PART II

Theological attitudes in Christian–Muslim encounters
Introduction

Muslim attitudes to the Bible exhibit both variation and family resemblances, while Muslims do not always assume that the Bible is an entirely corrupted text. However, a ‘positive’ approach to the biblical text does not necessarily mean an openness to its message as understood by Jews and Christians. As this chapter will show, the Bible can be used to strengthen the cause of Islam rather than endorsing the biblical faiths themselves.

We begin with the status of the scripture as a whole and whether it is abrogated or cancelled out by Islam. Moving on to the texts and their content, a range of views will be uncovered, along with discussion of different types and sources of corruption. Finally, Muslim uses of the Bible reveal the complex interactions it is possible to have with scripture of other faiths, scriptures which the Qurʾān both endorses and challenges.

The Bible can be perceived as an agent of change by Muslims, or as a more static object to be observed or refuted. As an example of a change agent, there are Muslims whose response to reading the Bible is to believe it, as part of the process of changing their faith and ultimately leaving the fold of Islam, a phenomenon rarely though increasingly the subject of research (Green 2014: 98–9; see also Gaudeul 1999: 70–7). Conversely, some Muslims energetically use the Bible to try to move people in the opposite direction, into Islam from outside it (Wandera 2015). All of the Muslim responses discussed inevitably occur in specific historical and geographical contexts. There is little space to discuss these here, except to note that there seems to be no simple correlation between particular situations and the responses generated in them. A combination of historical pressures, Islamic scriptural prompts and individual choices and reactions help to shape the many Muslim responses to the Bible.

Abrogation

Regardless of what the Bible may teach, there is a question over whether this teaching has any validity after the emergence of Islam. Addressing this involves the concept of abrogation (naskhī). This can be internal, within the Qurʾān, but the Qurʾān is also seen as abrogating part or all of the Bible’s ongoing legal applicability. However, through most of Islamic history different Qurʾānic verses were used as a basis for internal Qurʾānic abrogation from those used to justify the
abrogation of previous scriptures (external abrogation). The classic verses used to justify internal Qur’ānic abrogation are Q 2:106 and 16:101. Q 2:106 states, ‘Whichever verse (āyā) we abrogate (nansakh) or cause to be forgotten, We bring instead a better or similar one. Do you not know that Allāh has the power over all things’ (this and all Qur’ān translations are from Fakhry 2000). Q 16:101 reads, ‘And if we replace (baddalnā) a verse by another – and Allāh knows best what He reveals – they say: “You are only a forger”. Surely, most of them do not know’. These verses have been traditionally used to discuss internal Qur’ānic abrogation, but specialised works on internal abrogation ‘as a rule do not go into the abrogation of earlier scriptures’ (Adang 1996: 194).

However, even when the Bible is not seen as the subject of Q 2:106 and Q 16:101, this does not mean that the biblical scriptures are still seen as fully valid. The view that Islam supersedes previous faiths involves the Qur’ān’s supplanting previous scriptures, or in other words, external abrogation. Q 3:19 states, ‘The religion with God is Islam’. Q 3:85 states, ‘Whoever seeks a religion other than Islam, it will never be accepted from him, and in the Hereafter he will be one of the losers’. Whilst it is possible to understand the Arabic term islām in both of these verses in its wider meaning of ‘submission’ rather than as a reference to ‘Islam’ as the developed religion identified by that name, Muslims typically find in these verses evidence that Islam supplants other faiths. For example, al-Ghazālī (d. 1111), in his compendium of principles of Islamic law, al-Mustasfā’, assumes the supersession of the previous faiths, as if there is nothing to debate:

As for ījmā‘, the consensus of the entire ummah is that the Sharī‘a of Muhammad has abrogated the sharī‘a preceding him, either in their entirety or only with regard to that where he disagrees with them. This is agreed upon. Thus, whoever denies this is violating ījmā‘.


So Muslim consensus (ījmā‘) agrees that the previous religions are superseded, either entirely or at least wherever they differ from Islam. This clearly applies to the scriptures of those religions too. To be precise, the Qur’ān and Islamic tradition sees Islam as restoring the original divine message rather than moving on and supplanting it. Islamic views of the Bible often both point back to a proposed ‘original’ message incorporating Muḥammad and true monotheism and also forward to a new age in which Islam reigns supreme and the previous scriptures must live in its shadow.

