

## FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS about JESUS

Dr Jay Smith

### INTRO

'Frequently Asked Questions' (FAQ) about Jesus which Muslims challenge us with and how we answer them in small 5-10-minute soundbites, employing the '3 C's' (Quick, Concise, yet Comprehensive)

### 01: DOES YAHWEH = ALLAH?

Is the God Yahweh of the Bible the same as the god Allah of the Qur'an?

In order to believe the two are the same, then they are going to have to accept 4 things:

- 1) Allah of the Qur'an has to be triune
- 2) Allah of the Qur'an has to be able to come to earth
- 3) Allah of the Qur'an has to have died and rose again
- 4) Allah of the Qur'an has to have an eternal Son

None of these four can be applied to the Allah of the Qur'an, yet all four are not only essential to our God, but are intrinsic in the Gospel message, and all four separate us from Islam as well.

A second and corollary question: Allah of the Arabic Bible = Allah of the Arabic Qur'an?

3 problems:

1st: Same names are not equal anymore than my name makes me equal to every Jay.

2nd: 'Allah' was chosen in the Arabic Bible as the only name available, due to "Dynamic Equivalents" (i.e. Eugene Nida). Yet, when choosing a foreign god, you incorporate their meanings (the problem of 'form and meaning'), which has created much confusion.

3rd: 'Allah' is a pagan god named 'ilaha', the generic title for the Nabatean god, 'Dusharah', who has a wife 'Al Uzza', whose generic title is 'Al-lat' (Surah 53:19-21)! Thus, Allah is pagan and polytheistic, yet both the Bible & Qur'an claim that their God is the 'ONE, true God'.

Consequently, the best name is YAHWEH, found 6,823 times, which Jesus claimed in John 8:58.

### 02: CAN GOD BE 1, YET 3, SIMULTANEOUSLY?

This is a problem for Allah, who is only one, a monad, thus no relationship within the godhead, and from whence comes relationships which we have as humans, since we are social animals.

Muslims say Allah is Compassionate, Merciful, and Loving; but all three require an object, so where was compassion, mercy and love before Adam and Eve were created?

Muslims, to truly understand where we get our relational qualities from, will have to accept a triune God, who is One, yet Three - simultaneously, which is a definition of our Biblical God.

### 03: CAN GOD COME TO EARTH?

Muslims ask the question concerning whether God can enter 'Time and Space', or whether he can come to earth, at their own peril.

If they truly believe that their god, Allah is 'Akbar' (the greater), than to suggest that he cannot come to earth, or take on human form takes away his greatness.

If they really believe that their Allah is omnipotent, but cannot come to earth, then that takes away his omnipotence.

Fortunately, we don't have this problem in Christianity, because the Bible is very clear that from the very beginning God entered 'time and space'. It's right there in the very first story (Gen. 3:8-9) where we find God '*walking and talking with Adam and Eve, in the cool of the day*', proving that from the beginning of mankind God has been able to enter 'time and space', and relate to mankind 'face-to-face'.

It's obvious that Islam's god, who can neither walk nor talk in 'time and space', is just too small, suggesting that Muslims need a bigger God, one who can come to earth, and can relate to them intimately, as a friend.

But, in order to get that kind of God, a real big God, they are going to have to come home, to our God, whose name is Jesus Christ.

### 04: CAN GOD HAVE A SON?

Muslims assume that Jesus was God's biological son, via Mary. The problem, is with the Qur'an: Surah 4:171 = God has no son, S.5:17 = cannot be the Messiah, 5:72 = can have no partners, 5:75 = cannot eat, S.5:116 = Mary is in the trinity, S.6:101 = has no wife. None reflect what we believe!

Jesus is and always will be the 'Son of God'. So, sonship can also be relational.

Surah 2:177 = '*ibn ul-sabeeli*', 'son of the road', Surah 39:4 intimates Allah can have a son! How?

'Son of God' = inherits everything his Father has, including his divinity. That's why Caiaphas asked Jesus it in Matthew 26:62-66. That's why Qur'an confronts Jesus' divinity in these 6 verses

### 05: WHERE DOES JESUS SAY, "I AM GOD"?

Jesus wouldn't say "I am God" but employed divine titles. Four times he said "I am God":

Matthew 26:62-66 - the 'Messiah', the 'Son of God', and the 'Son of Man'. Look at Caiaphas's reaction; tore his robe and said, "*this man has spoken blasphemy, and thus deserves death*".

