four canonical Gospels on the other. But, notice that at the same time, Ali assumes that the canonical Gospels have some merit in that it is in the existing canonical Gospels that traces of the original authentic Gospel can be found. So, here we can see that even the fiercest critics of the Bible admit that the existing Christian Scriptures, in this case the four Gospels, cannot be ruled out arbitrarily. In other words, Muslims need to tell us their reasons for rejecting the four Gospels in favor of a single Gospel.

⁴ Doug Smith, "Dispelling Muslim Myth about the Gospel" *Christian Apologetics Journal*, V.3, No. 1, Summer, 2004, 23.

⁵ A. Yusuf Ali, *The Qur'an: Text, Translator and Commentary* (New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an, Inc., 2001), 232; quoted in Doug Smith, "Dispelling Muslim Myth about the Gospel" *Christian Apologetics Journal*, V.3, No. 1, Summer, 2004, 23.

So, the issue of the alleged difference between the Gospel mentioned in the Qur'an on the one hand and the four Gospels of the Bible on the other, must be adjudicated on the basis of concrete evidence or the necessary facts and data one provides to support one's case. If Christians have sufficient evidential support (as they often claim) for endorsing the reliability of the four Gospels, then the burden of proof would be on Muslims to do, at the least, two things to be able to successfully counter the Christians' claim: (1) Muslims must be able to show that the evidence that Christians provide to support their claim regarding the reliability of the Gospels are mistaken or even false; (2) Muslims must be able to give a piece of evidence regarding the original single Gospel that they refer to; and further tell a story regarding why and how the original Gospel was lost. Therefore, in my view, the strength of the Muslim's challenge against their counterpart (Christians) must meet the requirements stated above in (1) and (2).

Qur'anic Description of the Gospel

The Qur'an characterizes the Judeo-Christian Scriptures in using such terms as 'the Book of God,' 'the Word of God', etc.⁶ This indicates that even if the Qur'an is the foremost and the final authority for Islamic beliefs,⁷ the Qur'an nevertheless recognizes divine revelations outside of Islam. As former Muslim Abdul Saleeb puts it:

Not only has God sent messengers for the purpose of guidance, but he has also given scriptures to some of those messengers in order to convey the will of God to the people of their time. Not all the messengers brought forth a divine book, but some of the ones that are mentioned in the Qur'an to have been given books are Abraham, Moses, David and Jesus.⁸

From Saleeb's remarks here, at least two things are worth noting. First, the Qur'an clearly endorses that the Torah (given to Moses), the Psalms (given to David) and the Gospels (given to

⁶ Norman L. Geisler and Abdul Saleeb, *Answering Islam: The Crescent in Light of the Cross* (Michigan: Baker Books, 1993), 213.

⁷ By Islamic beliefs I primarily have in mind such things as Muslims view on God's oneness, prophets of God, the books of God, etc. Of course, here Muslims' view on sin, creation, trinity, Christ's divinity, etc., are also a case in point. Qur'an further dictates, for Muslims, regarding how they should view Christian Scriptures.

⁸ Abdul Saleeb, *Islam in To Everyone An Answer*, eds., Francis J. Beckwith, William Lane Craig and J.P. Moreland (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2004), p. 352.

Jesus) all have divine origin. That means that ultimately, it is the almighty God (Allah) Himself who is responsible for producing the Christian Scriptures or the Bible. Second, the Qur'an states that the Scriptures play an important role in uncovering God's will for people. For example, in speaking of the Torah, the Qur'an states, "Surely, We sent down the Torah full of guidance and light." (5.45; see also 5.47). So, insofar as the Qur'an is concerned, as Huston Smith (a prominent world religions expert) rightly argues, key biblical figures, namely Abraham, Moses, David and Jesus, are authentic messengers, each of whom introduced important features of the God-directed life.⁹