The parallel lines of abrogation and supersession become more intertwined in the modern age. This is because the doctrine of internal abrogation, whereby one Qur’ānic verse abrogates another, is less popular than it once was. There is therefore a greater tendency to interpret Q 2:106 as a reference to abrogation of the previous scriptures as a whole, rather than – as many classical commentators understood it – a reference to intra-Qur’ānic abrogation. For example, the nineteenth-century Indian Muslim Sayyid Ahmad Khan (d. 1898) explicitly rejects the intra-Qur’ānic interpretation, taking the verse as indicating the abrogation of some of the stipulations of the Mosaic law (Khan 1963: 139; trans. Hahn 1974: 125).

Corruption of the Bible

Can the Bible be regarded as revelation by Muslims? This is closely tied to the question of the status and ongoing existence of the previous scriptures as mentioned in the Qur’ān, namely the Tawwāt, Zabīr and Injīl, referring to the Torah, Psalms and Gospel, terms variously understood by Muslim authors. To what extent do these texts mentioned in the Qur’ān correspond to the extant biblical scriptures? To take one example of discussion over how to interpret these Qur’ānic terms, Q 5:47 refers positively to the Injīl: ‘So let the followers of the Gospel judge according to
what God has sent down in it. Those who do not judge according to what God has revealed are lawbreakers. Ibn Taymiyya (d. 1328) takes this as evidence that both corrupted and uncorrupted versions of the previous scriptures must have been circulating at the time of Muḥammad, otherwise the Qurʾān could not appeal to the Injīl as a standard of judgment. He states that a proper Muslim view of the Taurāt and Injīl is:

That in the world there are true [ṣaḥīḥ] copies [versions], and these remained until the time of the Prophet (peace be upon him), and many copies [versions] which are corrupted. . . .The Qurʾān commands them to judge with what Allah revealed in the Taurāt and Injīl. [Allāh] informs that in both there is wisdom [ḥikma]. There is nothing in the Qurʾān to indicate that they altered all copies [versions].


Ibn Taymiyya’s solution is to assume that the Qurʾān gives grounds for believing that there must have been some reliable versions of the Injīl in circulation at the time of Muḥammad, as well as some unreliable ones. He does not state whether these reliable versions had disappeared by the time he was writing, though this seems to be the implication. Whilst one contemporary writer explores the positive implications of this position (Saeed 2002), another, Muhammad Abu Laylah, raises four objections to Ibn Taymiyya’s view. These problems arise not from apparent tensions with historical or manuscript evidence but from factors arising from Islamic principles. First, if a sound version of the Injīl endured until the time of Muḥammad, and presumably beyond, why did no early Muslim mention it? Secondly, why was it not preserved by Muslims? Thirdly, Muḥammad would surely have safeguarded a proposed original Injīl. Finally, Muḥammad would not have allowed the four New Testament Gospels to eclipse the pure Injīl (Abu Laylah 2005: 167). Such questions underpin Muslim enquiry into the status of biblical texts today.

The question of what is meant by ‘revelation’ needs clarifying. Muslims traditionally see revelation (waḥy) as involving words sent down upon a prophet without any involvement from his own mind. Since, with the exception of certain views of the Pentateuch, this is not the Jewish or New Testament understanding, some new categories are needed by Muslims, unless the Bible is simply to be dismissed. Some see the Gospels, for example, as resembling the Hadīth, containing reports about Jesus and what he said but not comprising entirely, as does the Qurʾān, the verbal utterances of God (Ibn Taymiyya 1905: II.10–11; trans. Michel 1985: 235).

There is a noteworthy argument, (see most recently Nickel 2011), that the Qurʾān and earliest commentators’ interpretations of it do not in fact teach that the biblical texts are subject to generalised textual corruption. Rather, specific groups of Jews misled Muslims in specific times and places. However, when writers argue for or assume corruption, of whatever kind, they often cite particular Qurʾānic verses in support of more general claims of biblical corruption.

Corruption is usually divided into corruption of the text itself (tahrīf laffī) and corruption of the interpretation (tahrīf maʾnawī), the belief that Jews and Christians misinterpret their (basically) reliable scriptures. Writers can draw on both these categories, not necessarily seeing them as mutually exclusive.