John 8:58, in the temple, to Jews, Jesus said, "*Before Abraham was, I AM*", which in Hebrew is 'Yahweh', the divine and personal name of God. Note their reaction.

### 06: ISN'T JESUS JUST TOO INFERIOR TO BE GOD?

In Matthew chapters 24 and 28, and in John chapter 14 you have references of Jesus saying that the Father is greater than him, and we find him praying to the father in the Garden of Gethsemane, and that only God, not he, knows the end of time; all examples which suggest that Jesus is inferior to the Father, which means he cannot be God.

The answer is in Philippians 2:6-9, where Jesus, who was equal to God, yet limited himself and became a man. So, during the 33 years on earth he was 100% a man, yet still 100% divine.

Thus, the temptations on the cross were very real as a man, while at the same time it had to be God on the cross, otherwise how could our sins be redeemed, since that is only something God can do?

While this is a mystery to us, let's look at it in the context of quantity vs quality. Quantitatively he was less of God while on earth, in the same way that Jay is quantitatively less of an American when he was living in Britain (he wasn't living in the US, wasn't breathing its air, nor participating in American life, etc...), yet qualitatively, he was still 100% an American, because his American passport says so.

In the same way when Jesus came to earth, he quantitatively took upon himself a limited form by being a human, but still qualitatively he was 100% divine.

The function of Jesus on earth may seem inferior (that's man's reasoning), in the same way that my function may seem inferior to the Queen of England (she lives in Buckingham Palace, and can open up Parliament, neither of which I can do), so quantitatively I am inferior to her in function; yet, qualitatively we are both 100% human, and are both equal before God.

So, God is perfectly capable of taking on a limited form as a man, without diminishing his divine status. Rather than questioning whether God is inferior by doing so, we should instead be in awe that he would choose to do so for you and me. Because if he hadn't, we would all still be in our sins without any hope of salvation.

## **07: WHY DID GOD NEED TO DIE?**

This is a foundational question, and to understand it we need to go back to the very beginning, to Genesis 3, where Adam and Eve, in the Garden of Eden, sinned against God, which required forgiveness.

Yet, God, in the same scenario where He condemned Adam and Eve, then turned towards Eve, and in verse 15 said that someone, HE, thus a male, would come in HER line, in the line of the woman, to crush the head of Satan, and he would bruise his heel. This is the first prophecy of the crucifixion.

So, who is that person? We know that He is going to be called the 'Messiah', that He will be called 'The Son of God', and that He would be called 'The Son of Man', the three divine titles we talked about earlier.

We've also been told in Isaiah 7:14 that this man would come through a virgin, which has to be a miracle, and that when this virgin conceives a son, He shall be called 'Emmanuel', which means 'God with us'.

So, why did He have to come; because of the sin which entered the world in Genesis 3. And this sin needed atonement. 79 times in the Old Testament it refers to atonement, stipulating that in order for the sin against God (which all sin is) to be atoned, a life had to be given and blood needed to be shed (see Leviticus 17:11).

But not just any life, nor just any blood. This blood must come from He who was sinned against, which means it had to be shed by God Himself, since none of us as sinful men and women are holy enough to redeem that sin.

That is why the whole sacrificial system, which Muslims are still following today, was begun with Abraham, but look in Genesis 15 to see how that sacrificial system was begun.

God told Abraham to get 3 animals and 3 birds, to kill them, then separate them on a rock so that the two parties could seal the blood covenant between God and Man (represented by Abraham), by means of both parties walking between the sacrificed animals.

But then God put Abraham to sleep, so only God went between the sacrificed animals (as a fiery brand), pointing out clearly that the entire sacrificial system was predicated on the notion that Mankind could not participate in this final sacrifice, as that was something only God could do.

Now can you understand why it had to be God, and no one else, who was required to come to earth? Because only God was worthy enough and holy enough to take upon Himself all of our sins. We should be in awe of what God has done for us, sacrificing Himself by dying on the cross, and then rising again, and by doing so destroying the sin of Satan, and redeeming us all to Himself, providing we accept what He did for us 2,000 years ago.

