



Muslim Methodologies And Schools In Critiquing The Doctrine Of Crucifixion

Dr. Ouis Miloud Department of Fundamentals of Religion, Faculty of Humanities and Islamic Sciences, University of Oran 1, Algeria. Email: ouismiloud.aet@gmail.com

Received: 02/01/2025; **Accepted:** 24/03/2025; **Published:** 31/03/2025

ABSTRACT

The belief in the crucifixion of Christ is one of the core doctrines held by Christians, which they instill in their followers through various methods and approaches. However, the Qur'an explicitly refuted this flawed doctrine. Despite this, classical and contemporary exegetes have differed in interpreting the incident of Christ's crucifixion, and their views diverged into three main opinions. Each of these views came to represent a distinct interpretative school concerning the understanding of the crucifixion doctrine.

This study aims to clarify and highlight the methodologies of these interpretative schools, explaining the reasons behind their differing views, while also showing how they converge in their theological and doctrinal conclusions regarding faith.

Keywords: Ahmed Deedat, Ibn Hazm, Ibn Jarir al-Tabari, Crucifixion, Christianity, Doctrine, Faith.

INTRODUCTION

The doctrine of crucifixion is considered the most important Christian belief among Christians. They may differ in other fundamental rituals and beliefs, but the doctrine of crucifixion and redemption is the cornerstone of the Christian religion. Because of this belief, Christ is said to have incarnated to save humanity from the sin of the original transgression.

The Holy Qur'an abolished this doctrine in Surat An-Nisa by denying the claim of the Jews and Christians that Christ was killed and crucified. Instead, Allah saved him from the hands of the enemies and raised him to Himself. This incident has sparked a long-standing debate between Christians and Muslims regarding the understanding of the verse in Surat An-Nisa how could Allah cast the likeness of Christ onto another person without people knowing it? So, how could they have known that the crucified person was not Christ himself?

The Christian belief in the crucifixion is based on an event that people witnessed with their own eyes and whose story was passed down from generation to generation until the Qur'an came and clarified that the crucified person was someone other than Christ.

In this paper, we present three interpretative doctrines, each of which adopts a specific approach to interpreting the Qur'anic text. Accordingly, we divided this research into four main parts. The first part addresses the opinion of exegetes who based their interpretation on well-established reports from the early generations, asserting that Allah cast the likeness of Christ onto someone else.

The second part discusses the interpretation of Sheikh Ahmed Deedat, who argued that the soldiers and guards were able to arrest Christ and place him on the cross, but Allah saved him from death after people thought he had died.

The third part presents the view of Ibn Hazm, who believed that Allah saved His servant from the hands of the soldiers, so they never managed to arrest him. Instead, they crucified someone else in his place, and then cast suspicion upon the people by making them believe that Christ had been killed.

In the final part, we weighed the different views and concluded in favor of Ibn Hazm's interpretation. The research concludes with a presentation of the most important findings reached.

I. The First Doctrine: Resemblance in Features

This doctrine holds that the person who died on the cross was someone who resembled Jesus Christ in appearance, but was not actually him. This view represents the majority of Qur'anic interpreters who base their exegesis on transmitted reports from the early generations (Salaf). It is represented by Imam al-Tabari, the leading figure of the traditionalist school of Qur'anic interpretation.

According to this school, the interpretations are based on reports passed down concerning the crucifixion incident—narratives that were originally conveyed by Jews or Christians who later converted to Islam. As a model of this interpretive school, we will present a summarized account of the explanation given by Imam al-Tabari regarding the notion of the "Christ-like figure."

Imam al-Tabari relied in his approach on narrations transmitted through the chain of Wahb ibn Munabbih, may God have mercy on him. He stated that the crucified individual was someone who resembled Jesus (peace be upon him). However, these narrations differ concerning the identity of this individual, and several views have been reported, as follows:

1. The Resemblance Was a Loyal Disciple

The first narration in the interpretation of the Christ-like figure according to Imam al-Tabari is that Allah cast his resemblance on one of his disciples. In the following narration, an explanation is given:

Jesus came with him seventeen disciples into a house, and they (the enemies) surrounded them. When they entered upon them, Allah made them all appear in the image of Jesus. So they said: "You have bewitched us! You must bring out Jesus to us, or we will kill you all!"