Corruption of the text

One view is that the Bible as a whole is thoroughly unreliable. The most famous and influential exponent of this view was the Andalusian Ibn Ḥazm (d. 1064). Although he was unusual in the hostility of his attacks and was the principal cause of textual corruption becoming a much more prominent feature of Muslim responses to the Bible, Ibn Ḥazm was not alone. ʿAbd al-Jabbār
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(d. 1025) and al-Juwaynī (d. 1085) both independently criticised the reliability of the biblical text at around the same time (al-Juwaynī in Allard 1968; ‘Abd al-Jabbār 2010).

For the proponents of both forms of corruption, textual and interpretive, the question of biblical references to Muḥammad is central. For those who emphasise corruption of the actual biblical texts, the Qur’ānic affirmation that Muhammad is mentioned in the Bible (Q 7:157) proves that the texts must have been altered, since no explicit references are found. For example, al-Juwaynī begins his treatise on biblical corruption in this way (Allard 1968: 39).

The principal category for Muslim verification of texts is mutawātīr (successive) transmission. This transmission is judged to have occurred when information is transmitted by a sufficient number of people (there is no agreement over what constitutes ‘sufficient’), such that the certainty of this information impresses itself upon the hearer (Whittingham 2008). The criticism that the biblical texts are unreliably transmitted is routinely levelled at them (Allard 1968: 57; Ibn Hazm 2007: I.235–6). For example, it is argued that the deportation of the Hebrews and Nebuchadnezzar’s sack of Jerusalem mean that continuity of transmission was impossible in relation to the Torah, and this explains why Ezra rewrote the Torah.

As for examples of allegedly corrupted text, Muslims can highlight variations between the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint over details such as periods of years in Hebrew scripture. As for the New Testament, accusations range from well-known issues such as apparent variations in the genealogies of Christ through to how many times the cock crowed in relation to Peter’s denial of Jesus (Ibn Ḥāzm 2007: 257, 300–1). There can also be a focus on variations in different Gospels’ accounts of a given event and issues related to New Testament quotations from the Old, to name but a few. Such charges, along with accusations of irrationality, are found in Īṭhār al-haqq (‘The truth revealed’) by the nineteenth-century Indian Rahmatullah Kairanvi (1964; trans 2003), a work published first in Arabic in 1867 following his famous debate with the Christian Karl Gottlieb Pfander in Agra in 1854. Īṭhār al-haqq drew on nineteenth-century critical biblical scholarship, the first work by a Muslim to do so, and has exercised such influence on Muslim perceptions that it has prompted a book-length response 150 years later (Nickel 2014).

Ibn Ḥāzm mentions a typical charge which goes to the heart of the Muslim view of the Gospels. On the basis of the opening of Luke’s Gospel, which describes the author as compiling his account carefully, Ibn Ḥāzm criticises the Gospels as ‘composed histories’ (tawārīkh muʿallaṭa) (Ibn Ḥāzm 2007: 308). Christians, would, of course, traditionally reply that this is entirely correct but that the writing was divinely inspired.

All of these issues – the prediction of Muḥammad, the question of reliable transmission and the significance of any human involvement in the writing of scripture – illustrate how Muslim responses to the Bible have been shaped by Islamic categories. The Islamic nature of the evaluative framework is likewise evident in the much greater attention given to the Gospels than to the rest of the New Testament. Since the Qur’ān refers to the scripture associated with Jesus as the Injīl or ‘Gospel’, other books, such as the Book of Acts of the Apostles, the various Epistles, or the Book of Revelation, usually appear to Muslims as far less likely be part of the original Injīl. Paul is often seen as a deceiver who introduced false doctrines about the divinity of Christ and the Trinity or false practices such as the permission to abandon food laws and circumcision. He is portrayed as a scheming Jew who had only pretended to adopt Christian belief for varied reasons such as gaining power or dividing Christians and thus ruining Christianity. For example, the thirteenth-century Egyptian scholar Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qārīfī provides examples of narratives depicting Paul’s corruption of doctrine and practice (al-Qārīfī 1987: 321–6, trans. Cucarella 2015: 288–9). While Paul is usually discussed by Muslims in relation to critiques of Christian doctrine and history, his status obviously affects the perceived reliability of an important part of the New Testament.
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So when a figure is named as responsible for corrupting the scriptures, it is typically Ezra for the Torah and Paul for the teachings of Jesus. The Roman Emperor Constantine (d. 337) also appears in this context as one who distorted the true nature of Jesus’ teachings, though the emphasis in such accounts is on his perversion of Christian doctrine and practice rather than of the biblical text itself (see ‘Abd al-Jabbār 2010: 106–11).