### 08: HOW CAN ANYONE TAKE ON OUR GUILT?

Muslims often ask how someone can take on the price of another, or the guilt of another, as this would be unjust...and on face value this does look unjust.

There are two references in the Qur'an which confront the seeming injustice of someone taking on the guilt of another; Surahs 6:164 and 53:38. These two verses attack the notion that God can take on our sin on the cross, or that we are imputed with Adam and Eve's sin.

Yet, what will Muslims do with Surah 7:24 which says that Adam and Eve were thrown out of the Garden of Eden, which is situated in space, and thrown down to earth. The fact that none of us are up in that garden now, proves that we are all imputed with Adam and Eve's sin.

Why is it that no one has the same choice that Adam and Eve had, and are not tested the same way as them, but are all automatically born already on earth?

It's obvious that the writers of the Qur'an borrowed this story from the Bible, but had no idea of the meaning of the story, something you should never do, because the Biblical stories are impregnated with theology, proving that original sin is both in the Bible and the Qur'an. So, why are the Muslims even asking this question...unless they also ask the same question of the Qur'an?

Furthermore, what about Surah 4:157, where there is a crucifixion; yet, the man on the cross is not Issa? So, someone else was on the cross paying the price for Issa, which also contradicts Surahs 6:164 and 53:38!

In conclusion, can someone else pay for my sin? Of course not! No man can pay for my sin. Even I can't pay for my sin...but God can...and God did...and He paid for all your sins by dying for you on the cross.

### 09: WAS JESUS CRUCIFIED?

Surah 4:157 = Jesus didn't die, someone else did. There are 5 problems with that verse:

1) Internal Problems: Surah 4:157 is confronted by Surah 19:33 "*Bless be me the day I was born, the day I die and the day I rise again*". Not future, because of S.19:15 (Yaxya)

2) Theological Problems: Surahs 6:164 and 53:38 both say that no one can take on the guilt of another, and that no one can pay the sin for another, yet what about the man on the cross?

3) Historical Problems: Every historical witness says Jesus was on the cross: Greek scholars Thallus and Phlegon (52 AD), Roman Tacitus under Pontius Pilate, during the reign of Tiberius (33 AD). Jewish Josephus, a Greek, a Roman, and a Jew, all from the 1st and 2nd centuries.

4) Eye-witness Problems: John = 3 years. Mary = 33 years. Man on the cross: "*Father forgive them, for they know not what they do*"..."*Into your hands I commend my spirit*". Wrong man?

5) Moral Problems: Could Issa let another man die in his place, and then claim it was he? Would God not tell anyone about it for 600 years...and then tell an illiterate Arab? That's deceitful!

### 10: IF GOD'S ON EARTH, WHO RUNS THE UNIVERSE?

While the 2nd person of the Trinity Jesus Christ was on earth, who was running the universe? This is an interesting question because it intimates that the Muslims who are posing it are imposing their view of their monad god, Allah, who is all contained in one mode, onto the Biblical God, who is likewise one, but in three persons. And you cannot do that.

It is obvious from a Biblical perspective that the Holy Spirit's function is always to run the universe, which He continued to do even while Jesus was on earth.

But the same question can be reversed back onto Muslims, which Jay does in this episode. In Surah 20:10-14 we find Moses investigating a burning bush, and a voice within the Bush, in verse 12, tells Moses to take off his shoes as he is on 'holy ground'.

Can any place be holy without God there? No, of course not. In verse 14 the voice claims to be God who is speaking to Moses. Can anything or anyone claim to be God without committing 'Shirk', the unforgiveable sin? Again, of course not!

Thus, that means that God had to be in that bush, which was on earth, which suggests that in 1400 BC, at the time of Moses God did come to earth, according to the Qur'an.

So, while God was in that bush on earth...who then was running the universe?

Muslims have no answer, unless they are willing to acknowledge that God is triune and accept the fact that while Jesus was on earth, the Holy Spirit ran the universe, and will always continue to run the universe; because that is His function.

