

The challenges of Sheikh Didat
& their answers

The author : Father Zakaria Boutros
The publisher: www.fatherzakaria.com

This series
(Religious arguments)

The books of the Islamic proselytiser Ahmed Didat had been widely dispersed in the market, as he met with some of the church pastors in United States & Europe ,he had argued with them on the Christianity & Islam, these arguments had been published in books, audio & video tapes & had been on a global international propaganda, these materials had been used by extremities & bigots in embarrassing the simple Christians who has no knowledge of the theological thinking or religious argument, a lot of our believers came to us inquiring about these utterances that are attacking our Christian beliefs & asking to give replies to them, this matter pushed me to write these books to answer him, clarifying the truth which he didn't know

Before going through the replies I want first to clarify our motives to publish these books & also our goals we aim at, then our style in the discussion

First: our motives

Our motives are:

1- Our heartily love to God: as the holy bible said: “you love the Lord your God with all your heart, and with all your soul, and with your entire mind, and with all your strength.”
([Mark 12:30](#))

2- Our love to all the people:” You love your neighbour as yourself”
([Matthew 22:39](#))

Second: our goals:

1- glorifying the holy name of God as written”, whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do everything to the glory of God” ([1 Corinthians 10:31](#))

2- The benefit of all the selves: “let's do what is good toward all men”
([Galatians 6:10](#))

Third: our style:

1- The respect of the freedom of creed, freedom of viewpoint & the individual right of thinking and embracing whatever he believes

2- We are ready to answer whoever asks us, as the holy bible said: “always be ready to give an answer to everyone who asks you a reason concerning the hope that is in you, with humility and fear” (1Peter 3:15)

3- We are careful about the foolish and ignorant arguments as the holy bible warns us from that saying: “refuse foolish and ignorant questionings, knowing that they generate strife..... And the Lord's servant must not strive” (2Timothy 2:23, 24)

4- When we answer any accusation and explain our faith, this doesn't mean at all that we are humiliating the creeds of others, or hurt their feelings, but we are very careful on the ethics of discussion & argument with all respectability

5- With the spirit of friendliness & understanding, we look for a common ground & points of agreement between us, we are not hunters of what we think from our point of view as mistakes, as we know that there are explanations from the other partner's point of view, which are convincing to him & not necessary convincing to us & visa versa

6- So we answer & express ourselves with the logic in which we believe, so if the reader agrees with it well & good & if he doesn't agree he can through it away after knowing our point of view, therefore we all will end in the friendliness which we never bargain, as the value of every human being for us is immense, as he is God's creature, whom he loved & as we love God we love all those beloved by God

7- We are careful not to say offensive, hurting words or insults as we are totally away from that & we never accept this, therefore we quietly & logically speak to let the peace & friendliness dominate

8- To achieve this goal & to avoid clashes let us disregard completely the idea of a winner & loser in the discussion as if we are in an honour battle &, so we have to differentiate between the personal subjective & objective battles, let us have objective discussion

9- We are careful not to have superficial replies, but a reply which is out of comprehensive deep study, to induce satisfaction to present the full truth; we hope to give satisfactory answers for the honest person who asks to know the truth

The author

Introduction

Answering Sheikh Didat

With whom Sheikh Didat had conducted his arguments?

Sadly the sheikh went to people from America & Europe, he had chosen people who know nothing about Islamic religion so they know nothing about the religion dialogue especially between Islam & Christianity, so all his arguments came one sided Exactly like a professional gladiator who fights with an innocent person who know nothing about fighting, so the game is one sided, shall the gladiator after the battle be proud of defeating this innocent person?

Why the sheikh didn't think of arguing one of the Christians specialised in the comparisons between religions from Middle East, especially Egypt?

Answering the issues provoked by Sheikh Didat

Sheikh Didat provoked several subjects regarding our faith in:

- 1- God is one in the holy trinity
- 2- The incarnation of the Christ son of God
- 3- Crucifixion of the Christ & inevitability of the redemption
- 4- The accuracy of the holy bible & its irrefutability

We published many books answering these issues
Also his Eminence provoked other challenges concerning;

- 1- The book of Ezekiel chapter 23 about Oholah and Oholibah
- 2- The book of Song of the Songs.
- 3- The permission of drinking wine
- 4- The discrepancy in the number of the people of Israel
- 4- The discrepancy in the number of the people of Jude
- 5- The discrepancy of the number of the years of famine

You will find in these books answers for these challenges

The first Challenge

The book of Ezekiel chapter 23 about Oholah and Oholibah

Sheikh Didat provoked the issue of "How does the holy bible contain such repugnant words which are not befitting to the Holy Scripture?!!

