

Subject: A reply to Kt regarding his comments in the third post of Stephen Shoemaker in Bart Ehrman blog, titled: Creating the Qu’ran: Where Did the Scripture of Islam Really Come From? Dated at August 8, 2023.

Author: Omar Abur-Robb

Library: <https://omr-mhmd.yolasite.com/>

Date: August 27, 2023.

Hi Kt,

This is a reply to your claims related to the Quranic and Hadith interpretations, and I did cover all your claims here. However, I truly don’t feel that you have done any proper homework or fact-checking before presenting these claims, and I think most of these claims could have been verified with just a quick fact-checking, and I feel that you have just copied these claims from these websites and pasted them here without even reading them properly.

It does feel a bit unfair that you are able to present many unfounded claims in less than 10 minutes while it would take me (and others) a long time to investigate and compose the needed replies.

Therefore, the pdf-reply here is a “**DONE**” one and I am not planning to investigate any of your Quranic claims after today, hoping that the serious people are able to recognize the serious claims from the non-serious ones.

The reply here addresses 12 claims that you have presented, and it does include good deal of technical data that some readers might want to skip. If this was the case, then these readers can just jump to the “general discussion” on **page 12**.

The start of the claim-by-claim replies:

1-- Your Claim (August 17, 2023): Muhammad receiving guests naked (see reference <https://sunnah.com/tirmidhi:2732>).

Answer:

You don’t see the chain of the narrators in the English translation. However, you can just copy all the Arabic narrative and paste it in Google-Translate from Arabic to English and you will see the chain of narrators **but** note that you might get a weird translation of some of the names.

Now ... This is a single-chain narrative, and in the chain, you get a narrator with the name “Muhammed bin Ishaq” and he is “weak” by many of the ancient hadith-experts. One the major experts who regarded this narrator to be “weak” is “Malik bin Anas” the well-known scholar.

I was aware about this narrator and his status, and I thought that this narrator is different than “Ibn Ishaq” the historian. But after digging for this claim, it turned out that they are the same person.

As this is a single-chain narrative with a weak narrator in the chain, then this narrative is rejected [I did discuss the meaning of the single-chain narrative and the process of rejection in the first post of Dr. Shoemaker here in the blog].

However, the content of this narrative it is not problematic as I will discuss here:

1# “Naked” here is just a figure of speech, because there are many narratives that do request to cover the “private parts”, and it is valid from the linguistic perspective to say that the word here is just a figure of speech. For example, if someone was wearing only his underwear and went into the main market in London in the 1900AD, then the people will not say that this man was 9th of 10 naked, but they would say that this man was naked, and this would be a figure of speech. In Muhammed case, he was half dressed, probably wearing the Ezar.

There were many types of attires in ancient Arabia, and among them was a style that consists of two main components. The first part was the Ezar: a cloth wrapped around the waist, extending from the belly-button to the knees or even down to the feet. This Ezar closely resembles the garment depicted in ancient Egyptian drawings. The second part is either the Thoub, which is a dress worn from the neck down to the feet or it might be a shirt, which a dress from the neck to bellow the waist. Remarkably, the Thoub and Ezar is still the main style in eastern Arabia today, and the Shirt and Ezar is still a style that can be seen in modern-day Yemen. In the middle and west of Arabia today, the Ezar was substituted with a light white trousers.

Therefore, the highly conclusion here is that the prophet was wearing the Ezar when Zaid came in. This is clearly explained in the English translation which I don't think you have read.

2# Zaid bin Haritha is not just a guest, he is the adopted son of Muhammed. Muhammed adopted him even before the prophethood. For more than 15 years, Zaid name was: Zaid bin Muhammed. This continued until Quran 33:5 which said that adopted sons need to be called to their true fathers, therefore his name returned back to “Zaid bin Haritha” but still, Muhammed continued to regard Zaid as his adopted son.

###

But regardless of the analysis of the content, still, the narrative itself is rejected as it is a single-chain narrative with a weak narrator in it.