### 11: Is JESUS, THE TRUE PROPHET, or Muhammad?

4 Criteria for Prophet-hood: 1) Must be in the prophetic line (Genesis 17, 22; Gal.4), 2) Must do a prophecy or perform a miracle, 3) Must have similar message (Jesus vs Issa), 4) Must know God's holy/personal/universal/unique name = Yahweh (Exodus 3:14-15). Jesus only qualifies!

The Qur'an = Issa is superior: S.19:20 - Issa, born from a virgin (Isaiah 7:14), S.3:46 - Issa spoke from the cradle, S.3:49 - Issa created birds out of clay, gave sight to the blind, healed the leper, and made dead men rise, S.19:19, Issa was a 'righteous son', (vs S.48:1-2). Comparisons between JESUS and Muhammad:

Jesus

Born of a Virgin (Mt.1:18-25; S.19:20)  
 Served God as a child (Lk.2:39-52; S.3:46)  
 Read the Bible early on (Lk.16-21)  
 Poor, depended on donations (Lk.4:16-21; 8:1-3)  
 Performed miracles (Mk.3:9-10; S.3:49)  
 Made blind eyes see (S.18:35-43; 3:49)  
 Made the lame to walk (Mt.9:2-8)  
 Healed withered hands (Mt.12:10-13)  
 Forgave the adulteress (Jn.8:7)  
 Jesus raised the dead (Jn.11:1-45; S.3:49)  
 Excused his opponents (Lk.23:34, 43)  
 Sets the condemned free (Jn.8:1-11)  
 Was sinless (Jn.8:46; S.19:19)  
 Died for sinners (Jn.1:29; 10:18)  
 Rose from the dead (Lk.23-24)

Muhammad

Born normally (Ibn Hisham pp. 68-69)  
 Was an idolater before a prophet (Bukhari 6:452)  
 Was illiterate (S.7:157)  
 Took 20% of booty from others (Ibn Hisham p.281)  
 Never did miracles (S.29:50)  
 Made seeing eyes blind (Bukhari 8:520)  
 Made the walking lame (Bukhari 8:520)  
 Cut off a hand for stealing an egg (Bukhari 8:last3)  
 Adulteresses whipped/stoned (S.24:2; verse on *Rajam*)  
 Killed the living (Ibn Hisham p.308; Bukh.5:369)  
 Had his opponents killed (Bukh.1:241; 5:248)  
 Enslaved the free (Ibn Hisham p.466)  
 Was sinful (S.47:19; 48:1-2)  
 Had sinners killed (S.9:5; 47:4; Buh.1:241; 5:248)  
 Died/buried in Medina & there still (al-Tabari 9:208)

When you compare the two Jesus comes out on top in every major and important category!

**12: DOES JESUS HAVE 2 DIFFERENT GENEALOGIES?**

The Genealogy of Jesus is different in Matthew 1 to that of Luke 3.

In the Matthew account, it goes from Joseph, to Jacob, and then on up to Solomon, and then to David.

In Luke 3:23 it begins with Heli ("who they thought was the father of Joseph" - this is a rhetorical statement) and continues up to Nathan, and then to David.

It's obvious that the two are not the same genealogy, as Joseph couldn't have had both Jacob and Heli as his father.

The account in Matthew, however, is the real genealogy of Joseph, which goes through Jeconiah (also known as Jehoiakim), whom, we are told in Jeremiah 22:30, will have no offspring who will sit 'on the throne of David' (the Davidic line which the Messiah must come through), thus eradicating any notion that the Messiah could come in that genealogical line, and so destroying any possibility that Jesus could be the promised Messiah.

But Jesus did not come from Joseph, as he was born of a virgin named Mary. So, Matthew's account is not Jesus' genealogy at all.

That is why Luke wrote down Jesus' true lineage, from Mary, not Joseph, stipulating that Mary's father, Heli (verse 23), has a completely different lineage, one that goes up to Nathan, and doesn't include the evil Jeconiah at all.

This, however, creates a dilemma for Muslims, since in Surahs 19:28, 66:12, and in 20:25-30, we are told that Mary, the mother of Issa (Jesus), is also the sister of Aaron, and the son of Imran (known as Amran in the Bible).

Aaron, however, lived in 1400 BC, and had a brother named Moses, and the two were the sons of Amran. Yet, they also had a sister named Miriam. So, unless Mary (or Miriam) was 1400 years old, she couldn't also be the mother of Jesus!