I remember that his eminence was challenging one of the American pastors who had no knowledge of the comparative religions especially between Islam & Christianity, asking him to read such verses as if they are shameful or disgraceful

But I am reading them very simply without any minor embarrassment, knowing that in spite of being difficult to accept from the first glance, yet it is not as repugnant as his eminence and other sheikhs are thinking , especially when we know its meanings & aim and its background culture

That's the problem of the superficial readers lies in the lack of proper understanding, so the proverb is saying "those who are half-educated are more dangerous than the illiterates"

If this is the case concerning the superficial readers, so how it will be with those readers of bad- intentions who are not reading the book aiming at understanding & benefiting, but they are reading it aiming at picking what they think unforgivable mistake, to provoke the destructive criticism and the bigot stabs, God forgive them & show them the way for their goodness, amen

Now to these challenged verses in the book of Ezekiel, I will read them as I said without any minor embarrassment, then I will answer the accusations directed to them, asking the lord to give us the grace of listening for understanding

The scripture said from (Ezekiel 23:3, 20):

"The word of the lord came to me, saying, Son of man, there were two women, the daughters of one mother: they played adultery in Egypt, engaging in adultery from their youth; there were their breasts were fondled and the teats of their virginity were bruised. The names of them were Oholah the elder, and Oholibah her sister: As for their names {"Samaria" is "Oholah"}, {and" Jerusalem" "Oholibah"}. .. She lusted after their lovers, whose flesh is as the flesh of donkeys, and whose semen is like the semen of horses.... Thus says the Lord: for that, I am will rise up your lovers against you ...They shall come against you with weapons and wagons ... I will commit the judgment to them...These things shall be done to you, because you lusted after the nations, and defiled yourself with their idols. "

The answer:

With the grace of God & his wisdom we will answer this question about what was mentioned in the book of prophet Ezekiel, the answers will include the following aspects:

- 1- The scripture statement in general
- 2- The exegesis of what was written here by Ezekiel
- 3- The repugnant expressions
- 4- Expressions from the noble quran
- 5- Expressions from the prophetic converses

The inspired words of God in the holy bible include:

- 1- The story of Adam's creation
- 2- The story of Adam's fall in the disobedience and his exile from the paradise
- 3- God's dealing with people throughout the human history revealing to them his love in spite of their falling
- 4- The story of redemption and salvation
- 5- God's commandment to the mankind, ordering the believers to do the benevolence and to avoid the evil deeds and wrong-doing

It is obvious that what was written here in Ezekiel was a forbiddance to do evil deeds and hideous acts committed by the Jewish nation at that time as will be explained from the following

- 1) This saying is directed to the Jewish nation, expressed as "The mother who had two daughters"
- 2) By the two girls Oholah, and Oholibah he meant Samaria, the capital of Israel and Jerusalem the capital of Judea

That's explained from the fourth verse of the same chapter as it is saying:
'As for their names {"Samaria" is "Oholah"}, {"and" Jerusalem" "Oholibah"}.'

- 3) The adultery of Oholah, and Oholibah {i.e. Samaria, and Jerusalem};
The scripture is saying that they played adultery with Egypt, Babylon and Assyria
As mentioned in the verses 3-19
- 4) What was meant by the adultery?

What's meant here was not the literal sexual adultery at all, as who did nation play adultery being not an adulteress woman literally?

So what was meant here is a metaphorical expression of the betrayal of this Nation to God, to whom it was belonging as his nation, that was expressed a the spiritual adultery

The spiritual adultery was an expression used by the holy bible with the Meaning of betrayal of the lord or showing enmity to him by following other gods As idols or friendship with the world or other similar things, as was explained from The Scripture in;

About the adultery with the meaning of abandoning God and worshipping other gods; (Judges 2:17)"They played the adultery after other gods, and bowed themselves down to them"

About the adultery with the meaning of friendship with the world in "You adulterers and adulteresses, don't you know that friendship with the world is enmity with God". (James 4:4)

About the adultery with the meaning of love of money (Hosea 9:1) don't rejoice, Israel, to jubilation like the nations; for you were adulterous to your God. You love the wages"

So the background of that subject of challenging, explaining that it is not the literal sexual meaning of woman's adultery but the metaphorical spiritual meaning of a nation's adultery of by abandoning God & worshipping other gods

Is it possible to have such words in the Holy Scripture? This is the core of challenging To answer this we say that we can't judge any text without studying its circumstances and the language used at that time and the customs and traditions of the people at that time, so let us explain the following aspects:

- 1) These words was a description of the evil deeds which were actually conducted in the liturgy and rituals of the idols worshipping at that time, this was mentioned in the British encyclopedia [Encyclopaedia Britannica Vol. 12 P.782], saying that; among the rituals of joining the idols worshipping was that they were practicing sex in an outrageous salacity as a sign of the union between those idolatrous in one essence {that's the same concept Pointed at by the lord on the words of prophet Ezekiel here, rebuking and blaming those who are committing such acts }**
- 2) Those outrageous salacious rituals were not looked at as disgraceful or shameful acts By those who are committing them or they wouldn't do them, but they were Honorable and glorious for them so the holy bible is saying" whose glory is in their Shame" (Philippians 3:19), so the lord wanted to disclose the ugliness of what they Are doing and the disgracefulness of what they are committing**
- 3) If the mere mentioning of these things is such outrageous as the holy bible said: For the things which are done by them, it is a shame even to speak of. (Ephesus 5:12) So how would be the disgracefulness of doing them? Wouldn't that deserve Disclosure, rebuking and punishment?**
- 4) Actually God mentioned these vices to punish the nation for committing them, so it was mentioned in this part of Ezekiel, the lord's judgment to condemn these acts, as he said;" for that, I am will rise up your lovers against you ...They shall come against you with weapons and wagons ... I will commit the judgment to them...These things shall be done to you, because you lusted after the nations, and defiled yourself with their idols. "(Ezekiel 23: 22-31)**

- 5) In addition to that, we can see in the court room, the prosecution is asking the criminals to simulate the crime however awful it was , in all its disgraceful details , so is there any hideousness in that ? Wasn't the Holy Scripture in Ezekiel showing that meaning? Wasn't that a proof for the act of spiritual adultery in its hideousness and impurity? So why that's considered to be not befitting, meanwhile there is no objection on what is practiced by the prosecution to disclose the crime?
- 6) A last point was left; I hope the challenging will accept with good intention, knowing that we fully respect all the religions and creeds of the others
I am saying that such words are mentioned in the noble quran and the prophetic verses and they are not considered, not befitting or shameful, but as the Arabic proverb is saying "there is no bashfulness in the religion"

Fourth; some words from the quran

- 1) The same word "teats of the virginity" which was mentioned in Ezekiel which is the subject of challenging was mentioned in the noble quran in The Night-Come chapter (Surat At-Tariq) 5-7: "So let man see from what he is created! He is created from water gushing forth. Proceeding from between the back-bone and the teat of virginity"
- 2) The same word "semen" which was mentioned in Ezekiel, was mentioned also in The Resurrection chapter (Surat Al-Qiyamah) 36-39;" Does man think that he will be left neglected ,was he not *Nutfah* (a discharge of semen) poured forth? Then he became an *'Alaqa* (a clot); then Allah shaped and fashioned him in due proportion. And made him in two sexes, male and female.
- 3) From that words also what was mentioned in The Confederates chapter (Surat Al-Ahzab) 50; "and a believing woman if she offers herself to the Prophet, and the Prophet wishes to wedlock her; a privilege for you only, not for the rest of the believers. ... In order that there should be no embarrassment on you. "
- 4) Also it was mentioned in The Light chapter (Surat An-Nur) 31" And tell the believing women to lower their gaze, and protect their private parts"
- 5) Also what was mentioned in the chapters of {Mount (Surat At-Tur), The Event (Surat Al-Waqi'ah), and Man ((Surat Al-Insan))} about the description of the paradise that contains the wine, Hourin (paradise nymphs) and immortal boys
- The Event chapter (Surat Al-Waqi'ah) 15-35 "They will be served by immortal boys, with cups, and jugs, and a glass from the flowing wine... and there will be Hourin (paradise nymphs)... And made them virgins"
- In Mount chapter (Surat At-Tur), 19-23; And We shall marry them to *Hourin* (paradise nymphs). There they shall pass from hand to hand a wine cup, free from any evil vague talk, and free from sin....And there will go round boy-servants of theirs, to serve them as if they were preserved pearls"

Here are some of the comments of some of the eminent Islamic scholars:

- **Mister Mohammed Galal keshk** said; it is well confirmed from the quran text that the *Hourin* ((paradise nymphs)) are for the sexual pleasure (Khawater Moslem (Muslim thoughts in the sexual issue, page 202)

- **Sheikh Al-Gazaly**; In the book of the revival of the religion science (Iheaa Oloum Alden) : the paradise is decorated by *Hourin* (paradise nymphs), those nice women as if they are rubies and corals , they had never been copulated (fucked) by any human or Jinn (fairy), they are rooming around in the different levels of paradise , if one of them swaggered in her walk, her coat will carry seventy thousands of the boys , fondled, perfumed , protected from aging .

- **Mister Mohammed Galal keshk** also commented on this pleasure and enjoyment saying; there is no place to any embarrassment from the sensational body demands, he added saying;' there is no hideousness or blemish in the body or in fulfilling its permissible lusts and desires in this world or seeking the bodily pleasure unlimitedly in the afterlife "(Khawater Moslem (Muslim thoughts in the sexual issue, page 211)

So does anyone dare to say that those are repugnant or vulgar words??? So why does the challenger dare to say so on the words in the book of Ezekiel which in all its expressions are far less than that mentioned above not even a tiny piece of it ?