The Qur'an explains the most important facts regarding Jesus and the Gospel: "We caused Jesus son of Mary to follow in their footsteps, fulfilling that which was revealed before him in Torah; and we gave him the Gospel which contained guidance and light, fulfilling that which was revealed before it in the Torah, and a guidance and an admonition for the righteous." (5.47).¹⁰ Jesus is depicted as a key channel via whom the Gospel is introduced or given to humans. Besides, the Qur'an describes the Gospel using several important phrases: it came from Jesus (3.3; 5.46), God's revelation (5.68), guidance and light (3.3; 5.46), Qur'an explains it (10.37), unbelievers refused to believe it (34.31), Qur'an confirms it (2.91), judged for rejecting it (40.70), those grounded in knowledge believe it (4.162), God's promises are in it (9.111), we are to judge by it (5.47), Christians are supposed to observe it (5.66; 5.68), Muslims should believe it (3.84; 4.136), refer to it when in doubt (10.94), compares the worship of Muslims to a parable found in one of the four Gospels of the Christian Bible (Mark 4.27-28).¹¹

⁹ Huston Smith, *The World Religions* (San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1991), 243.

¹⁰ *The Qur'an: Arabic Text with a New Translation*, trans., Muhammad Zafrulla Khan (New York, Olive Branch Press, 1997), xiv.

¹¹ *The Qur'an: Arabic Text with a New Translation*, trans., Muhammad Zafrulla Khan (New York, Olive Branch Press, 1997; see also Doug Smith, "Dispelling Muslim Myth about the Gospel" *Christian Apologetics Journal*, V.3, No. 1, Summer, 2004, 23-24.

From the above Qur'anic references, it is clear that as Muslim scholar Muhammad Zafrulla Khan remarks, the Qur'an requires a belief not only in its own truth but also in the truth of previous revelations.¹² In fact, the Qur'an clearly mandates both Christians and Muslims, to believe and take the Gospel as a reliable revelation of God. Thus, from the Qur'an's standpoint, if people ignore the message of the Gospel, then they will be judged for their ignorance. But if people believe the Gospel, then they will receive guidance and light, that is a clear direction in life as followers of God.

Christians applaud Qur'an's requirement of taking the Gospel as a reliable revelation of God. This is because Christians think that the Gospel recognized by Qur'an should be the same Gospel found in the Bible. But Muslims seriously object to such remarks. This is because for Muslims, the existing four Gospels of the Bible lack any reliable ground to be considered as God's word. So, as indicated earlier, the best way to go about assessing the disagreement surrounding the Gospel is to look at some of the reasons (or objections) Muslims point out for rejecting the four Gospels of the Bible.

II. Unlocking Muslims' Major Reasons for Rejecting the Gospels

Tahrif

One of the most popular reasons for Muslims' rejection of the Gospels¹³ has to do with the notion of *tahrif*. The word *tahrif* stands for "corruption."¹⁴ In relation to the Scripture, in this case the four Gospels, the word *tahrif* is used by Muslims to show how Christians perverted the Scriptures with the intention to mislead and conceal its meanings. As Muslims argue, the precise

¹² *The Qur'an: Arabic Text with a New Translation*, trans., Muhammad Zafrulla Khan (New York, Olive Branch Press, 1997), xiv. Of course, here, Qur'anic mandate to believe in other revelations extend to Torah and Psalms as well, as indicated in our earlier discussion.

¹³ Muslims also accuse the Jews of distorting the Torah.

¹⁴ Frederick Mathewson Denny, *Corruption in Encyclopedia of the Qur'an* V. 1, A-D., Gen. ed., Jane Dammen McAuliffe (Boston: Brill, Leiden, 2002), 439-440.

form of the distortion of the Gospels can be looked at in two major ways: first, the meaning of the original Gospel which the Qur'an speaks has been changed; second, the actual words of the original meanings have been changed.¹⁵ Notice however that, if the Muslims' claim is that Christians changed the meaning of the Gospels (taken in the first sense as stated above) then, such 'change of meaning' only shows the mishandling of the Gospels on the part of the Christians. For example, Christians may misinterpret the Bible by reading it out of its context. But from the Christians' misinterpreting the Bible, it does not follow that Christians have corrupted the Bible. Misinterpreting (mishandling) a text does not necessarily amount to corrupting a text. In other words, misinterpretation of a text only shows the interpreters' lack of adequate skill or knowledge regarding how to unfold the meaning of a certain text.