Could textual corruption be seen as accidental rather than deliberate? This appears to be the view of Ibn Khaldūn (d. 1406), the famous North African historian (Ibn Khaldūn 1867: II.6; trans. Whittingham 2011: 217). Yet Ibn Khaldūn, though using the Bible himself, warns people in his role as a jurist that the law forbids study of scriptures preceding the Qur’ān (1858: II.387; trans. 1958: III.438).

While the accusation of textual corruption is well known, the perception of corrupt interpretation also plays an important part in the story of what taḥrīf means.

**Corruption of the interpretation**

Muslim writers often mention that Christians and Jews have misunderstood and therefore misinterpreted their scripture. Jewish failure to recognise references to Muhammad are one example. As for the New Testament, the charge is that Christians interpret certain texts literally when they should be interpreted metaphorically, particularly regarding references to fatherhood and sonship within the Godhead. This criticism reflects the Muslim concern with correct interpretation of the Qur’ān, in particular establishing criteria for departing from a literal or apparent reading. A common Muslim view is that if something contradicts reason, then this provides justification for departing from the evident (ẓāhir) meaning, a concern of al-Ghazālī (see for example al-Ghazālī 1961; trans. Jackson 2002). This principle leads to the dismissal of Christian claims about Jesus as irrational in their surface or apparent meaning (I avoid the phrase ‘literal sense’ here since Christians would not understand the sonship of Jesus as reflecting normal human paternity in a ‘literal’ way). From the Muslim viewpoint, these texts about sonship demand to be reinterpreted.

Challenges over Christian misinterpretation of fatherhood and sonship are no recent phenomenon, reaching back to the first extant Muslim theological treatise against Christianity by al-Qāsim ibn Ibrāhīm al-Rassī (d. 860), written most likely before 826 (in di Matteo 1921–23: 324). Similarly, challenges to the divine status of Jesus are built on Muslim interpretation of certain verses taken to indicate his solely human status. The most-quoted verse in this context is John 20:17, in which Jesus tells his disciples about returning ‘to my father and your father, to my God and your God’ (Accad 2003), as though placing himself on the same level as them.

*Al-radd al-jamīl* (‘The fitting refutation’) by (Pseudo–) Ghazālī (Beaumont and El Kaisy-Friemuth 2016), of disputed authorship, uses the Bible extensively to attempt to prove the Islamic view of Jesus as correct. Arising from the milieu of Egypt probably in the twelfth century, its many biblical citations are sometimes regarded as indicating the author’s acceptance of the authority of the Bible when rightly interpreted. How real this acceptance was remains open to question (Whittingham 2011).

The case of (Pseudo–) Ghazālī is a particular example raising the wider question of what significance lies behind Muslims taking the idea of biblical corruption as relating only or mainly to its interpretation. Some take it as holding out greater hope for dialogue (Gaudeul and Caspar 1980: 103). Others are less sanguine, one Muslim author commenting that the idea that corruption applied to interpretation was ‘adopted merely in order to allow Muslims to use the Bible apologetically . . . not a doctrinal position developed to enable Muslims to use the Bible as a source of guidance’ (Saleh 2008: 632).
It is worth noting that general endorsement of the biblical text in principle – perhaps prompted by qurʾānic endorsements – does not lead to acceptance of specific details or teachings where these conflict with Islamic views. For example, the question of whether Jesus was crucified is routinely settled by reference to the Qurʾān, despite any openness to the Bible, as is the case of one of the Muslim writers with a relatively positive view of the Bible (Ibn Khaldūn 1858: I.418; trans. 1958: I.476).

Use of the Bible

While the predominant Muslim response to the Bible presumes some form of corruption, there are many other kinds of Muslim engagement. These need not indicate greater openness to biblical truth claims, the Bible being used instead as a resource for Muslims in dealing with a number of interfaith or intra-Muslim interests. There is of course much greater access to the biblical text in the modern age, thanks to increasing availability of translations into relevant languages. Whether a writer ignores the Bible for reasons of theological preference or simply owing to lack of access, either to the text or to an informant who can provide oral information, is in many cases impossible to answer.