Fifth; Some of the words mentioned in the prophetic converses

In the confirmed prophetic converses, a lot of that kind of words were mentioned , and they are not considered repugnant or vulgar concerning the wedlock, and the accompanied sensations and feelings and the lusty pleasure of each body part, also the converses mentioned concerning the sexual relation of the noble prophet with the mother of believers especially Miss Aisha , whoever wants to know that , should read that in the following references ;

- 1) Sahih Al-Bokhary
- 2) Sahih Muslim
- 3) Islam and sex by Dr: Abdul Wahab Bouhadibih , that book was introduced by professor Hala Al-Aouri
- 4) The prophet's women by Dr Aisha Abdul Rahman , bent Al-Shatte'
- 5) Khawater Moslem (Muslim thoughts in the sexual issue) by Mister Mohammed Galal keshk, published by the Islamic heritage bookshop.

Finally

I hope that I fulfilled the research, and now it is obvious to us those main items that I will recapitulate in;

- 1) What was mentioned in Ezekiel was a forbiddance for disgraceful and hideous acts committed by the Jewish nation at that time.
- 2) That saying was not about adultery in its literal sexual meaning, but it is the metaphorical spiritual adultery through abandoning God, and worshipping other gods
- 3) The words mentioned were a description of the evils which were actually practiced in the rituals and liturgy of the idol worshipping at that time with the aim of its disclosure and forbiddance
- 4) Many Words Similar to these were mentioned also in many noble quran verses and noble prophetic converses and they are not considered repugnant or vulgar

With the wisdom of God that was our answer on that challenge of what was mentioned in the book of Ezekiel, chapter 23

The second challenge

About

The book of the songs of songs

The challenge on the book of the songs of songs includes the followings:

- 1) The flagrant flirtation patterns
- 2) It is a dialogue between two lovers
- 3) The sexual expressions

First: The flagrant flirtation patterns

Actually the challengers on that book said in their challenging" whoever reads the book of the songs of songs in the Old Testament and read the shameful flirtation patterns included in it , will realize that included shameful expressions are the result of hideous animal lusting nature can never be the words of God , the lord of all-mankind"

The answer

To that extent this book has been under attack accused of being shameful flirtation patterns, only because it includes metaphorical expressions extracted from the legalistic sacred loving relationship between the groom and his bride , expressing God's love for his people , these loving and not sexual expressions are described by his eminence as, "the result of hideous animal lusting nature that can never be the words of God , the lord of all-mankind" so he is denying that these loving and not sexual expressions are issued by God , the lord of all-mankind

Why didn't he ask himself: How did God, the lord of all-mankind created the sex in the human being (Although the expressions of the Song of Songs are not sexual at all)?

And why did God create the natural inclination of man to the opposite sex? And why did he legalize the marriage and marital relationships and what are happening in it concerning the bodily pleasures? Doesn't his eminence remember what did Islam legalize concerning the pleasure marriage in Women chapter (Surat An-Nisa) 24: saying" those of whom you have enjoyed sexual relations, give them their *wages* as prescribed; but if after *wages are* prescribed, and you agree mutually to give more, there is no sin on you., Allah is ever All-Knowing, All Wise." Can this be expressed as he said before as a shameful flirtation pattern resulting from a hideous animal lusting nature? Does anyone dare to describe the romantic and honest love words between the man and his wife as shameful flirtation patterns??

Does the challenger remember also what was mentioned in:

-In Mount chapter (Surat At-Tur), 19; concerning the believer's pleasure in the afterlife with the paradise nymphs (*Hourin*), as the noble verse is saying: "And we shall marry them to *Hourin*"

-Also in the Event chapter (Surat Al-Waqi'ah) 22-37 " and there will be Hourin (paradise nymphs)... And made them virgins" And (there will be) *Hourin* (fair females with wide, lovely eyes. Like unto preserved pearls. A reward for what they used to do. To his saying...Verily, We have created them maidens of special creation. . And made them virgins."

Here are comments of some of the eminent Islamic scholars:

+ Mister Mohammed Galal keshk said; it is well confirmed from the quran text that the *Hourin* (paradise nymphs) are for the sexual pleasure (Khawater Moslem (Muslim thoughts in the sexual issue, page 202)

- Sheikh Al-Gazaly said; In the book of the revival of the religion science (Iheaa Oloum Alden) : the paradise is decorated by *Hourin*, (paradise nymphs) , those nice women as if they are rubies and corals , they had never been copulated (fucked) by any human or Jinn (fairy) , they are rooming around in the different levels of paradise , if one of them swaggered in her walk, her coat will carry seventy thousands of the boys , fondled, perfumed , protected from aging .