For example, the Qur'an says that the 'people of the Book' Jews and Christians: being ignorant of their scriptures (2.78), conceal the scriptures (2.146, 159, 174; 5:15), change the scriptures (2.75), sell false scriptures for gain (2.79) and believe parts and disbelieve other parts (2.85).¹⁶

Contrary to most Muslims, Qur'anic scholars hold that the Qur'anic references that talk about Christians and Jews tampering with the scriptures, do not show that the words of the scriptures had been physically changed (as stated in the second sense above). For example, in his article on *Corruption*, Frederick Mathewson Denny writes: "The corruption of scripture is not a major or sustained topic in the Qur'an although it became an important and abiding theological as well as textual controversy in later relations between Muslims and the People of the Book."¹⁷

¹⁵ Doug Smith, "Dispelling Muslim Myth about the Gospel", 25-27.

¹⁶ Colin Chapman, *Cross and Crescents: Responding to the challenges of Islam*, 2 ed. (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 93.

¹⁷ Frederick Mathewson Denny, *Corruption*, 440; Douglas Pratt also makes a similar point in his *The Challenge of Islam: Encounters in Interfaith Dialogue* (Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2005), 213-214.

Denny's remarks are extremely informative in showing us that Muslims lack any direct support from their own Qur'an to establish their allegations against Christians distorting the Gospels or that Christians physically changed the actual words of the scriptures. Rather, what we can obviously see in the Qur'an is the Qur'an's claim that Christians misused the Gospel. Whether the Qur'an is correct in its claim regarding Christians distorting or misusing the scriptures is totally a different matter than the more serious objection Muslims raise, which is *Christians have physically changed the four Gospels*. So, Muslims still owe us the burden of proof in justifying their claim regarding the corruption of the Gospels.

Doctrinal Incongruence between the Qur'an and the Gospels

The other equally popular reason for Muslims' rejection of the Gospels has to do with the four Gospels containing elements that are denied by the teachings of the Qur'an. Before we look at some of the alleged elements imported into the Gospels, we need keep in mind that for Muslims, the Qur'an supersedes all previous revelations. Thus, all other previous revelations (including the Bible) have been working their way toward attaining their fulfillment in the Qur'an. Qur'an, therefore, maintains its supremacy over any other revelation. In this regard, Islamic commentator, Maulana Muhammad Ali writes, "...neither the Old nor the New Testament, nor any other sacred book, makes any approach to the grand and noble truths that find expression in the Holy Qur'an....the Qur'an corrects the errors of the former [the bible] as it does in the matter of religious doctrines."¹⁸ A key to Ali's claim here is that the Qur'an is complete and the final revelation in which there are no "errors."

In light of this, the conflict between the Gospels and the Qur'anic teachings stems from the idea that the Gospels contain false information. As Kenneth Richard Samples rightly notes,

¹⁸ *The Holy Qur'an: Arabic Text, English Translation and Commentary*, trans., Maulana Muhammad Ali (Lahore: Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at Islam, 1995), xi.

For Muslims, "...false beliefs infiltrated the biblical texts....distortion allowed heretical and false doctrines to arise...."¹⁹

So, for Muslims, the core doctrinal teachings of the four Gospels, namely the doctrine of the incarnation of Christ, the doctrine of Christ's deity, the doctrine of the trinity of the God head, the doctrine of original sin, and the crucifixion of Christ, are elements imported into the Gospels, to mention a few.²⁰ Since the Qur'an denies all of these doctrines found in the Gospels (e.g., 4.163; 4.157-159; 3.64), Muslims conclude that the four Gospels in their present form, despite containing some traces of the original Gospel, cannot represent the true genuine Gospel that the Holy Qur'an speaks of. Hence, Muslims look for the original Gospel (*Injil*) elsewhere.