2-- Your Claim (August 17, 2023): Muhammad jokingly poking a friend and asking him in public to remove his upper garments, and the other embraces and kisses Muhammad's body (see reference <https://sunnah.com/abudawud:5224>).

Answer: Your claim here is just unfair, and I truly think that you didn't even read the narrative before presenting it here as a claim. Muhammed poked a man with a stick, the man claimed to be harmed and Muhammed told him to “take retaliation”, the man said, you are wearing a shirt, therefore, Muhammed raised the Shirt, and the man just kissed him instead of taking a retaliation.

I didn't even bother to check the "chain analysis" of this hadith as I don't see any problem in it. But you can form any view that you feel fit.

3-- Your Claim (August 17, 2023): A handsome man asking to come close to Muhammad and touching him on his knees (see reference <https://sunnah.com/nasai:4991>).

Answer:

What is your point here!

I don't think you regard the knees to be part of the "private parts". Also, you failed to mention that this handsome man was (as in the Hadith) the archangel Gabriel. This led me to think that you didn't really read this narrative to the end, and you probably just copied it from those websites and pasted it here..

However, in this particular hadith there are two prophecies that were clearly and vividly fulfilled in the last century:

[The signs for the judgment day are:] When you see the herdsmen competing in building tall buildings, when you see the barefoot and naked ruling the Earth, when you see a woman giving birth to her mistress.

The people in east Arabia before 1970AD were mostly uneducated and very poor, and in just 20 years after that (by the wealth of producing oil), these people started to compete on high sky-risers, and in just no time they became influential in the politics of the world.

Also, until about the 1950, the larger family still had influence as it did provide support for the branched families (and I am speaking her about the whole world not just Arabia). This large family did enforce the adults to respect their parents. However, after the 1950, the adults started to see that they didn't need the support of the larger family and they started to break from the larger-family norms. Therefore, it can be seen clearly that many of the adults today (in the East and the West) have no care about their parents and even they don't want to recognize them. This is the explanation of the line: "a woman giving birth to her mistress", which means that the daughter treats her mother as though the daughter is the one who knows all.

4-- Your Claim (August 17, 2023): Aisha recounting that Quranic verses tied to "stoning" and "Breastfeeding an adult 10 times" were eaten by a sheep (see reference <https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah:1944>)

Answer: This is a single-chain narrative, and by looking at the chain of narrators (using google-translate as explained in point 1), you will find that one of the narrators is (again) "Muhammed bin Ishaq" the one we have discussed in point 1. Therefore, this narrative has been rejected by many scholars as it is a single-chain narrative with a weak narrator in it.

You have repeated this claim (The Quran was eaten by a sheep) many times now, and I did reply to you about this narrative many times as well. So, maybe next time when you repeat this claim again you would probably add that some Muslims "claim" that

this narrative is rejected because one of the narrators is weak. This would be more fair and it will be much appreciated.

5-- Your Claim (August 17, 2023): Muhammad marrying a preschool girl at 6 years old (see reference <https://sunnah.com/nasai:3255>)

Answer: You know very well that the Muslims have two stages of marriage: the “contract” and then the “act of marriage” itself. So, your claim is misleading as Muhammed made the contract when Aisha was 6 but he took her when she was 9.

Now ... taking a wife of 9 is not exceptional to Muhammed but this was the Arabian culture for thousands of years before, and I assume it was also the culture in Africa and India.

This culture is simple: when the female reach puberty then she can get married, and the sign for puberty is the first menstruation. So, the culture of Arabia was: when a female reaches her first menstruation then she can be legally married.

The current age in the West for the first menstruation is between 12 and 13. But the first menstruation in the hot environments happens between 8 and 9. If you know nothing about this then just check google.

Now ... I am aware that the West criticize this young age of marriage, but this position is not based on their scriptures or biology, because in biology: females in mammals (other than humans) start to be active immediately after puberty. So, no scriptures and no biology here, therefore, this position of the West is just based on their own private special “social moralities”.