+ Mister Mohammed Galal keshk also commented on this pleasure and enjoyment saying; there is no place to any embarrassment from the sensational body demands, he added saying; 'there is no hideousness or blemish in the body or in fulfilling its permissible lusts and desires in this world or seeking the bodily pleasure unlimitedly in the afterlife "(Khawater Moslem (Muslim thoughts in the sexual issue, page 211)

Does anyone dare to describe these words as hackneyed and repugnant??? So does the challenger dare to say so on the words of the song of the songs , which in all its expressions are far less than that mentioned above not even a tiny piece of it

Second: their saying that's a dialogue between two lovers:

From the challenges also on that book: they say that this book is basically a dialogue between a lover and beloved, so how it was an inspiration God of all mankind?

The answer:

Actually this book is not describing the relationship between God and his church from the dialogue between a lover and beloved, but the metaphorical similitude is derived from converses between a bridegroom and his bride, i.e. Between two who are interconnected by a legal, sacred and romantic relationship. We do believe that the Christ in his loving relationship with the church which is the congregation of believers is assimilated by the loving relationship and bond between the bridegroom and his bride, so John the Baptist said:" He who has the bride is the bridegroom; but the friend of the bridegroom, rejoices" (John 3:29), so he assimilated the Christ by the bridegroom and the church by the bride, and himself by friend of the bridegroom

Assimilating the Christ by bridegroom and the church, which is the congregation of believers by the bride, was mentioned in many other places in the holy bible, which can't be totally mentioned here

The spiritual meaning beyond that metaphorical similitude is the clarification of the sacred loving bond between the Christ and his church , which is his people as he said:" I have loved you with an everlasting love: therefore with loving kindness have I drawn you."(Jeremiah 31:3) , also the bible is saying : " Husbands, love your wives, even as the Christ also loved the church, and gave himself up for it" (Ephesus 5:25), it is not a lusty sexual love but it is a devoting sacrificing love "as the Christ gave himself for her"

Is there here any shame, or flagrant mustiness??

Third: the sexual expressions

The challengers are driving the examples from the words of the book of Song of the Songs to prove that they are sexual hackneyed words, from those words:

'Let him kiss me with the kisses of his mouth" (Song of the songs 1:2), and the challenge here is: what are those kisses aren't they a flagrant sex?

The answer:

- 1) We shouldn't forget an important basic fact which is: these words are between a bridegroom and his Bride, so that's a legal sacred speech and not hackneyed illegal relationship
- 2) In addition to that it's an expression for pure honest love , and we are saying in our most sacred worshiping with a thought devoid of impurity " kiss one another by a sacred kiss " meaning that express your love to each other by a sacred handshake, not by a deceiving kiss as Judas, the Iscariot did , who extradited the Christ to the Jews to crucify him , so the Christ had to say to him :"(do you betray the Son of Man with a kiss?" (Luke 22:48)

So do these kisses are flagrant flirtation a result of natural animal lust as they say Aren't the kisses between the bridegroom and his bride or between the husband and his wife something away from being flagrant or hackneyed? As the flagrant and the hackneyed is the one related to the illegal relationship but the expressions concerning the legal relationship has no mustiness suspicion in it

- 3) The spiritual meaning of that similitude: the holy inspiration had made from that sacred relationship between the bridegroom and his bride a metaphorical similitude on the legal relationship bonding us with God in an honest sacred love
- 4) Actually the challengers are falsely accusing the book of Song of the Songs, depicting it to the reader as a book of the fallen hackneyed literature, God forbid to say hackneyed words , but those challengers are resistant to understand those spiritual sacred expressions , they misunderstood them according to their personal thinking , so the holy bible said in Apostle Paul letter to Titus 1;15 (To the pure, all things are pure; but to those who are defiled and unbelieving, nothing is pure; but both their mind and their conscience are defiled."
- 4) Dear reader, let me be frank with you, I hesitated a lot to mention the words of the Christ about this issue, not to be misunderstood, I am assuring to you dear reader that I didn't mean to humiliate anybody by saying this, as we love and respect everybody even if he is not agreeing with us in his thinking, as the proverb is saying: "the difference in opinion doesn't ruin the friendship"
- 5) Now after making up my point I found myself (confident in your love and good thinking of me) to mention the words of the Christ as it was mentioned in (Matthew 7:6)"Don't give that which is holy to the dogs, neither throw your pearls before the pigs, lest perhaps they trample them under their feet, and turn and tear you to pieces. "for that the reading of this book was forbidden for the spiritually immature, not to harm themselves if they take it in its literal meaning exactly as the challengers did and not by the spiritual meaning which is meant by this metaphorical eloquent expressions concerning the most sacred bond of love which is the bond between God and his holy church

6) After that dear reader I want to prove to you that the book of song of the songs is not as the challengers are claiming of being a hackneyed flirtation book

A) In the bride saying:

"Your name is oil poured forth, therefore the virgins love you." (Song of the songs 1:3)

From that verse it is obvious that if the book is a flirtation between two lovers so did the beloved girl accept that other girls are sharing her in loving her lover, did she was devoid of jealousy and keeping the love of her lover for herself only ? So why she is saying, therefore the virgins love you?