In this regard, most Muslims appeal to a text called the *Gospel of Barnabas*. As Sidney H. Griffith argues, the *Gospel of Barnabas* has had a wide circulation in modern times. This text was discovered in an Italian manuscript in Amsterdam in 1709. Following the translation of the text into an Arabic language in the early 20th Century, some Muslims have claimed that the *Gospel of Barnabas* preserves the original Gospel, which the Qur'an speaks of. Furthermore, according to Griffith, the origin of the *Gospel of Barnabas* has been traced to western Mediterranean world, most likely in Spain back in the 16th century.²¹

For example, some of the things *The Gospel of Barnabas* teaches are: Jesus is not the Messiah, rather the Messiah is Mohammed; unless people have faith in Mohammed, none will be saved, Mohammed will go to Hell and be terrified as he beholds the punishment of others, and Jesus is a voice in the wilderness.²² Even a cursory look at these ideas coming from *The Gospel*

¹⁹ Kenneth Richard Samples, *A World of Difference: Putting Christian Truth-Claims to the Worldview Test* (Michigan: Baker Books, 2007), 251.

²⁰ Norman L. Geisler and Abdul Saleeb, *Answering Islam: The Crescent in Light of the Cross*, 216.

²¹ Sidney H. Griffith, *Gospel in Encyclopedia of the Qur'an*, 343.

²² www.answering-christianity.com/barnabas and www.islam101.com/barnabas/chapter_index.htm, accessed June 3, 2010.

of Barnabas show that the ideas not only contradict what the four Gospels teach but also what the Qur'an itself teaches. For example, the Qur'an teaches that Mohammed is the great prophet but not the messiah. Similarly, the four Gospels clearly portray Jesus as a messiah. Moreover, Mohammed, according to Muslims is one of the exemplary men who ever lived. Thus, it is unthinkable for Muslims to think of Mohammed going to hell. On the other hand, the Gospels tell us that John the Baptist, not Jesus, is the voice in the wilderness. But as we will see in the final section of this paper, there are even more problems associated with the *Gospel of Barnabas*. Thus, all things considered, the Muslims' denial of the four Gospels continues to be problematic.

III. Responding to Muslims' Objections

Objection 1: Muslims claim that the Bible in general and the four Gospels of the Bible in particular have been corrupted. Thus, Muslims confidently claim that the four Gospels of the Bible are historically inaccurate and can not therefore be taken seriously. Muslims also add to the charge that the Gospels are full of errors. For example, a Muslim apologist Ahmed Deedat claims that the Bible contains 50,000 "errors".²³

Response: According to the Qur'an's message, since God revealed to the prophet Mohammed the previous Scriptures (namely, the Torah to Moses and Psalms to David and the Gospels to Jesus), the Muslims need to understand that when they claim that the Gospels are historically inaccurate, they owe us an explanation in one important sense. That is, if the Gospels at the time of the prophet Mohammed were already corrupt, why did the Qur'an confirm their truthfulness? As Colin Chapman rightly remarks, Muslims themselves have to give evidence with respect to who corrupted the Scriptures and when it was done. Since the Qur'an itself says

²³ Ahmed Deedat, *Is the Bible God's Word?* (Durban, RSA.: IPCI, 1980), chap. 4, [Online], available: <http://islam101.com/jamaat/bible/BibleIntro.html>. [June 5, 2010].

that God watches over and protects His word revealed in the Qur'an, we can challenge the Muslims as to why we cannot trust God also to protect the Gospels from corruption.²⁴ Moreover, most of the objections Muslims raise against the Gospels stem from Muslims assumptions that if the Gospels tend to differ from what the Qur'an teaches, then for Muslims, such differences come across as an indication of the mistakes found in the Gospels. But this begs question. That is to say that, the truthfulness of the Bible does not have to depend on what the Qur'an agrees or disagrees with. The Bible should justify its own truthfulness on its own ground.

In this regard, the New Testament in which the Gospels are an important part has overwhelming textual evidence. One of the leading New Testament scholars, Craig L. Blomberg, argues that if we consider the original Greek alone, there are over 5,000 manuscripts and manuscript fragments of portions of the New Testament which have been preserved from the early centuries of Christianity. The oldest of these is a scrap of papyrus (p⁵²) containing John 18:31-33, 37-38, dating from A.D. 125-130. This manuscript was discovered no more than forty years after John's Gospel was most likely written. Moreover, a little over thirty papyri date from the late second through early third centuries, including some which contain fairly large portion of entire books and two which cover most of the gospels and Acts (p⁴⁵) or the letters of Paul (p⁴⁶) have been recovered. Four reliable and nearly complete New Testaments date from the fourth and fifth centuries have been recovered.