The Qur'an has confused the two Marys, proving that its genealogy of Jesus is the wrong one, while the Bible, in contrast, submits that the genealogy of Jesus goes back to David two separate ways, via his adopted father Joseph (by marriage), and also through his true biological mother, Mary!

So, the two genealogies in the Gospel accounts are not contradictory at all, but complimentary; unlike that which we find in the Qur'an.

### **13: IS JESUS, NOT ISSA, MORE HISTORICAL?**

Muslims always claim that they have the 'real' Jesus. Yet, if you're going to ask that question, you need to ask who is the 'Jesus of history', not the 'Jesus of faith'.

To do that you need to go to the best historian of that time, Josephus, the Jewish historian, who gives us the best window into what was happening in the first century, in Judaism.

He mentions that there were three important debates which defined Judaism at that time; the Law which stipulated how the Jews were to live, the temple which was their center of worship, and the kingdom, the Davidic Kingdom, around which their identity was defined.

By 70 AD the temple and Jerusalem were destroyed, so the Kingdom no longer became a factor, and the Laws could no longer be enacted properly; so thus, these three themes would no longer be relevant after that time and would no longer be popular.

Does Jesus refer to these three themes? Absolutely.

He compares the Old Testament Mosaic law to the New Covenantal Law He was introducing in Matthew 5.

In John 2:19 He refers to the Temple, saying that if they destroyed it, in three days He would raise it again, which would have made no sense after 70 AD; proving that Jesus would have to have been living and made this statement prior to this time.

As for the Kingdom of God, He redefines it in Matthew 18:20 stipulating that it was no longer a place, but a relationship; that the Kingdom of God was anywhere there were 'two or three gathered in His name'.

Yet, conversely, when we look at the 'Issa' of the Qur'an, he never talks about the Law, nor about the temple, nor even about the Kingdom of God, placing him outside of a first century environment.

So, in answer to who is the more historical; the Biblical Jesus certainly is, because the Bible has got the right Jesus, talking about the right things, in the right place, and at the right time, proving that He is not the Jesus of faith, but the real Jesus of History.

### **14: HOW can SOMEONE PAY for my SINS?**

The quick answer is that no one (no person) can pay for my sin, because everyone is sinful, including myself. Only He who was sinless can pay that sin.

Every sin against another person (what we call horizontal sin) is also a sin against God (vertically). We can ask for forgiveness from another and repair that relationship (the horizontal sin), but how do we repair the sin which is vertical, against a Holy God, since the wages of that sin is death (Romans 6:23)?

So, how do Muslims pay for that sin against God? By simply working it off through 'Baraka' (blessings, recorded by the angel on their right shoulder)?

Absolutely not, but then Muslims have no idea that at one time we were in the presence of a Holy God, in the garden of Eden. Yet, how can we get back into His presence, since God is so holy, He can't even look upon One sin (Habakkuk 1:13)?

We can't, unless He who is sinless, takes on that sin Himself. And the Qur'an tells us who is sinless, in Surah 19:19; it is Issa, our Jesus Christ.

That's why God had to come to earth, to pay for ALL of our sins. All Muslims (or anyone else) has to do is simply accept that God died and rose again for their sins, and they can be with Him for eternity.

### 15: WHAT ABOUT THE 'SIGN OF JONAH'?

In Matthew 12:38-40 Jesus says to the Pharisees, '*Just as Jonah was in the belly of the whale for 3 days and 3 nights, so shall the Son of Man be 3 days and 3 nights in the heart of the earth*'. Yet, Jesus died on Friday, and rose on Sunday morning, which is 3 days and 2 nights. Thus, Muslims say, isn't this an error, and doesn't that prove that the Bible is corrupt?

It would help to go to Matthew 27:63-64 where the chief priests and the Pharisees went to Pilate and asked him to guard the tomb for 'three days', because Jesus had said he would rise 'on the 3<sup>rd</sup> day'; so, nowhere is there a reference to 3 nights.

This suggests that there is something different between how we refer to numbers in English and how they do it in Hebrew. To help us see that difference, we need to go back to Esther 4:16, where Mordecai is sitting at the city gate 'for 3 days and 3 nights', yet on the morning of the 3<sup>rd</sup> day Esther calls him, and he goes in, a similar scenario to what we find in Matthew 12.