But the spiritual meaning of those words is: the believing soul who is tasting the sweetness of the relationship with God can never settle down unless others are attracted with her to him to enjoy the same grace which she is enjoying, exactly as the Samarian woman who met the Christ and her life was totally changed, so she rushed up to her town the Samara and attracted her people to follow the Christ

B) The bride is saying

"Take me away with you. Let us hurry..... We will be glad and rejoice in you. ... They Are Right to love you." (Song of the songs 1:4)

It is obvious also from the words of the bride that she is sharing the others also in her love to her lover as after her saying," Take me away with you," she is saying by the pleural pronoun" us" Let us hurry, we will be glad and rejoice in you," she is confirming that by her saying" They are right to love you". So how can this be a personal flirtation and the words are pointing to the sacred sharing as all the believers who love God are meant in that speech, so it is not the issue of flagrant flirtation as claimed by the Challengers!!

C) In the bridegroom saying to his bride

"Graze your young goats beside the shepherds' tents." (Song of the songs 1:8)

How this could be a flirtation, and he is allowing his beloved to go to the shepherds, Wasn't he jealous on her? Didn't he want to keep her love to himself and to refuse to Leave her for a moment or a twinkling of eye!!

The spiritual meaning that was away from the mind of those challengers was that: the heavenly groom who is the Christ is advising the soul who is related to him to go to the priests and servants of God to Graze her life there under their guidance

There are many phrases from that kind, in that book answering the accusations of the challengers by definite proofs that this book can't be a flirtation between two lovers on

the sexual, physical level that was misunderstood by the challengers, but it is a sacred book with superior meanings in metaphorical expressions can't be realized by the lusty bodily people, as , to the pure , all things are pure

Actually the main issue concerning the beloved Muslims which hinder them from understanding the Christian expressions concerning God's relationship with man, as they are viewing that relationship between God and man as just a worshipping relationship to God, but in the Christian faith that relationship is a strong loving relationship , as we see the bible is saying :**"For God so loved the world" (John 3:16)** and also, **"We love him, because he first loved us"**(1John 4:19)

On that scale, the contexture of song of the songs book was made, using the metaphorical expressions of the legal relationship between the bridegroom and his bride, showing the depth of God's love to man, so do we consider these legal similitude as flagrant hackneyed similitude?

"He, who has ears to hear, let him hear."!!!!

That was a brief answer for that challenges and a clarification for the spiritual meaning for that metaphorical expressions

The third challenge

The contradiction in the number of People of Israel between what was Mentioned in 2 Samuel and 1 Chronicles

Actually these apparently challenges are increasing the holy bible solidarity, when an honest person inspects carefully the verity of the matter, then he will realize the accuracy of the holy bible, exactly the opposite of was aimed at by the challengers aiming at skepticism in the accuracy of the holy bible text, and that's the proof :

First: the problem

- 1) The number of the People of Israel according to 2 Samuel (2 Samuel 24:9) is 800,000 Persons
- 2) But according to 1 Chronicles (1 Chronicles 21:5) is 1,000,000 persons
- 3) The difference between the two numbers is = $1,000,000 - 800,000 = \underline{300,000 \text{ persons}}$

Second: the solution

Actually the number mentioned in 2 Samuel 24:9 was not including the officers and soldiers assigned for king's sentry that was mentioned in 1 Chronicles 21:5, it was mentioned in details in the same book (1 Chronicles) chapter 27, here is the explanation:

- 1) in (1 Chronicles 21:5)" All those of Israel were thousand thousand and a hundred thousand (one million one hundred thousand) men

2) But in (2 Samuel 24:9) "the sum of the numbering of the people were only eight hundred thousand"{800,000}

Third: the explanation in details

By studying 1 Chronicles chapter 27, we will find that there was for the king's sentry:

1) **Thousand Chiefs** for the twelve tribes of Israel. Meaning that there was:
12 Chiefs, each one was heading a thousand officer (1 Chronicles: 27)

So the sum of officers will be:
12X1000 = 12 thousand officers

2) There was 12 squads of soldiers in the army working under the command of the Thousand Chiefs (1 Chronicles: 27), as each squad was patrolling for a month, and the twelve squads were for patrolling in the twelve months of the year (1 Chronicles: 27)