Proving the truth of Muḥammad and Islam

There is a long history of Muslim writers presenting biblical predictions of the Prophet Muḥammad, stretching from the early centuries of Islam to the modern day. These often occur in works on ‘proofs of prophethood’ seeking to establish the veracity of claims about Muḥammad (see Schmidtke 2011). Ibn Rabban al-Ṭabarī (d. c. 865) provides an early example (Ibn Rabban al-Ṭabarī 1923; trans. Mingana 1922), while examples abound on the internet (see for example www.salafipublications.com/sps/downloads/pdf/MSS060004.pdf). One prominent work of this type is by the Damascus-based follower of Ibn Taymiyya, Ibn Qayyim al-Jawziyya (d. 1350). His Hidāyat al-ḥayārāt fi ajwībat al-Yahūd wa’l-Naṣārā (‘Guiding the confused over the arguments of the Jews and Christians’) (Ibn Qayyim 1979; trans. Ibn Qayyim 2007) not only finds Muḥammad in particular verses but regards the very advent of Muḥammad as the fulfilment of all biblical scripture (Accad 2005).

Locating Muḥammad in the Bible helps to establish the antiquity of the claims about him and of the model of prophethood which he represents (Wheeler 2006). Prominent verses include Deuteronomy 18:18, ‘I will raise up for them a prophet like you [Moses]’ and Isaiah 21:7, referring to ‘riders on donkeys, riders on camels’. Indeed, ‘virtually the entire messianic typology which Christians drew from the Jewish scriptures’ has been applied instead to Muḥammad (McAuliffe 1996: 152).

Histories

Authors from the classical period drew on the Bible in helping them to write comprehensive histories of the world. An example is Ḥamza al-İṣfahānī (d. between 961 and 971) and his treatment of Israelite history (Adang 2006). But his teacher Abū Jaʿfar al-Ṭabarī (d. 923), the enormously influential historian and Qurʾān commentator, made little use of the biblical text itself. Whether al-Ṭabarī had access to the biblical text in writing or alternatively through informants is an open question (see al-Ṭabarī 1883–84, and as a sample text, al-Ṭabarī 1987; on the emergence of Bible translations in Arabic, see Griffith 2013). Whatever the reason, the example of al-İṣfahānī and al-Ṭabarī shows a student willing to take a different approach from his teacher over using the Bible.
There are unusual examples of lives of Jesus, like the account by al-Yaʾqūbī (d. between 897 and 905), who uses the Gospels with minimal demur (al-Yaʾqūbī 1883; trans. Donaldson 1933; see discussion in Griffith 2003). A similar modern example is ‘Abbās Maḥmūd al-ʿAqqād’s work Abgariyyat al-Masīḥ (‘The genius of the Messiah’) (al-ʿAqqād 2006 [1953]; trans. al-ʿAqqād 2001), which also uses the New Testament Gospels as its principal source for information about Jesus. But such examples, occurring 1,000 years apart, are not typical, and there are no obvious contextual factors to explain why these authors trod an unusual path. Muslim authors more typically rely on the Qur’ān and traditions than the actual biblical text for the lives of prominent figures.

Commentary on the Qur’ān – and the Bible

Commentators on the Qur’ān sometimes make use of the Bible to illuminate or explore Qur’ānic passages. The most notable exponent of this is Burhān al-Dīn al-Biqāʾī (d. 1480), who, based in Cairo, included such copious biblical quotations in his commentary (al-Biqāʾī 1992) that he also felt the need to write a treatise defending the use of the Bible by Muslims (Saleh 2008).

More recently, Mustansir Mir has drawn attention to the use of the Bible in the work of Ḥamīd al-Dīn al-Farāḥī (Mir 2005). Mir also follows this example in his own interpretation of the Qur’ān, and while he recognises differences between the scriptures, he also uses similarity, for example in support of his own interpretation of the Qur’ānic narrative of the Queen of Sheba’s conversion (Mir 2007: 51–2).