Jesus said to his companions: "Who among you will purchase himself today for Paradise?" One of them said: "I will." So he went out to them and said: "I am Jesus." And Allah had made him appear in the image of Jesus, so they took him, killed him, and crucified him.

From there, it was made to appear to them (that he was Jesus), and they thought they had killed Jesus. The Christians also thought the same that it was Jesus while Allah raised Jesus up on that very day.

2. The Resemblance Was Judas Iscariot, the Traitor

The second narration regarding the identity of the person crucified who resembled Christ (peace be upon him) is the interpretation of the verse in Surat An-Nisa, which states that the likeness of Jesus was cast upon the one who betrayed him as a punishment from Allah. That person was Judas Iscariot, whom Imam al-Tabari mentioned under the name "Yudas Zakariyya Youta."

They took him and crucified him while he was saying: "I am not the one you are looking for! I am the one who showed you where he was!"

According to Christian belief, after the resurrection, Christ asked his disciples about him. In al-Tabari's tafsir, it is said that Jesus looked for the one who had sold him out and led the Jews to him. He asked his disciples about him, and they said: "He regretted what he had done, and hanged himself and died." Jesus then said: "Had he repented, Allah would have accepted his repentance."

In another narration reported by Imam al-Tabari:

When morning came, one of the disciples went to the Jews and said: "What will you give me if I guide you to Christ?" They promised him thirty silver coins. He took the money and led them to him.

However, the likeness had already been cast before that. So they took the one who resembled him, restrained him, tied him with a rope, and began dragging him, saying: "You used to bring the dead back to life, cast out devils, and heal the insane can't you save yourself from this rope?"

They spat on him, threw thorns at him, and brought him to the wooden cross upon which they intended to crucify him.

Then Allah raised Jesus up to Himself, and they crucified the one who had been made to resemble him.

3. The Resemblance Was Cast Upon All Those Present

The third narration is that the likeness of Christ was cast upon everyone present. Imam al-Tabari narrates, on the authority of Wahb ibn Munabbih, that:

The likeness of Jesus was cast upon all those who were in the house with him when they were surrounded, without Jesus having asked them for this. But Allah did so in order to disgrace the Jews and to save His Prophet (peace be upon him) from the evil they had intended for him namely, to kill him.

II. Second Doctrine: The Suspicion of Death and Killing

That is, Christ did not die killed on the cross, but was brought down from it alive. This opinion is considered one of the most important interpretative views that addressed the issue of the crucifixion and the problem of the Christ-like figure.

The proponent of this view is Sheikh Ahmed Deedat, who followed the method of the critics in their critique of the New Testament and their refutation of the doctrine of crucifixion.

1. External Criticism

Before beginning his critique of the crucifixion, Sheikh Ahmed Deedat explained the method of crucifixion as a specific form of torture used against rebels, addressing all its details. Based on these details, he (may Allah have mercy on him) argued that Jesus (peace be upon him) did not die on the cross, but that Allah saved him after everyone thought he had died.

Among the pieces of evidence he presented was the fact that Jesus' legs were not broken, unlike what was usually done to those who were crucified. The legs of the two men crucified beside him were broken, while his legs remained intact.

Another indication that Christ did not die is the nature of the tomb in which he was placed. It was a spacious chamber with good ventilation. It was described as five feet wide, seven feet high, and fifteen feet deep.