Now ... I might be wrong here but I am under the impression that many current Westerners are tolerant for the female that reached puberty to be active (as long as she takes the needed precautions and her partner did reach puberty but under the legal age) but they don’t allow her to get married. So, she can be active but not to be married. I assume that many cultures would regard this to be bizarre.

Also, the Westerners today have some “new” special private social moralities that the majority of the people on earth today are totally disagreeing with, and totally criticizing these moralities. The majority of the people here includes the Muslim world, the Indians, the Chinese, the Russians, the Conservative Christians in Africa, and the Conservative Christians in South America.

So, I would rather prefer if the West would try their best to restrain themselves from imposing their own private special social moralities on other cultures. That would be so kind from them.

6-- Your Claim (August 17, 2023): Muhammad’s attempt at suicide by throwing himself from a mountain after, according to Islamic tradition, he began receiving divine revelations (see reference <https://sunnah.com/bukhari:6982>)

Answer: From only the content of this narrative, I can say that Muhammed is just a human who could have been overwhelmed by this new reality and therefore, he might have been confused or even depressed.

However, many Muslim Scholars are questioning this narrative from a technical perspective (although it is from Al-Bukhari). I did say in the first post of Dr. Shoemaker that many Muslim Scholars have rejected some narratives in Al-Bukhari based on the “chain analysis”.

This narrative is a single-chain narrative [and I did explain in details the single and double chains in the first post of Dr. Shoemaker] but the chain here is broken. Aisha is totally honest, but in this narrative, she is the first of the chain and she is not the witness for the related events. If she said that she heard the Prophet say: {...} then the chain is complete, but this is not the case.

She might have taken this info from the Prophet, or she might have taken it from others, or this might be her understanding. We just don't know. Therefore, the chain here is broken; because the definition of the Sahih is to have a trusted chain from the documentation to the witness. But if there was a gap in the chain (for example unknown person or the first in the chain is not the witness) then by definition this is not Sahih.

Now ... many Scholars would regard a chain that reach one of the companions to be complete, but many others are strict with the definition of the Sahih, which means that the first in the chain need to be the witness.

Furthermore, one of the narrators of this narrative is Abul-Razzaq [If you put the Arabic narrative in google-translate you might get the strange name: Dr. Al-Razzaq, and this is one of the weird things that you might get from google-translate). His full name is Abdul-Razzaq bin Humam. He is trusted from the moral perspective, but many ancient hadith-experts have regarded him to be making a lot of mistakes, therefore, these Experts are not trusting him fully from the memory perspective.

So, we have here a single-chain narrative with a broken chain and a disputed narrator in it, therefore, this narrative can legitimately be rejected by the “chain analysis”.

7-- Your Claim (August 17, 2023): The “black stone” in the Kaaba that Muslims venerate can partly grant absolution of sins if they touch the black stone and Yamani corner and circle it 7 times. It will also be a witness with two eyes and a mouth (see reference and reference <https://sunnah.com/nasai:2919> og referensen <https://sunnah.com/tirmidhi:961>)

Answer: The first reference that you have provided is not problematic.

It says that touching them erases sins, but this is understood from Quran 11:114, which says that the “good deeds wipe out evil deeds”. This is exactly the same as voluntary praying, charity, reading the Quran, etc. Of course, this is related to equivalent deeds: a minor evil-deed would be wiped by a minor good-deed, and major evil-deed might be wiped by a major good-deed. But there are some evil-deeds that would not be wiped, and they will be accounted for in the judgment day.

There are no issues in the first reference that you have provided, but you can form your views anyway you feel fit.

###

Regarding the second reference which is related to the back stone: **So, What!!!**

We do believe in many other things: we believe an illiterate man from the middle of nowhere in Arabia who had no experience in leadership or management is the Prophet of God. We believe that the sea parted for Moses. We believe that Jesus raised the dead and healed the sick. We also believe that at the Judgment day, the hands and feet of some people will testify against them (see Quran 36:65).

So, how the things in the second reference are different from the above!!!