Blomberg argues that only minor variations distinguish these manuscripts from one another. However, the vast majority of these variations have to do with changes with spelling, grammar and style, or accidental omissions or duplications of words or phrases. That means that only about 400, i.e., less than one per page of English translation, have any significant effect on

²⁴ See Colin Chapman, *Cross and Crescents: Responding to the challenges of Islam*, 2 ed. (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 194-195.

the meaning of the passage. Most of such minor variations are noted in the footnotes or margins of modern translations and other editions of the Scripture. The only textual variants which affect more than a sentence or two are John 7:53-8:11 and Mark 16: 9-20. Neither of these passages is very likely to be what John or Mark originally wrote. Though the story in John (the woman caught in adultery) still has a good chance of being true. If we put all our cumulative evidence on the table regarding the reliability of the New Testament, overall 97-99 % of it can be reconstructed with strong degree of certainty. More importantly, no Christian doctrine is merely based on disputed passages.²⁵

Blomberg's remarks are not mere suggestions, but historically grounded factual data about the reliability of the New Testament, of which the Gospels are part of. Therefore, the Muslims' accusation of the corruption of the New Testament is merely based on unsubstantiated claims. If the Muslims have a point, then they still can provide us with evidence that disproves overwhelmingly well-grounded evidence of the reliability of the New Testaments books, in this case the Gospels. Moreover, the New Testament also has overwhelming archeological evidence that shows the historical reliability of people who are mentioned in the Gospels, places and other events described.²⁶ As Collin Chapman argues, the accusation about the corruption of the text of the Bible was developed by the latter Muslim apologists. In the words of Collin Chapman, whenever Muslims stress that the Bible is corrupt or the Gospels are corrupt, we can pause a question, "When do you believe they were corrupted and by whom?"²⁶

²⁵ Craig L. Blomberg, *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels*. Leicester and Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1987, a chapter contributed in chapter 6 of William Lane Craig, *Reasonable Faith: Christian Truth and Apologetics* (Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1994).

²⁶ John McDowell, *The New Evidence that Demands a Verdict*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers, 1999), 17-69.

²⁷ See Colin Chapman, *Cross and Crescents: Responding to the challenges of Islam*, 204-205.

Objection 2: Muslims confidently claim that the original Gospel was lost. So, Muslims claim that because the existing four Gospels are corrupted, we can hardly recover the content of the original message that the Qur'an recognizes. Therefore, they claim that the *Gospel of Barnabas* is the original *Injil* that was revealed to Jesus.

Response: But the problem with this is that the *Gospel of Barnabas* is full of mistakes. For example, it locates Nazareth on the shores on the lake of Galilee. It also speaks of Jesus sailing to Nazareth. There are also historical errors in the *Gospel of Barnabas*. For example, it claims that Jesus was born while Pilot was a governor of Judea. But Pilot didn't become governor until A.D. 26 or 27. There also are no evidence whatsoever about its existence before the 16th Century. It is even believed by some Muslim scholars that the *Gospel of Barnabas* may have been a forgery. Some Muslims regret that, the majority of Muslims blindly accept it as true.²⁷ It is highly problematic for Muslims to rely on the *Gospel of Barnabas*, since it lacks any basis for its authenticity. But as Norman Geisler and Abdul Saleeb remark, the reason why the majority of Muslims uncritically accept the *Gospel of Barnabas* is because this Gospel claims that Jesus did not die on the cross. Rather, Judas Iscariot was substituted for Jesus. Since the Qur'an itself did not endorse the death of Jesus on the cross for many Muslims, it appears to be genuine.²⁸

Since the *Gospel of Barnabas* is not even from the 1st Century, it lacks credibility to critique the historically well grounded Gospels of the New Testament. In my view, the four Gospels of the New Testament are the only authentic accounts of the historical figure Jesus and his deeds. As Geisler and Saleeb further remark, no father or teacher of the Christian church ever

²⁷ Colin Chapman, *Cross and Crescents: Responding to the challenges of Islam*, 2 ed. (Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2007), 204-205.