2. Internal Criticism

Sheikh Ahmed Deedat's internal critique was characterized by his broad knowledge of the texts of the Bible. His method relied on direct citations from the Gospels. According to these texts, the Jews and the priests were able to arrest Christ, then brought him to trial, where the judgment of crucifixion was issued against him. He was then led to Golgotha the place where he was crucified. As mentioned in the Gospel of John: "So he went out, bearing his own cross, to the place called The Place of a Skull, which in Hebrew is called Golgotha." (John 19:17)

They placed him on the cross and tortured and beat him. However, according to Ahmed Deedat, he was not truly crucified. Crucifixion, as Deedat defines it, is the hanging of the accused and the breaking of his legs with an instrument called *crurifragium* something that did not happen in the case of Christ, as confirmed by the Gospel texts. Christ prayed to his Lord to save him, and the Lord answered his prayer. ¹ As stated in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "He offered up prayers and supplications, with loud cries and tears, to the One who was able to save him from death, and he was heard because of his reverent submission." (Hebrews 5:7) Also, it is written in the Psalms: "He protects all his bones; not one of them is broken." (Psalms 34:20)

Therefore, according to Sheikh Ahmed Deedat, as long as Christ's legs were not broken, this indicates that the crucifixion did not truly occur and this is in harmony with the Qur'anic verse: "وما صليوه". Deedat argues that due to the intensity of the torture, Christ's body entered a state of unconsciousness, and the soldiers assumed he had died. That is why they brought him down and did not break his legs. It is stated in the Gospel of John:

"But when they came to Jesus and saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs." (John 19:33) Deedat goes further to offer a scientific explanation: the state of unconsciousness ² that Christ fell into had impacted his circulatory system, and the stab he received from the spear was, in fact, a mercy from God to stimulate and accelerate blood circulation.

Thus, Christ was not killed Allah saved him from death. Even Pilate, the Roman governor, was surprised by how quickly he had "died," especially since they lacked the medical means to confirm death at that time. It is mentioned in the Gospel of Mark: "Joseph of Arimathea, a prominent council member who was also himself waiting for the kingdom of God, went boldly to Pilate and asked for the body of Jesus. Pilate was surprised that he was already dead. Summoning the centurion, he asked him if Jesus had already died. When he learned from the centurion that it was so, he gave the body to Joseph." (Mark 15:43-45)

According to Deedat, those who brought Jesus down from the cross were believers who had concealed their faith. They were the secret followers those he referred to as "my mother and my brothers." (3) These individuals had not been mentioned before, until the moment of rescue. When they brought him down, they found him still alive.

This is how Deedat interprets the Qur'anic verse: "وما قتلوه يقينا." It was made to appear to the people that he had died on the cross. Among the Gospel-based evidence Deedat used is the story of Mary Magdalene, who recognized her Lord after he had disguised himself so as not to be discovered by the Jews or the Romans. Out of great joy, she wanted to embrace or kiss him. But he told her: "Do not touch me." Deedat interprets this as being due to the wounds Christ had suffered from the torture. ³

III. The Third Doctrine: The Suspicion of the Claim

The critical approach is considered the root from which the other methodologies branched in the study of texts. Ibn Hazm was the pioneer in employing this approach, using alongside it other methodologies such as the historical method, the comparative method, and textual criticism, in his critique of the Bible both the Old and New Testaments.

In this section, we will see how the Imam, through his application of this methodology, was able to reach conclusions that constitute the essence of what contemporary scholars of Biblical studies have arrived at.

1. Internal Textual Criticism

Although Imam Ibn Hazm addressed the critique of the crucifixion doctrine at the beginning of his book, as we have previously mentioned, he did not stop there. He employed the method of internal textual criticism by comparing Gospel passages within a single Gospel, as well as comparing passages between one Gospel and the others, and comparing the texts to facts and rational axioms.

Imam Ibn Hazm directed his internal criticism toward the discussion of the crucifixion event in terms of time, place, and the witnesses who were said to have observed the incident all based on the texts available to him in order to demonstrate that the time and place of the crucifixion are themselves proof that the witnesses did not actually see the event.