However, from a technical perspective, Ibn Khuthaym is one of the narrators of this narrative. His full name is: Abdulla bin Othman bin Khuthaym and he has been regarded by many ancient hadith-experts to be “Not Strong”.

8-- Your Claim (August 17, 2023): Muhammad being under the influence of “magic” (see reference <https://sunnah.com/bukhari:6391>)

Answer: Yes, but this allegedly happened for a short time, because this narrative should have been wide-spread but it is actually a single-chain narrative.

However, if you looked at the attitude of the companions and many generations of the followers after them, they really didn’t care about black-magic, they didn’t discuss it, but they just ignored it. I think they did have a very decisive penalty against practicing black-magic but I assume that was mainly based on Quran 2:102. But still, the companions and the followers (for many generations) just ignored this matter. I assume that this was based on part of the verse in Quran 2:102: “although their magic could not harm anyone except by Allah’s Will” [translated by quran.com]. But there is here double-negations, which cannot be really explained properly except by saying that this magic could only last for a short duration. Therefore, I can understand why the companions have just ignored this subject as there were more serious sickness than this magic.

However, this subject started to be a major thing for some Muslims many centuries afterward when they learned the process of Exorcism (!!) from the Jews and Christians. The detail of this process wasn’t known at the time of the companions.

Returning back to your reference: Muslim Scholars have disputed this narrative: It is a single-chain narrative that should have been wide-spread, and it does seem that it contradicts with some verses of the Quran, therefore, many Scholars did reject this narrative by using the **content analysis** (i.e. the content here is based on a single-chain that contradict another stronger narrative without any possible reconciliation).

However, other Scholars have highlighted a possible reconciliation that: the impact of this issue was just for a short duration of time.

9-- Your Claim: The issue of the Bell:

In August 9, you said:

“In addition to that, Muslims frequently warns of “bell” which is Satans instrument and comes from Satan Even islams angles are afraid of it, warns

about it, and are scared of it. Then,,,muslim scholars tells us that Muhammad received inspiration for the Qur'an through a bell (as mentioned in Sahih Al Bukhari and Sahih Muslim – see Sunnah.com). I really don't understand what these muslim scholars tries to say.”

I answered in August 12:

“I truly don't know anything about “bell”, can you please give me more info about it?”

You answered in August 12 (in a comment that was released by the moderator about August 26):

* This is how the bell is explained by the ancient scholars in relation to Satan etc. It is a multiple references in islamic litterature related to the bell.

<https://sunnah.com/search?q=the+bell>

* This is a few verses from both from Sahih al Bukhari and Sahih Muslim supposedly told by Aisha (Muhammeds wife). It is worth to mention from my perspective and assessment on this , that both Bukhari and Muslim lived centuries later than Muhammed.

<https://sunnah.com/search?q=inspired+by+the+bell>

Here Muhammed was inspired by the bell which the muslims think is the instrument of Satan, and all islamic angles are afraid of its present.”

Answer:

For the first reference: the Bell here is a product that is manufactured by humans for humans, it is simply a “bell”: a musical instrument. Today, there are many musical instruments that can be regarded as bells.

The narrative mentioned the “bell” to represent the Music in general. It is common in ancient Arabic to mention the part to mean the whole, or to mention the whole to mean the part.

The link between this instrument and the “Shytan” is metaphorical. This is the same as in Quran 5:90 when it highlighted that wine and gambling are filth from the work of the “Shytan”. The link to the Shytan here is metaphoric, and this metaphoric style is accepted in the Arabic language and I think it is accepted in all other languages.

Now ... Music is a debated subject within the Muslim Scholars, and I did mention in the first post of Dr. Shoemaker that there are two analyses that are conducted for the narratives: the chain analysis and the content analysis. In the content analysis, we might find many opposing trusted narratives. However, it is a pre-mature decision to immediately reject one for the others. Therefore, in the content analysis, Scholars will do the best to try and reconcile these opposing narratives (as it is possible that these narratives are related to different contexts). If the Scholars couldn't reconcile the opposing narratives, then they would reject one for the others (as we have discussed in point 8).