3) Each of these squads was composed of 24 Thousand soldiers (1 Chronicles: 27),

4) So the number of soldiers of the twelve squads was:

24 X12 = 288 thousand soldiers

5) So the sum of officers and soldiers who were not included in the census was:

12 Thousand Officers + 288 Thousand soldiers = 300 Thousand persons

And that was the same difference between the censuses mentioned in:

1 Chronicles 21:5 which was 1,100,000

And 2 Samuel 24:9 which was 800,000

300,000

This is the difference we need to affirm

The fourth Challenge

About the difference in the Number
Of people of Judah between
What was mentioned in Samuel and Chronicles books

First: the problem:

- 1) In 2 Samuel 24:9 it was mentioned that the number of people of Judah was 500 thousand men
- 2) In 1 Chronicles 21:5 it was mentioned that the number was 470 thousand men
- 3) So the difference is 500 thousand - 470 thousand = 30 thousand men

Second: the solution:

- 1) Read in 2 Samuel 6:1 you will find that king David took 30 thousand men to bring the Ark of God from the Palestinians
- 2) Those 30 thousand were on the land border between Judah in Gaza and the land of Judah
- 3) Those were included among the people of Judah so the total number was 500 Thousand
- 6) But they were not mentioned in the book of Chronicles so the number was: 500,000 – 30,000 = 470,000 men

This is also what we need to affirm

The Fifth challenge

Number of the famine years

First: the problem

- 1) In (2 Samuel 24:13) it was mentioned that the number of famine years are seven
- 2) In 1 Chronicles 21:12 it was mentioned that the number of famine years are three
- 3) So there is four years difference

Second: the solution:

If we return back to the famine that happened in the land of Egypt at the time of Joseph The chaste, as mentioned in (Genesis 41), we will read about the seven years of Famine Which happened on stages

Fist stage: the famine in the beginning

It was mentioned In (Genesis 41:55) "... all the land of Egypt was famished..."
 Also In (Genesis 41:56) "The famine was over all the surface of the earth"
 {That was a famine in its beginning}

Second stage: the stage of severe famine

It was mentioned In (Genesis 41:56)" The famine was severe in the land of Egypt."
 Also in (Genesis 41:57)" the famine was severe in all the earth."

{ In this stage the famine became severe }

Third stage the summit of famine :

We read in (Genesis 47:13) "There was no bread in all the land; for the famine was very sore"

{Here we reached to the real famine when it was very sore }

From that we realize that the number mentioned in 1 Chronicles 21:12, which is seven Years included the three successive stages

- 1) **Fist stage:** {two years} when the famine started and people were fed on what they had from the cattle and feeble animals
- 2) **Second stage:** {two years} also there are still little of the plants and grass that can be Fed
- 3) **The third stage:** the remaining three years where the famine was so sore that they Found nothing to eat so they ate the donkeys and birds' stool, even their own sons As happened in the siege of Samara
- 4) **Concerning the number {three years} mentioned in 2 Samuel 24:13** that represented the toughest period of the famine which was the last period mentioned in (1 Chronicles 21:12)

So there was no discrepancy between the two numbers of the two stories, on the Contrary this apparent discrepancy confirms the accuracy of the holy bible for the Meticulous students

The sixth challenge

The wine

Is it lawful or unlawful in the Christianity?

The Accusations

Some are accusing the Christianity by legalizing the wine, and trying to prove that by many accusations as:

- 1) The Christ transformed the water to wine in the wedding of Cana of Galilee (John 2)
- 2) They are saying that it was mentioned in the holy bible that (little wine is healing the Stomach's Sake)
- 3) They are telling that the church is using the wine in the Eucharist

So let us answer these allegations

The first accusation

The transformation of water to wine In the wedding of Cana of Galilee

The challengers are saying that the Christ transformed water to wine in the wedding of Cana of Galilee, that's a proof that Christianity made the wine lawful

The answer:

Whoever read that miracle in the holy bible will realize that this wine transformed from the water;

1) Made those drunken to be sober (John 2: 9,10) as we read" When the ruler of the feast tasted the water that had become wine ... the ruler of the feast called the bridegroom, and said to him, "Everyone serves the good wine first, and when the guests have drunk freely, then that which is worse. You have kept the good wine until now!"

It is well known that whoever drinks the wine develops numbness in the sensation areas of his mouth, so after a certain amount of wine he will no longer feel the taste of the wine

But the ruler of the feast who tasted the water that had become wine regained sobriety from his drunkenness, and he discriminated the taste of good wine , as if he regained the taste sensation , therefore he blamed the bridegroom saying: , "Everyone serves the good wine first, and when the guests have drunk freely, then that which is worse. You have kept the good wine until now!"