➤ Internal Criticism of the Timing of the Event

Imam Ibn Hazm (may Allah have mercy on him) said: “The Christians themselves admit that they did not dare seize him during the day, fearing the public. Rather, they captured him at night after the people had dispersed following the Passover.”⁴ In this statement, Ibn Hazm speaks about the day of the event and the occasion at the time namely the Passover⁵ and the Feast of Unleavened Bread. He also refers to its timing that is, the hour in which the crucifixion took place which is consistent with what is mentioned in the Gospel texts. For in the Gospel of Mark it says: “Now the Passover and the Festival of Unleavened Bread were only two days away, and the chief priests and the teachers of the law were scheming to arrest Jesus secretly and kill him. ‘But not during the festival,’ they said, ‘or the people may riot.’”⁶

The priests and guards thus refrained from crucifying Christ during the festival for fear of an uprising by the public, and out of concern for chaos and disorder. They therefore decided to arrest him at night. From the Gospel of Mark, we understand that the arrest took place after the end of the Passover, which contradicts what is stated in the Gospel of John where it is mentioned that the arrest occurred on the day of the Passover: “When Pilate heard this, he brought Jesus out and sat down on the judge’s seat at a place known as The Stone Pavement (which in Aramaic is Gabbatha). It was the day of Preparation of the Passover; it was about noon. ‘Here is your king,’ Pilate said to the Jews. But they shouted, ‘Take him away! Take him away! Crucify him!’”⁷

As for the matter of timing, the Gospels agree that it was night. In the Gospel of John, it is stated: “Now Judas, who betrayed him, knew the place, because Jesus had often met there with his disciples. So Judas came to the garden, guiding a detachment of soldiers and some officials from the chief priests and the Pharisees. They were carrying torches, lanterns and weapons.”

The words “torches and lanterns”⁸ clearly indicate that the event took place at night. This is also supported by what is mentioned in the Gospel of Matthew: “From noon until three in the afternoon darkness came over all the land. About three in the afternoon Jesus cried out in a loud voice, ‘Eli, Eli, lema sabachthani?’ (which means ‘My God, my God, why have you forsaken me?’)”⁹

The fact that they feared riots, and that the crucifixion was carried out at night, is evidence that Christ was well accepted by the general public and had followers who would support him and not abandon him — as is stated in the Qur’an: *فَلَمَّا أَحَسَّ عِيسَىٰ مِنْهُمُ الْكُفْرَ قَالَ مَنْ أَنْصَارِي إِلَى اللَّهِ قَالَ الْحَوَارِيُّونَ إِنَّا مُسْلِمُونَ ﴿١٠٦﴾*

However, a textual reading of the Gospels informs us that the disciples were, at that moment, frightened for their own lives and fled. In the Gospel of Matthew it says: "At that time Jesus said to the crowd, 'Am I leading a rebellion, that you have come out with swords and clubs to capture me? Every day I sat in the temple courts teaching, and you did not arrest me. But this has all taken place that the writings of the prophets might be fulfilled.' Then all the disciples deserted him and fled." ¹⁰

The word "fled" indicates abandonment. Even in the Gospel of Matthew, it is mentioned that Peter his close companion who had pledged to die with him denied him. It is written: "Now Peter was sitting out in the courtyard, and a servant girl came to him. 'You also were with Jesus of Galilee,' she said. But he denied it before them all. 'I don't know what you're talking about,' he said. Then he went out to the gateway, where another servant girl saw him and said to the people there, 'This fellow was with Jesus of Nazareth.' He denied it again, with an oath: 'I don't know the man!'"¹¹

If those closest to Christ had left him and feared for themselves, then who was it that transmitted the report of the crucifixion? The flight of the disciples, as mentioned in the text, is itself evidence against the claim that the general public as alleged were present, witnessed, and transmitted the account of Christ's crucifixion.