The Music narratives went into the content analysis and there were many legitimate judgments regarding this subject from the normal judgment that Music is allowed except in some specific circumstances, to the judgment of the extreme Scholars who regarded Music to be forbidden.

But this is not our subject here.

You have claimed that “the angles are afraid of it, warns about it, and are scared of it” and this totally **false** as there is **nothing** in the list you have provided says this.

Regarding your other claim that “Muhammad received inspiration for the Qur’an through a bell”:

This is just an untruthful description. These references mentioned the following: Muhammed was asked how he received the inspiration from the divine and he answered: Sometimes it is like the ringing of a bell

So, he didn’t receive the inspiration through a bell (as you have claimed) but he described the inspiration to be like the ringing of a bell.

To me, there is a different between your claim and the data in the references that you have provided. But you can form your views anyway you feel fit.

###

I need to highlight one more point here: probably all the current translations of the Quran use “Satan” as a translation for the Arabic word “Shytan” but this (in my opinion) is terribly wrong:

Satan in the Hebrew means the “opposer”. So, someone stopping you in the street could be called Satan, and this word can be used for good or bad.

Shytan in ancient Arabic is the malicious rebellious of humans or non-humans. For example, there was an aggressive poisonous snake and the ancient Arabs called it Shytan. A rebellious camel could be called Shytan. And I assume that abstract entities (as forgetfulness and laziness) can be called Shytan. The word Shytan is used much before Islam and it does have a clear meaning.

Also, Satan today refer to the Devil (which in Arabic is called “Iblees”). However, Shytan in the Quran doesn’t necessary mean Iblees, but it can mean other things depending of the context. Therefore, the best translation for the Arabic word “Shytan” is just “Shytan”.

10-- Your Claim:

In August 9, you made many claims that Muslim Scholars said that the Quran was changed, modified and substituted.

In August 12, I asked you: Can you highlight the statements of the Muslim Recognized Scholars who said that the Quran was changed, modified and substituted?

You answered in August 12 (in a comment that was released by the moderator about August 26):

Regarding verse changed:

Abu Yunnus, freemdmn of Aishah ordered him to write the verse “Haftdhuu alaas-salaatti was-salaatil wastaa wa quumeuu lillaahi qaantin (2,238) He was ordered to change the verse. This was reported by Muwatta Iman Malik

Regarding verses modified;

Al Hajiaj Ibn Yusuf made eleven modification in the reading of the Uthmanic Text.In Al Baqarah (surah 2,259) it was originally read “Lam yatasanna waandhur” but was altered to “Lam yatasanna” Also in Al Ma’ida (surah 5,48) and a few others, like ibn Abi Dawud.

Regarding substituted:

Sahih al Bukhari (Volum 6, book 61, Number 527) refer to “But Allah said, “None of our revelations do We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, but We substitute something better or similar.

Answer:

10.1.1# The first narrative is not just mentioned in Muwatta Malik, it is clearly mentioned in Tafsir Al-Tabari and Tafsir Al-Qurtubi. And it is not just Aishah, but it is also reported for Umm-Salama, Hafsa, and Ibn-Masud.

10.1.2# There are word variations in the Quran (as I have discussed in my pdf-reply to Dr. Shoemaker in his second post), and these variations doesn’t exceed 3% of the Quran and it does not impact the general meaning of the verses. We believe that these variations are legitimate, and they were said by Muhammed himself.

Now ... you probably criticize that a book of God has word variations, but this view of yours has “zero” interest to us; because this view of yours is not based on solid logic but on personal judgements, so why should we discuss your personal judgements about the Quran!

However, from the scientific historical perspective: the Muslims expanded so quickly in the east and the west of the world, then they went into serious civil wars, then they went into awful defragmentation, but still, they share a book with 100% of the meaning and at least 97% of its exact wording, therefore, this book can only be from one source (or at least, this is our opinion).

10.1.3# When you say the book was changed then you are saying that some people deliberately decided to take the original words of the author and change it. Therefore, your claim here is totally **false** and **misleading**, because what Aisha did was asking the scribe to write what she heard from the Prophet, and this is completely not changing the Quran.