This is an example of a Hebrew idiomatic expression, which the Pharisees and Jesus were well acquainted with, suggesting that '3 days and 3 nights' would have to touch all, or part, of 3 days.

So, while this sounds like an error in English, in Hebrew, it was quite acceptable, and Jesus here was speaking to Pharisees, thus he was most likely speaking in Hebrew.

### 16: Is the MAN OF PEACE, JESUS or MUHAMMAD?

Both Christianity and Islam claim that they have the real man of peace, but who is correct? Is it Jesus or Muhammad who is the best model for peace?

Muhammad may have been peaceful in Mecca, but according to the Islamic Traditions, once he moved to Medina, he was anything but peaceful. Almost immediately, he had Asma Bint Marwan, the poetess, killed at night (while suckling her baby); and her crime? She wrote some critical poetry against Muhammad. Can you then understand the reason for the violent reactions by Muslims all over the world when the 12 cartoons against Muhammad came out in Denmark (17 people around the world were killed), or the violent murders of the editors of the Charlie Hebdo magazine, who dared to mock Muhammad. Yet, they mocked Jesus even more, and no Christians called for their deaths, nor was anyone killed, because we don't find any reference to Jesus asking people to kill those who mock him, as we find with Muhammad.

When we look at Muhammad's biography, we find that from 624 AD he started using violence, throwing out the Jewish Banu Qaynuka family that year, and the Jewish Banu Nadir family the next year, in 625 AD. Then finally in 627 AD he attacked the last remaining Jewish family, the Banu Quraiza tribe, slitting the throats of 800 of their men, taking the women as concubines for his men, and the children as slaves. Yet the three Jewish tribes were natives of Medina, while Muhammad was only a guest, having only arrived there from Mecca 5 years earlier. We have a name for what he did there; we call it genocide.

From 627 AD – 632 AD, he was personally involved in 29 battle campaigns, and planned another 33 campaigns, so that the final 5 years of his life was replete with violence. So, if you want an example of a man of violence, you need go no further than Muhammad's own biography.

As an alternative, look at Jesus' biography. He never advocated, nor used violence; and the one-time violence was used for his defense, carried out by his disciple Peter in the Garden of Gethsemane, in Matthew 26:52, Jesus told Peter to 'put away your sword, for he who lives by the sword, dies by the sword'. He wouldn't even let his disciple defend him with violence.

So, if you're looking for the true man of peace (and we all want peace), you need look no further than Jesus Christ, the true man of peace, for everywhere, for everyone, and for every time.

### **17: Was JESUS PEACEFUL by KILLING a SERVANT (LK.19:27)?**

Moving to the supposed problems of peace in the Bible, we consider first the seeming violent actions and sayings of Jesus in the New Testament, and we begin with the story found in Luke 19:27 where Jesus said to bring the servant before him and kill him, suggesting that Jesus was advocating that we kill people.

To understand this verse you need to read the full chapter, and go specifically to verse 11, where it is clear that Jesus is teaching a parable, or a story here. Jesus often gave parables to explain a deeper spiritual truth, in this case asking who was in the Kingdom of God, and what would happen to those who were not.

For this particular parable Jesus uses the story of a king who gives different sums of money to his servants, and then asks them what they did with it. To the man who did nothing, he demanded that he be killed, intimating that all of us will be asked the same question at the end of time; namely, what did we do with the Kingdom of God which is dependent on acknowledging that Jesus died and rose again for our sins? For those of us who did nothing with that truth, those of us who reject his death and resurrection, we will be destroyed for eternity.

There is no suggestion in this story that Jesus wanted anyone killed while he was on earth, and, unlike Muhammad, he had no one killed during his 33 years on earth. But in the future, we will all have to stand before Jesus and be accounted for what we did with his death and resurrection. Are all of you ready to answer that question?

### **Addendum to killing servants, & the 'End of Times'**

A further question about Luke 19:27 concerns why Jesus used this parable at just this time? The answer has to do with the context of those days. Herod Archeleas, the son of Herod the Great wanted to become king of Israel, but needed Rome's authority to do so, and so had gone to Rome to gain it, but while there was opposed by Jews living there who didn't like his ruthlessness, and so confronted him. When he returned, he then rounded up those Jews and had them killed. Jesus, knowing that his audience would have known of this event, used this parable as an application concerning what God would do with those who rejected him at the end of time.