➤ **Internal Criticism of the Place of Christ's Crucifixion**

In addition to the factor of time, the factor of place also plays a significant role in denying the validity of the narrators' testimony about the crucifixion of Christ. For no event can be conceived without a time and place. Ibn Hazm referred to this point when he said: "He was not crucified except in a distant location outside the city, in a private garden owned by a potter. It was not a place known for carrying out crucifixions nor was it designated for such." ¹²

Supporting Ibn Hazm's view is historical evidence showing that crucifixion was among the harshest and most severe forms of torture ultimately leading to death. The term "to crucify the victim" is defined in the Bible Dictionary as follows: "To hang someone on a cross to execute the death sentence against them. This was done by tying the hands and feet to it, or more horrifically, by nailing through the fleshy parts." ¹³

This method of torture was known among many ancient nations ¹⁴, and its goal was to terrify and deter anyone who might dare rebel against the ruling authority. Crucifixions were carried out in well-known, visible places where everyone could witness them and take heed. There is no practical benefit in crucifying someone in a location far from public view.

This interpretation is also supported by the fact that Jesus was accused of rebellion, thus making him, in Roman eyes, deserving of crucifixion. The evidence is found in what was written above his cross in the Gospels: the phrase "King of the Jews" ¹⁵, along with a crown of thorns placed on his head ¹⁶, implying that the Romans considered him a rebel and a claimant to kingship. Therefore, the crucifixion in their view should have taken place in full public view, not in a remote place as Ibn Hazm pointed out.

This remote location is named Golgotha in the Gospels. In the Gospel of Matthew it is stated: "As they were going out, they found a man of Cyrene named Simon, whom they compelled to carry his cross. And when they came to a place called Golgotha (which means Place of a Skull), they gave him wine to drink mixed with gall; and after tasting it, he was unwilling to drink. And when they had crucified him, they divided up his garments by casting lots, so that what was spoken through the prophet would be fulfilled: 'They divided My garments among them, and for My clothing they cast lots.' And sitting down, they kept watch over him there." ¹⁷

Further proof that this was a previously unknown site for crucifixions is what is mentioned in the Gospel of John: "Now in the place where He was crucified there was a garden, and in the

garden a new tomb in which no one had yet been laid. Therefore, because of the Jewish day of preparation, since the tomb was nearby, they laid Jesus there.”¹⁸

Thus, Ibn Hazm’s reference to the place where Christ was crucified is significant. It is well known that crucifixion was one of the most disgraceful and humiliating forms of torture, intended to humiliate the crucified individual in a public manner, deterring any potential rebellion against the ruler’s authority. So, what was the purpose of crucifying Christ in such a remote place, if the intended public deterrent effect was absent? The only logical explanation is that the soldiers never succeeded in arresting Christ in the first place.

Evidence for this is found in the Gospel of Matthew: “But Jesus kept silent. And the high priest said to him, ‘I charge you under oath by the living God, tell us if you are the Christ, the Son of God.’”¹⁹

This conversation between the high priest and the person under arrest whose identity was uncertain is proof that they were unsure of who they had captured, and thus failed to seize Christ himself.

2. External Criticism

Ibn Hazm employed external criticism to refute the claim that the resemblance of Christ was physical and sensory. In doing so, he was influenced by his *zāhirī* (literalist) methodology, whose core principle is reliance on transmitted reports. He followed the approach of the hadith scholars, which is based on rigorous scrutiny and analysis of the chains of transmission (*isnād*).

As is well known among scholars of hadith, the chain is evaluated from two aspects: the continuity of its narrators and the reliability of those narrators. As for the continuity, Imam Ibn Hazm demonstrated that the chain was disconnected and thereby invalidated the Christian claim of *mutawātir* (mass-transmitted) reporting as we have seen in his discussion of the criteria for a *mutawātir* report.

Regarding the evaluation of the narrators themselves i.e., the authors of the Gospels Ibn Hazm, through exposing the contradictions among the Gospels, proved that they were liars who were not followers of Christ. They were not the disciples mentioned in the Qur’an. It is as if Ibn Hazm was relying on the principle of the integrity of prophetic followers, who are entrusted with conveying their prophet’s message out of religious necessity.