10.2# Regarding the second narrative:

This narrative is a single-chain that was mentioned only in the Book of Al-Masahif authored by Abu-Baker bin Abu-Dawud. In this chain, there is one narrator with the name: Abbad bin Suhayb. His status within the ancient hadith-experts is “left out” (Matrook). This status is much lower than the status of “weak” or “unknow”.

So, this narrative that you have mentioned (which you could have easily verified by yourself if you have done a bit of homework and fact-checking) is rejected by the Muslim Scholars.

10.3# Regarding the third narrative:

The narrative you have mentioned is this:

<https://sunnah.com/bukhari:5005>

Where in it do you find that the Muslims substituted the Quran!!!

I didn't analyze the chain of this narrative and I didn't look for the Scholar opinions about it, I am just going to discuss the content of it “as-is”:

The narrative speaks about Omar that he doesn't seem to be agreeing about a verse in the Quran that Ubai insisted that he heard it from the Prophet.

I did discuss in the first post of Dr. Shoemaker the criteria of Zaid bin Thabit for gathering the Quran. His criteria were simple: The verse of the Quran need to be supported by at least two witnesses and one written document.

Now ... Omar opinion is not a witness statement here, it is just a personal judgment, therefore, the statements of trusted witnesses will override personal judgments, and I think this is a universal common sense.

So, regardless of Omar opinion, the verse in question was supported by at least two witnesses and one written document.

But Still, there is nothing in the narrative that says that the Muslims have substituted the verses of the Quran. Therefore, your claim here is just **false**.

11-- Your Claim:

#####

I am going here to comment on your claims that you have addressed to Mak22, and I hope that Mak22 won't mind me replying to your claims in this “final” pdf-reply.

#####

In August 9, you have claimed that God has daughters in reference to Quran 53:19-23, and I did reply to this claim twice (August 12 & 17) as I will clarify in point 13.

However, Mak22 commented in August 17: “I am not sure how you read the sources but you are way off ...”.

In August 24, you said to him:

Sources,,,,, my sources are from what I understand to be respected muslim sources, and for the chapter An Najm (chapter 53) explained in Tafsir Al Jalalayn, page 338, Ayah 22:52 – 22:55

<https://quranunlocked.com/en.jalalayn/text/22/55>

Now ... I am completely surprised how this is related to your claim that God has daughters!!!

The second thing is: what are your objections here!!!

Let me just be very clear: We don't regard Muhammed to be a divine being. He is a human and we believe that he is the Prophet of God. But as a human he might make some mistakes. However, when you surround humans with a proper Quality Management System then this system is capable of containing the errors of humans. The best example is aviation, which many would regard as the most dangerous method of transportation. However, since this transportation is governed by a very strict Quality Management System, it is not surprising to learn that aviation is actually the least fatal method of transportation.

We believe that Muhammed was a Prophet of God and he was a human, and he also was governed by a proper quality management system that included following up, reciting, checking, rectifying, etc.

So, the Quran verses 22:52-55 are very normal, and I don't really know your objections here, but also, I don't have the desire to know any of your Quranic objections after today.

12-- Your Claim:

In the same comment to Mak22 (August 24) you said the following:

All those muslim hadiths about breastfeeding for adult is said recited from his wife A'isha but also others like :

<https://sunnah.com/ibnmajah:1940>

“that the Messenger of Allah said: “Breastfeeding once or twice, or suckling once or twice, does not make (marriage) unlawful.”

You know **nothing** about this matter, and you could have clarified this matter by just making a little bit of true homework and fact-checking. But you just took something that you don't understand and present it as a genuine claim.

But It has been said many times over and over again from the ancient times: if you don't know something then for the sake of heaven and earth just ask someone who does before making a serious judgment.

You thought that this hadith is linked to point 4, but it is **NOT**.

Islam has established a clear culture that if a woman (and let us call her Ann) breastfed an infant (and let us call him Sam) then Ann will become a Mother to Sam

with all the respect and obligations except inheritance (The same case if the infant was a female).