Furthermore, in Mathew 24:34 Jesus mentions that these events of the last times won't happen before this generation has died out, which Muslims claim is an error, because that generation died out 2,000 years ago.

Jesus, in Matthew chapters 24 and 25 is talking about the end times, and it is then that the generation won't die out, and all of these events would happen, quickly, not while he was living in the first century AD, since he already said in Matthew 21:43 that the kingdom had already been taken away.

### **18: Was Jesus peaceful by whipping the Money Changers (MT.21, JN.2:13-16)?**

In the story of Jesus in the Temple in Matthew 21:12-13, it says that he drove out the money changers and the animals from the court of the temple, using whips, implying that he was using violence, which Muslims claim was against people, the money-changers. Therefore, since Jesus used violence against people, so can Christians. But was he, and is this the full story?

To understand this story better we need to look at John 2:14-16 where the same story is recounted, but from another perspective, that of John's, who was an eyewitness to this very event. In verse 15 it is clear that Jesus only used a whip against the animals in the court, which is quite permissible even today, while in verse 16 it is with the authority of his voice that Jesus drove out the money-changers; proving that Jesus never used violence against anyone, but only employed the authority of his voice, something we are encouraged to model today as well.

### **19: Was Jesus peaceful by calling for Swords (Lk.22:36)?**

Jesus is in the upper room with his disciples the day before the crucifixion, and in Luke 22:36 he tells his disciples that he was leaving them. Therefore, they were to sell their cloaks, and buy swords, which suggests that he was calling his disciples to now use swords for violence.

But is it? Look at the context. To begin with, what were swords doing on a table? The fact is these weren't swords, but foot long daggers (known as Makhaira in Greek), which were used to cut the meat, and for cleaning one's fingernails; even used by Paul to cut his tents. They were one of the most important implements for a male in the first century. That's why Jesus was telling them to now go and buy one, and sell their cloaks if need be to do so.

Jesus had been taking care of them for three years, and now that he was leaving them, he wanted them to now take care of themselves. Two Makhairas at a table would not be sufficient for an insurrection (that was the number Peter held up, followed by Jesus stating that was enough).

As an application, the next day in the garden of Gethsemane (in Matthew 26:52), Peter took out his Makhaira and cut off the ear of a servant. Jesus put the ear back, and then turning to Peter said, "Put away your sword, for he who lives by the sword (Makharia), dies by the sword".

Unlike Muhammad who praised his disciple for killing Asma Bin Marwan, a widow with 6 children, stabbing her in her heart as she was suckling her baby simply because she had written poetic verses against him, Jesus never allowed his disciples to defend him. Likewise, we are not permitted to use any swords, or knives, or daggers for the Kingdom of God; because it is a kingdom which requires no violence for its defense.

### **20: Was Jesus peaceful by Condemning Peace (MT.10:34)?**

If Jesus is a man of peace, then what should we do in Matthew 10:34 where he says to the disciples, “*I have not come to bring peace, but a sword*”? This seems pretty clear that he was not a man of peace at all.

To understand this statement, we need to look at the entire chapter 10, which is the commissioning of the twelve disciples. Look at what he says; he’s sending them out “as lambs before wolves”, and then he promises them five things: that they should expect to be ‘hated, persecuted, jailed, flogged, and even killed’ for Christ’s name.

Notice what he says following the statement of the sword in verse 34, that he has come to set “*a man against his father, and a daughter against her mother*”, suggesting that it isn’t we who will use the sword, but that even our own family will use the sword against us!

Thus, he is clearly saying that if we truly preach the gospel correctly, then we should expect hatred, persecution, jailings, floggings, and even death, for indeed the sword will be used on us.

In verse 38 he says, “*whoever does not take up the cross (which means suffering violence) and follow me, is not worthy of me*”, almost assuming that violence is to be expected.

The gospel is not a gospel of peace, for when it is preached correctly, it will cause violence against those who preach and practice it. Thus, Christ is not asking us to use the sword, but that we should expect the sword to be used against us.