Just as we hold that the Companions of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) were upright and truthful and that their companionship with the Prophet ensured they would not lie about him, especially since he warned: “Whoever deliberately lies about me, let him take his seat in the Fire.”²⁰ so too, the supporters of Jesus (peace be upon him), whom the Qur’an testifies were Muslims and followers of truth, are above attributing falsehood or disbelief to Allah.

From this foundation, Ibn Hazm concluded that Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John were nothing but liars upon Christ.²¹

Imam Ibn Hazm thus passed judgment that the authors of the Gospels were liars based on the clear disbelief, contradictions, and impossible statements found in their texts, which could not have come from the disciples. Moreover, he held it impossible for distortion to occur in a report that had been transmitted by the masses (*tawātur*).

One might object to this judgment, arguing that it is known these Gospels were written a considerable time after the life of Christ, and Christians themselves acknowledge that they were authored by individuals. Furthermore, the Bible both Old and New Testaments was not publicly accessible, and its reading was restricted to the clergy.

This limited access is what facilitated repeated alterations and distortions of the texts. On this basis, it could be argued that those authors may be innocent of the actual distortions, which might instead have been introduced by those who came after them.

Weighing Between the Doctrines

Someone may ask: If the soldiers, guards, and priests were unable to arrest Christ, then why did Christ not appear to his followers?

Many Muslim scholars have responded to the Christian doctrine of crucifixion, clarifying and elaborating. However, in answering this specific question and in support of Ibn Hazm's approach I will discuss the doctrine of the "Resurrection" as a basis for refuting the doctrine of crucifixion.

After critically reading and analyzing Gospel passages, it becomes evident that Christ did indeed appear to his followers again what Christians refer to as the resurrection from the grave after three days. We are not concerned here with discussing the duration of Christ's stay in the grave, which is also a matter of dispute. What concerns us is his reappearance to the disciples and even more important, the form in which he appeared.

From reading the Gospel texts, it becomes clear that Christ appeared to his companions disguised and hungry. In the Gospel of Luke it is stated: "While they were still talking about this, Jesus himself stood among them and said to them, 'Peace be with you.' They were startled and frightened, thinking they saw a ghost. He said to them, 'Why are you troubled, and why do doubts rise in your minds? Look at my hands and my feet. It is I myself! Touch me and see; a ghost does not have flesh and bones, as you see I have.' When he had said this, he showed them his hands and feet. And while they still did not believe it because of joy and amazement, he asked them, 'Do you have anything here to eat?' They gave him a piece of broiled fish, and some honeycomb. And he took it and ate it in their presence."²²

According to Christian narration, Christ was crucified and killed. We also know that Christian sects differ in their understanding of Christ's nature. The Arians, Ebionites, and followers of Paul of Samosata²³ claimed he had a human nature. The Barbarians²⁴ and the followers of Eutyches claimed he had a divine nature. The Nestorians said he had two distinct natures. The majority of Christians claimed he had one nature after the union of the divine and human.

Excluding those who believed in Christ's purely human nature, we ask the remaining sects: If Christians say that Christ is God who united with Mary's body, and that he was crucified to redeem humanity from sin, then what was his nature after the crucifixion?

Was it a human nature? A divine nature? Or one nature uniting both?

If, before the crucifixion, he had one nature a union of divinity and humanity to fulfill the mission of redemption then that nature must have ended with the fulfillment of that mission. Since the crucifixion affected only the human nature, as the Nestorians claimed, then he would return to a purely divine nature.

But if it is claimed that he rose from the grave with a nature in which divinity and humanity were reunited, then proof is required. What was the purpose of reappearing in that nature after completing the act of redemption?

And if it is claimed that he returned with a divine nature then was the divine hungry, asking for food after resurrection?

Does the divine need nourishment?

Why did he say to his companions, "Look at my hands and my feet"?