This means that the daughters of Ann are sisters to Sam, and therefore, Sam cannot marry anyone of them.

In the hadith you have referenced, the Prophet is saying that suckling once or twice doesn't make the Breastfeeding woman (in this case Ann) a mother to the infant (in this case Sam) and it doesn't make Ann's daughters as sisters to Sam. This imply that the Breastfeeding need to be full and complete in order for Ann to become a mother for Sam.

13-- Your previous Claims in this post:

You forward some claims in August 9, which I answered in August 12. Then you replied in August 13, and I replied in August 17. These replies are related to your claim that God has daughters as per Quran 53:19-23, and about "Allah" as the name of God. I truly regard your claims here to be totally non-serious and totally false because the Quran verses are very clear, and "Allah" as the name of God has been discussed many times by Scholars from different faith in the net and YouTube.

The end of the claim-by-claim replies

The General Discussion:

Some people might have a strong repulsion toward the Quran, but this is their thoughts, their minds, their map of the world, and I shouldn't be bothered with the thoughts in the minds and hearts of these people, it is simply not my business.

However, some might present a claim that I see false, and I will be interested to present on the table my information and views related to this claim. But still, there are some people that dedicated their energy on criticizing the Quran regardless of logic, regardless of homework and regardless of fact-checking. But this is not a professional act, and the best approach is just to ignore their claims hoping that the serious people are able to recognize the serious claims from the non-serious ones.

Now ... If some people hated a book (any book) and they didn't care about logic, homework or fact-checking then they are able to present an infinite number of unfair claims by just mis-interpreting and re-mis-interpreting the verses in it,, and not all people are able to handle the "Unfair Infinity".

This is not related only to the Quran, but it is related to any subject that the non-serious people have decided to get involved in; including science, global warming, politics, social affairs, history you name it.

One of the strategies to deal with these non-serious claims is to insist on clarifying whether these claims are supported by recognized Scholars from recognized universities. If this was the case, then we could deal with only the claims of these Scholars because recognized Scholars do respect logic due to their professional pride and due to their peers' supervision.

As I have implied in a previous comment (August 17), the discussions with the recognized Scholars and serious people are always useful because both of them have a limit of logic that they cannot break, but the problem starts when the non-serious debaters jump in.

Now ... I might be wrong here (and this would not be the first time and it will not be the last) but I truly think that you didn't make any fact-checking or reasonable homework before presenting your claims, and I truly feel that if these 12 claims have been answered then you will just copy another 20 from these non-fair websites and paste them here without fact-checking in just 10 minutes, and this is not fair for time and energy.

This is the reason that I have no desire to investigate any of your Quranic claims after today, and the main reason is that I cannot handle the unfair-infinity.

###

Furthermore, you have implied before (in a previous platinum post about Daniel prophecies) that I am writing from an apologetic perspective, and I did reply to this claim at that time. But you did imply here the same claim, and I truly don't think that you differentiate between apologetic and academic works.

I have explained many times my methodology for analyzing metaphysical subjects. This methodology consists of two parallel analyses: the Scientific Historical Analysis (taking-out all the metaphysical data), and the metaphysical analysis. Then I will identify the gaps between these two analyses.

Now ... most of my discussions here in the blog are based on the Scientific Historical Analysis. I do sometimes discuss the metaphysical data, but this is about explaining the meaning of these data which can be presented by both Muslims and non-Muslims. This is the same if an Atheist was explaining the meaning of the verses in the NT. This is not an apologetic work but an academic one.

As the style of my presentation for the metaphysical data is about explaining the meaning of these data, which is a style that can as well be conducted by non-Muslims, then this style cannot be apologetic.

But as you have formed an opinion about my style of presentation, then I hope you will allow me to present my opinion about your style of presentation:

I might be wrong here (as before), but I truly think that you have a mission to criticize the Quran by any means possible regardless of logic, regardless of homework, and regardless of fact-checking. If this was the case, then this would probably be a little bit far from fair.