So it was an unusual wine that causes no drunkenness, on the contrary it regains one's sobriety, so whoever accuses the Christianity by permitting the wine depending on that incident is mistaking

2) Actually that water transformed to wine, represent the plenums with the Holy Spirit. Our teacher Apostle Paul is saying in his letter to Ephesus chapter 5:18" Don't be drunk with wine, in which is dissipation, but be filled with the Spirit"

So Apostle Paul linked the wine by being filled with the Holy Spirit, that gives superior effects to that given by the usual wine ,regaining the sobriety of the drunken from the deceiving world beverages ,and exhilarating their lives to feel the grace of God

The second accusation

They are saying that it is mentioned in the bible
(Little wine is healing the Stomach's Sake)

The answer:

- 1) Actually this phrase used by them is a distorted phrase; it is not "Little wine is healing The Stomach's Sake" but the correct verse is "Be no longer a drinker of water only, But use a little wine for your stomach's sake and your frequent infirmities".
(1Timothy 5:23)
- 2) The wine was a remedy for that kind of infirmities; you may remember the Good Samaritan parable, who found a man who fell among robbers, who beat him, when the Good Samaritan passed by him "he bound up his wounds, pouring on oil and wine."
(Luke 10:34)
- 3) So the advice of Apostle Paul to timothy to use little wine was as a remedy for his frequent infirmities, not to enjoy drinking wine

Now dear reader you may recognize now that this accusation also is invalid and falsely based and unjustifiable accusation

The third accusation

The usage of wine in the Eucharist

They are saying that the church is using the wine in the Eucharist, and by saying that proofing that the Christianity is legalizing drinking of wine

The answer:

- 1) Actually the Christ said on himself "I am the true vine, and my Father is the Winegrower."(John 15:1)
- 2) He also said about his followers" You are the branches".(John 15:5)
- 3) And as the vine extract diffuses to the branches to nourish them, the Christ used the Vine extract to point to his sacred blood that we take and it diffuses in our veins to

Sanctify our blood and whole internal essence

- 4) So the Christ didn't give us the vine extract to enjoy its zest and be drunk but he gave it to us for a sacred immaculate purpose, can't be realized except by the believers**

The wine

And the holy bible opinion

I wish to tell you dear reader the opening of the holy bible on the wine and its drinking

First: The degrees of drinking the wine

By reading the proverbs chapter twenty three we will find three degrees of wine drinking;

1) The first degree: the degree of addiction

This degree is obvious in the following verses:" Who has woe? Who has sorrow? Who has strife? Who has complaints? Who has needless bruises? Who has bloodshot eyes? Those who tarry long at the wine"(Proverbs 29:30)

2) The second degree the degree of just drinking

As the thirtieth verse is saying "Who has strife? Who has needless bruises? Who has bloodshot eyes? Those who stay long at the wine; those who go to seek out mixed wine. (Proverbs 23:30)

3) The third degree: just looking at it (Proverbs 23:31) "Don't look at the wine when it is red, when it Sparkles in the cup, when it goes down smoothly. In the end, it bites like a snake, and Poisons like a viper. "

4) The forth degree: not sitting with the drinkers

(Proverbs 23:20) "Don't be among winebibbers, among riotous eaters of their flesh"

You may notice dear that God had forbidden all these stages. From that we realize that the wine is unlawful in the holy bible

Second: the lord is eulogizing those who are not drinking wine

The lord showed in the book of Jeremiah his eulogizing for not drinking the wine as he said" Then came the word of the lord to Jeremiah, saying, Thus says the lord of Armies... Go, and tell the men of Judah and the inhabitants of Jerusalem.... The words of Jonadab the son of Rechab, that he commanded his sons, not to drink wine, are performed; and to this day they drink none, for they obey their father's commandment: but I have spoken to you, rising up early and speaking; and you have not listened to me."(Jeremiah 35:13)

The lord is rebuking his people, as Jonadab's son obeyed their father, not to drink Wine while this People is not obeying the lord's command

Third: the lord's forbiddance of drunkenness by wine

We are reminding again of the lord's saying through Apostle Paul in Ephesus chapter 5:18:"Don't be drunk with wine, in which is dissipation, but be filled with the Spirit"

The lord's ban of drunkenness by wine was followed by an affirmative commandment of being filled with the Spirit.

Actually the man who tasted the sweetness of the Christ and got drunk by the wine of his Love and had been filled by the Holy Spirit, will never think of drinking the wine in all Types and Degrees whatever be its joy, this is what was explained by the holy bible In its saying:" A full soul loathes a honeycomb'(Proverbs 27:7)

The end

**In the end of that book,
I raise a prayer from my heart
To the lord to use these words to clarify
God's transcendental purposes,
To discredit every strange thinking
And to answer every challenge
Impinges our sacred belief
I leave you in God's peace
I wish you remember me in your prayers**