Why was he in disguise, hiding from the soldiers and guards?

Is God afraid of being crucified or killed again?

Or was Christ resurrected with a purely human nature? But this is not what Christian's claim. For it is stated in the Epistle to the Hebrews: "And just as it is appointed for people to die once and after this, judgment."²⁵

This verse means that a person dies only once, and there is no death after death.

These questions have only one answer: The soldiers and guards never managed to arrest Jesus, the son of Mary.

What Christians call the "resurrection after death" was merely a normal meeting in which Christ gathered with his companions and told them that he had neither died nor been crucified after news of his death and crucifixion had spread.

This news is what the companions of Christ transmitted to the people.

The question that Christians pose to us is: If those who witnessed the crucifixion did not know that God had cast Christ's likeness onto someone else how could they know this if God had raised him up? And what about those who died before the Qur'an was revealed declaring his ascension?

The answer lies in the apocryphal Gospels²⁶, as stated in the Gospel of Barnabas: "Jesus answered, embracing his mother: Believe me, mother, for I tell you the truth, I have not died at all. For God has kept me until near the end of the world."²⁷

This text gives us a clear picture that the priests and soldiers never succeeded in capturing Christ. Instead, they crucified someone they were able to seize from among the criminals and spread the news that it was Christ who had been crucified.

This news even reached his mother. But how can a mother, knowing that her son is being led by soldiers to be crucified, remain calm and content, without following him or sending someone to inquire about him?

Indeed, we find no testimony in the first three Gospels from Mary (peace be upon her) that she witnessed the crucifixion except for one account in the Gospel of John²⁸, which was written much later than the other Gospels and has been the subject of significant debate.

In that same gathering which Christians call the "resurrection after death" — after God saved His prophet from the schemes of the Jews, Christ told the disciples that he was going to a place they could not follow. In the Gospel of John, it says: "My children, I will be with you only a little longer. You will look for me, and just as I told the Jews, so I tell you now: Where I am going, you cannot come."²⁹

This is confirmed by the Qur'an, which affirms that God raised Jesus, son of Mary, to Himself: (النساء: 157-158) ﴿وَقَوْلِهِمْ إِنَّا قَتَلْنَا الْمَسِيحَ عِيسَى ابْنَ مَرْيَمَ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ وَمَا قَتَلُوهُ وَمَا صَلَّبُوهُ وَلَٰكِنْ شُبِّهَ لَهُمْ...﴾

CONCLUSION

At the end of this research paper, we conclude with the following findings:

1. All Islamic scholars agreed that Jesus (peace be upon him) was neither crucified nor killed.
2. The scholars differed in interpreting the verse "but it was made to appear so to them", resulting in three main doctrines.
3. The majority of exegetes followed the narrations transmitted from the early generations (Salaf), as well as from Jews and Christians who had converted to Islam.

4. Ahmed Deedat's approach presents a new method for denying the crucifixion, but it contradicts the views of traditional exegetes.
5. Islamic scholars unanimously agree that the account of the crucifixion of Christ is based on reports and that no one actually witnessed the crucifixion.
6. The traditional commentators differed on identifying the substitute who was made to resemble Christ, with three distinct opinions.
7. The Christian sects have major theological disagreements regarding the events of the crucifixion and the resurrection.
8. Imam Ibn Hazm employed a unique methodological approach in interpreting the resemblance of Christ an approach unprecedented before him.
9. Ibn Hazm's methodology, when confronted with a speculative narration (zanni) that contradicts established certainties (qat'i), is to prioritize the definitive, and reinterpret or contextualize the narration in a way consistent with his established certainties.
10. The resurrection of Christ is conclusive evidence for denying the occurrence of the crucifixion.
11. The crucifixion is the central Christian doctrine upon which the Christian faith is founded.