²⁸ Norman L. Geisler and Abdul Saleeb, *Answering Islam: The Crescent in Light of the Cross*, 304.

quoted the *Gospel of Barnabas*, from the 1st to the 15th Century. This further strengthens the lack of any credibility for the *Gospel of Barnabas*, to say the least. Therefore, we can fairly and confidently say that Muslims haven't been able to show any single evidence to substantiate their claim that the existing four Gospels are corrupted and therefore are not part the original Gospel that the Qur'an speaks of.

What then can we learn from all this? In my view, in our interaction with Muslims, we should realize that most of them lack genuine knowledge of the Bible. Since they have already made up their mind in terms of concluding that the Qur'an is an incomparably true revelation of God, Muslims will never take any chance to put their own holy book to the test. This makes it extremely difficult to have an honest conversation with them. For example, we should be careful not to criticize the Qur'an directly when we have conversations with Muslims. From my own personal experience of talking with many Muslims, they cannot tolerate, when people even slightly tend to say anything negative about the Qur'an.

Christians and Bible scholars may have a very good ground, in terms of their knowledge of the Qur'an, but lacking interpersonal skills when it comes to religious dialogue with Muslims, could change things, sometimes for the worst. By this I mean that Muslims can be extremely emotional and even physically abusive if we give an impression that we are too critical of what they dearly hold to be true. Therefore, developing good communication skills is one of the best things anyone can do in order to get the maximum from interacting with Muslims. I believe that this is true both in writing as well as in oral communication. From my own research, I have learned much about the Qur'an on the one hand the overwhelming evidence for the reliability of the Gospels and the Bible in general.

Finally, in this paper I have attempted to briefly expose Muslims' view of the Gospels. I have given two major reasons why they reject the Gospels. I have also responded to two major objections that the Muslims raise against the Gospels. I have tried to show why their objections fail. In light of this, I conclude that the reliability of the Gospels remains a well attested fact which the Muslims can hardly dismiss.

Bibliography:

- Ali, A. Yusuf. *The Qur'an: Text, Translator and Commentary*. New York: Tahrike Tarsile Qur'an, Inc., 2001.
- Blomberg, Craig L. *The Historical Reliability of the Gospels*. Leicester and Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity, 1987.
- Chapman, Colin. *Cross and Crescents: Responding to the challenges of Islam*, 2 ed. Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2007.
- Craig, William Lane. *Reasonable Faith: Christian Truth and Apologetics*. Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books, 1994.
- Deedat, Ahmed. *Is the Bible God's Word?* (Durban, RSA.: IPCI, 1980), chap. 4, [Online], available: <http://islam101.com/jamaat/bible/BibleIntro.html>. [June 5, 2010].
- Denny, Frederick Mathewson. *Corruption in Encyclopedia of the Qur'an* V. 1, A-D., Gen. ed., Jane Dammen
- Geisler, Norman L. and Saleeb, Abdul. *Answering Islam: The Crescent in Light of the Cross*. Michigan: Baker Books, 1993.
- Griffith, Sidney H. *Gospel in Encyclopedia of the Qur'an* V. 2, E-I., Gen. ed., Jane Dammen McAuliffe. Boston: Brill, Leiden, 2002.
- Saleeb, Abdul. *Islam in To Everyone An Answer*, eds., Francis J. Beckwith, William Lane Craig and J.P. Moreland. Illinois: InterVarsity Press, 2004.
- Samples, Kenneth Richard. *A World of Difference: Putting Christian Truth-Claims to the Worldview Test*. Michigan: Baker Books, 2007. Smith, Doug "Dispelling Muslim Myth about the Gospel" *Christian Apologetics Journal*, V.3, No. 1, Summer, 2004.
- Pratt, Douglas. *The Challenge of Islam: Encounters in Interfaith Dialogue*. Hampshire: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2005.
- Smith, Huston. *The World Religions*. San Francisco: Harper Collins Publishers, 1991.
- The Holy Qur'an: Arabic Text, English Translation and Commentary*, trans., Maulana Muhammad Ali. Lahore: Ahmadiyyah Anjuman Isha'at Islam, 1995.
- The Qur'an: Arabic Text with a New Translation*, trans., Muhammad Zafrulla Khan. New York, Olive Branch Press, 1997.
- www.answering-christianity.com/barnabs and www.islam101.com/barnabas/chapter_index.htm, accessed June 3, 2010.