There are also, rarely, examples of Muslims choosing to write a commentary on the Bible. The first was by the Ḥanbālī scholar Najīm al-Dīn al-Ṭūfī (d. 1316), who composed Al-ta’līq ‘alā l-anāⱡīl al-arba’h wa-l-ta’līq ‘alā l-Tawrāt wa-ʿalā ghayrihā min kutub al-anbiyāʾ (‘Critical commentary on the four Gospels, the Torah and other books of the prophets’) in preparation for his subsequent refutation of Christianity. A critical edition and English translation of this is now available (Demiri 2013). The other notable example is Sayyid Ahmad Khan, whose Tabyīn al-kalām fi tafsīr al-Tawrāt wa-l-Injīl ʿalā Millat al-Islām (‘The Mohomedan commentary on the Holy Bible’) (1862–65), in three parts, includes commentary on Genesis chapters 1–11 and Matthew chapters 1–5. Both al-Ṭūfī and Sayyid Ahmad Khan try to interpret the Bible in harmony with Islamic principles, and al-Ṭūfī only appeals to the idea of a corrupt text when he is unable to do this.

Other literature

‘Tales of the prophets’ works (Qiṣṣaṣ al-anbiyāʾ) recount, usually in popularised form, the lives and deeds of important figures, many of whom also occur in the Bible. Much of this material derives from Qur’ānic wellsprings or traditions of various kinds circulating in the Islamic world, though the Bible is drawn in periodically and often indirectly through circulating traditions which have absorbed biblical material. For example, al- Kisāʾī (date unknown, earliest manuscripts from early thirteenth century) gives an account of Jonah which includes his travelling to Nineveh and preaching there. This detail is not in the Qur’ān and reflects the biblical text, although it may have come to al-Kisāʾī through an intermediary source (al-Kisāʾī 1922–3: 298; trans. al-Kisāʾī 1978: 323).

In more recent times the biblical text has also fed into creative literature, helped by the availability of modern Bible translations (Somekh 1995: 192–3). Of course, the motifs and teachings of the Bible may be absorbed indirectly, from other writers, rather than from the biblical text itself. An interesting example is the major focus on the figure of Job, portrayed in his biblical form by the poet Badr al-Dīn al-Sayyāb (Khoury 2007: 179).
Appreciation

It is hard to identify biblical passages which all or many Muslims appreciate, on account of the widely varying stances of different authors. The Sermon on the Mount (Matthew chapters 5–7) is cited positively by figures from al-Ghazālī (Malik 2013) to the important twentieth-century writer Rashid Riḍā (d. 1935), owing to its legal and ethical import. However, the attitude of appreciation and possible use of the sermon is affected by views as to the authenticity of its text, sometimes questioned by others (Malik 2013: 50).

Conclusion

Various reasons prompt Muslim engagement with the Bible, whether the presence of significant populations of Jews and Christians in a given area, as in the early Islamic period, or missionary presence in nineteenth-century India. Intellectual curiosity can also be a factor, as in the case of qurʾānic commentators in search of background information. There is continuity and repetition across the centuries in some of the apologetic or polemical responses, with later writers drawing on classical or postclassical predecessors, as in studies of Muḥammad in the Bible. There are also new developments, such as Kairanvi’s use in nineteenth-century India of European critical biblical scholarship. His work also provides an example of the Bible experienced as the scripture of the conqueror, rather than as the scripture of the conquered peoples, which was the status of Jews and Christians at the time of the early Muslim conquests and their aftermath.

There is an ongoing ambivalence in Muslim writings about the Bible which cannot be neatly resolved. This has been described as ‘scorning and searching’ (McAuliffe 1996) and also as ‘rejection’ and ‘simultaneous reliance’ (Lowin 2004: 451). Something of the diversity to which this ‘dualistic’ response leads is captured in the responses of two modern Lebanese Muslim thinkers. Muḥammad Ḥusayn Fadlallah and Mahmoud Ayoub represent quite different ways of engaging with the Bible, one more cautious, the other more accepting (Hirvonen 2013: 121–41). These two thinkers are more than simply representatives of historical trends, but their individual responses nevertheless employ some of the differing approaches arising from many centuries of Muslims wrestling with the Bible.

The Qurʾān is the ultimate touchstone for all Muslim respondents to the Bible. Since the Qurʾān mentions some form of biblical scripture in a positive way, the questions of what those proposed biblical texts comprise, and what the implications arising from them are, remain open. Muslims offer a range of answers in responding to scriptures which they regard variously as lost, corrupted, misinterpreted, still useful, and to be respected.
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