REFERENCES

➤ The Holy Qur'an

1. The Holy Bible.
2. Al-Bukhari, Abu Abdullah Muhammad ibn Ismail. Sahih al-Bukhari. Al-Bushra Edition, Pakistan, 1437 AH / 2016 CE.
3. Al-Tabari, Abu Ja'far Muhammad ibn Jarir. Jami' al-Bayan 'an Ta'wil Ay al-Qur'an. Al-Matba'ah al-'Asriyya, Beirut, 1433 AH / 2012 CE.
4. Ibn Hazm, Ali ibn Ahmad. Al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Ahwa' wa al-Nihal. Al-Sahhar Publishing and Printing Co., 1421 AH / 2020 CE.
5. Ahmed Deedat. The Crucifixion of Christ: Fact or Fiction? Dar al-Fadila.

ENDNOTES

¹ Ahmed Deedat, The Crucifixion of Christ: Fact or Fiction?, p. 74.

² Ibid., p. 88.

³ Ibid., p. 102.

⁴ Ibid., p. 108.

⁵ The Passover begins on the evening of the 14th and continues through the 15th day of the month of Abib, which means "month of greenery" or "formation of the ears (of grain)," later known as "Nisan" after the Babylonian exile. The Passover is immediately followed by the seven-day Feast of Unleavened Bread. The two festivals are closely linked to the memory of the Exodus from Egypt. Passover also marked the beginning of the Jewish religious calendar, while their civil calendar began in Tishri (October).

⁶ Gospel of Mark, chapter 1: (1–2).

⁷ Gospel of Mark, chapter 1: (1–2).

⁸ Gospel of John, chapter 18: (2–3).

-
- ⁹ Gospel of Matthew, chapter 27: (45–46).
- ¹⁰ Gospel of Matthew, chapter 26: (55–56).
- ¹¹ Gospel of Matthew, chapter 26: (69–70).
- ¹² Ibn Hazm, *Al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Ahwa' wa al-Nihal*, p. 109.
- ¹³ Bible Dictionary, p. 545.
- ¹⁴ The Jewish historian Josephus, who lived near the time of Christ, wrote in his book *The History of Josephus that crucifixion was a known method of execution among the Romans and in Babylonian civilization. The term also appears in the Qur'an in Pharaoh's words: ﴿لَأَصْلَبَنَّكُمْ فِي جُذُوعِ النَّخْلِ﴾...*
- ¹⁵ See: Gospel of Mark, chapter 15: (26–27).
- ¹⁶ See: Gospel of John, chapter 19: (4–5).
- ¹⁷ Gospel of Matthew, chapter 27: (32–36).
- ¹⁸ Gospel of John, chapter 19: (41–42).
- ¹⁹ Gospel of Matthew, chapter 26: (63–64).
- ²⁰ *Sahih al-Bukhari, Book of Knowledge, chapter on the sin of lying about the Prophet MOHAMED*, p. 189.
- ²¹ See: *Al-Fasl fi al-Milal*, p. 114.
- ²² Gospel of Luke, chapter 24: (36–43).
- ²³ The Arians, Ebionites, and followers of Paul of Samosata were early Christian sects before the Council of Nicaea. They held that Christ had a human nature.
- ²⁴ The Barbarians were a now-extinct sect that believed in the divinity of Christ and his mother Mary. This belief is referenced in the Qur'an: ﴿أَأَنْتَ قُلْتَ لِلنَّاسِ اتَّخِذُونِي وَأُمَّيَ إِلَهَيْنِ مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ﴾
- ²⁵ Epistle to the Hebrews, chapter 9.
- ²⁶ The term “Apocrypha” (Greek: Apokryphon) refers to non-canonical Gospels, many of which date back to the early Christian centuries. Some align with Nicene Christian doctrine, while others diverge significantly.
- ²⁷ Gospel of Barnabas, chapter 220, p. 214.
- ²⁸ Gospel of John, chapter 19: (25–27): “Standing by the cross of Jesus were his mother, his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene...”
- ²⁹ Gospel of John, chapter 13: (33–34).